



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 2020

No. 30

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable LAMAR ALEXANDER, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, a light to a dark world, we honor and praise Your Name.

Lord, continue to guide our Senators. Use them to bring a little more light and truth to our Nation. Help them to remember that Your timing is not their timing, but Your providence will prevail. May they embrace the demands of a life of integrity, a life that refuses to give in to fear, hypocrisy, and hatred. Lord, You are our strength and shield, and we trust You to guide our steps.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, February 13, 2020.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable LAMAR ALEXANDER, a Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALEXANDER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DIRECTING THE REMOVAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES FROM HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN THAT HAVE NOT BEEN AUTHORIZED BY CONGRESS—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S.J. Res. 68, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

Pending:

Cramer (for Cruz) Amendment No. 1301, to amend the findings.

Cramer (for Reed) Amendment No. 1322, to amend the findings.

Cramer (for Cotton) Amendment No. 1305, to exempt from the termination requirement United States Armed Forces engaged in operations directed at designated terrorist organizations.

Cramer (for Risch) Amendment No. 1314, to amend the findings.

Cramer (for Rubio/Risch) Amendment No. 1320, to amend the findings.

Cramer (for Sullivan) Amendment No. 1319, to amend the rule of construction.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The majority leader is recognized.

TRIBUTE TO BOB SWANNER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this week, I offered thanks to a long list of Senate officers and staff who helped this body fulfill our unique constitutional responsibilities in recent weeks, but we are soon saying goodbye to one of those distinguished servants of the U.S. Senate. So I would like to begin this morning by sharing my gratitude and the whole Senate's gratitude for Bob Swanner.

Bob first joined the staff of the Senate Recording Studio more than two decades ago. Back then, he was already somewhat of an expert in designing and constructing television and radio studios. In fact, I understand that his record was so impressive that he was offered the job on the spot, and as anyone knows who has worked with Bob for even a few minutes, he has spent every day since then demonstrating how lucky we were to have him on board.

By his second year on the job, Bob had already successfully spearheaded the transition of Senate broadcasts to high-definition TV, and he didn't stop there. Over the past two decades, Bob has guided the overhaul of the camera and audio systems in every Senate hearing room. He masterminded the design of the new Senate Recording Studio's facilities in the Capitol Visitor Center, and he has made sure that speeches here on the floor are delivered under only the best TV lighting.

Let's face it—Hollywood, this place is not. Frankly, capturing a U.S. Senator's "good side" is not always an easy assignment, but as Bob knows better than anyone, our audio-visual capabilities in this institution are not about glamor; they are about civics. They are about making sure the American people can look and listen to their government.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1051

Oh, and I haven't even gotten to the small fact that Presidential inaugurations take place here on the Capitol grounds as well. Not long after Bob was promoted to general manager of the Recording Studio came the 2017 inauguration—one big professional challenge after another and one success after another on behalf of the institution that Bob has served.

It is no surprise that Bob's colleagues at the Recording Studio are sorry to see him go. The Senate is better for his dedicated efforts over these many years, but he will begin his well-deserved retirement with our sincere thanks for a job well done.

IMPEACHMENT

Mr. President, now on an entirely different matter, it has been 1 week since the Senate concluded the third Presidential trial in American history.

Things move quickly in Washington, as always, so it is natural that our focus is now shifting to the many policy subjects where we have more work to do for families all across our country.

But when the Senate acts, we do not only address the particular issue before us; we create lasting precedent. This is especially true during something as grave and uncommon as an impeachment trial. Just as citizens, scholars, and Senators ourselves studied the past precedents of 1868 and 1999, so will future generations examine what unfolded over the past few months.

So before we adjourn for the upcoming State work period and leave impeachment fully in the rearview mirror, I wanted to speak about it one more time—not about the particulars that have been so exhaustively discussed and debated but the deeper questions, to record some final observations for the future.

The Senate did its job. We protected the long-term future of our Republic. We kept the temporary fires of factionalism from burning through to the bedrock of our institutions. We acted as Madison wished—as an “impediment” against “improper acts.” The Framers’ firewall held the line.

But in this case, all is not well that ends well. We cannot forget the abuses that fueled this process. We cannot make light of the dangerous new precedents set by President Trump's opponents in their zeal to impeach at all costs. We need to remember what happened so we can avoid it ever happening again.

As we know, the leftwing drive to impeach President Trump predated—predated—any phone call to Ukraine—and, in fact, his inauguration. This isn't a Republican talking point; it is what was reported by outlets like POLITICO and the Washington Post. House Democrats barely tried to hide that they began with a guilty verdict and were simply shopping for a suitable crime.

So, unfortunately, it was predictable that the House majority would use the serious process of impeachment as a platform to politically attack the

President. It was less predictable that they would also attack our Nation's core institutions themselves. But that is what happened.

First, the House Democrats chose to degrade their body's own precedents. The majority sprinted through a slapdash investigation to meet arbitrary political deadlines. They trivialized the role of the House Judiciary Committee, the body traditionally charged with conducting impeachment inquiries. They sidelined their own Republican minority colleagues and the President's counsel to precedent-breaking degrees.

All of this was very regrettable, but from a purely practical perspective, breaking the House's own china was Speaker PELOSI's prerogative. What was truly outrageous is what came next—a rolling attack on the other institutions outside the House.

To begin with, the recklessly broad Articles of Impeachment were an attack not just on one President but on the Office of the Presidency itself.

Their first article criticized the alleged motivation behind a Presidential action but failed to frame their complaint as definable “high Crimes [or] Misdemeanors.” This House set out into unchartered constitutional waters by passing the first-ever Presidential impeachment that did not allege any violations of criminal statutes.

Clearly, they owed the Senate and the country a clear limiting principle to explain why removal on these grounds would be different from the malleable and subjective “maladministration” standard, which the Framers rejected as a ground for impeachment. But they offered no such thing.

And their second article sought to criminalize the normal and routine exercise of executive privileges that Presidents of both parties have rightly invoked throughout our history. This was, in effect, criminalizing the separation of powers themselves.

So the House articles would have sharply diminished the Presidency in our constitutional structure. To extract a pound of flesh from one particular President, House Democrats were willing to attack the office itself.

But it did not stop with the House and the Presidency. Next in the crosshairs came the Senate.

The very night the House passed the articles, the Speaker began an unprecedented effort to reach outside her own Chamber and dictate the contours of the Senate trial to Senators. The bizarre stunt of withholding the articles achieved, of course, nothing, but the irony was enormous.

The House had just spent weeks jealously guarding their “sole power” of impeachment and criticizing other branches for perceived interference. Indeed, this reasoning was the entire basis for their second Article of Impeachment, but their first act out of the gate was to try to bust constitutional guardrails and meddle in the Senate.

When that stunt went nowhere and the trial began, House Democrats brought their war on institutions over to this Chamber. From the very first evening, it was clear the House managers would not even try to persuade a supermajority of Senators but simply sought to degrade and smear the Senate itself before the Nation. Senators were called “treacherous” for not structuring our proceedings to the managers' liking.

Finally, when the trial neared its end and it became clear that bullying the Senate would not substitute for persuading it, the campaign against institutions took aim at yet another independent branch—the Supreme Court—in particular, the Chief Justice of the United States.

A far-left pressure group produced ads impugning him for presiding neutrally—neutrally—and not seizing control of the Senate. One Democratic Senator running for President made the Chief Justice read a pointless question gainsaying his own “legitimacy.”

So, in summary, the opponents of this President were willing to throw mud at the House, the Presidency, the Senate, and the Supreme Court—all for the sake of short-term partisan politics.

The irony would be rich if it were less sad. For years, this President's opponents have sought to cloak their rage in the high-minded trappings of institutionalism. The President's opponents profess great concern for the norms and traditions of our government. But when it really counted—when the rubber met the road—that talk proved cheap. It was they who proved willing to degrade public confidence in our government. It was they who indulged political bloodlust at the expense of our institutions: reckless—reckless—insinuations that our 2016 election was not legitimate; further insinuations—right here on the floor—that if the American people reelect this President in 2020, the result will be presumptively illegitimate as well; bizarre statements from the Speaker of the House that she may simply deny reality and refuse to accept the Senate's verdict as final.

There has been much discussion about the foreign adversaries who seek to reduce the American people's faith in our democracy and cause chaos and division in our country—rightly so—but we must also demand that our own political leaders exercise some self-restraint and not do the work of our adversaries for them.

The critics of our Constitution often say that because our Framers could not have imagined modern conditions, their work is outmoded. We hear that the First Amendment or the Second Amendment or the separation of powers must be changed to suit the times.

But the geniuses who founded this Nation were actually very prescient. Case in point: The reckless partisan crusade of recent weeks is something they predicted more than two centuries

ago. Hamilton predicted “the demon of faction will, at certain seasons, extend his scepter” over the House of Representatives. He predicted that partisan anger could produce “an intemperate or designing majority in the House of Representatives,” capable of destroying the separation of powers if left unchecked.

The Framers predicted overheated House majorities might lash out at their peer institutions and display “strong symptoms of impatience and disgust at the least sign of opposition from any other quarter; as if the exercise of . . . rights, by either the executive or judiciary, were a breach of their privilege and an outrage to their dignity.” They knew the popular legislature might be “disposed to exert an imperious control over the other departments.”

They predicted all of this. They predicted it all.

So they did something about it. They set up a firewall. They built the Senate.

This body performed admirably these past weeks. We did precisely the job we were made for.

We did precisely the job we were made for, but impeachment should never have come to the Senate like this. This most serious constitutional tool should never have been used so lightly—as a political weapon of first resort, as a tool to lash out at the basic bedrock of our institutions because one side did not get their way.

It should never have happened, and it should never happen again.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MARCH FOR LIFE

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, on January 24, tens of thousands of pro-life Americans filled the streets of Washington, DC, for the annual March for Life. Unfortunately, I couldn't come down to the floor to talk about the march because the Senate was tied up with the impeachment trial, although I did get the opportunity to meet with some marchers from Rapid City, SD. Now that the floor is open again, I wanted to come down to recognize this year's marchers, including those from my home State of South Dakota, and talk about why they march.

Every year in this country, hundreds of thousands of babies are killed by abortion—hundreds of thousands. That is not some number the pro-life movement has cooked up. That is straight from the pro-abortion Guttmacher Institute, formerly affiliated with Planned Parenthood, which reports that “approximately 862,320 abortions

were performed in 2017.” That is 862,320. Most of us can't even fathom what a number that big looks like, but that is a lot of babies, because, of course, that is what we are talking about—babies, human beings.

Proponents of abortion try to deny the humanity of the unborn child, but science and ultrasound and common sense all make it very clear that when we talk about unborn children, we are talking about human beings, with their own fingerprints and their own DNA. Human beings deserve to be protected, even when they are small and weak and vulnerable—especially when they are small and weak and vulnerable.

Stick around politics long enough and you are sure to hear someone talking about the importance of being on the right side of history. It is a common trope, but it is no less true for that. The truth is, we should think about being on the right side of history. When people look back at us, we want to be remembered for standing up for what is right, not for going along with injustice.

Abortion repeats a tired pattern. One group of people or society decides that another group of people is less valuable. They advance plausible-sounding reasons why it is legitimate to deprive these people of their human rights, and for various reasons people in that society go along with it. It is a story that has been repeated too many times, and the judgment of history never looks kindly on these societies.

The United States was founded to safeguard human rights. We haven't always lived up to that promise, but we have never stopped trying. It is time for America to start standing up for the rights of unborn humans.

Last week, in his State of the Union Address, the President called for a ban on late-term abortions. In 2016, somewhere around 11,000 babies were aborted at or after the 21-week mark in pregnancy—11,000 in 1 year. That is a lot of babies.

As neonatal science advances, we have been able to save babies born at earlier and earlier stages of pregnancy. Babies have survived after being born at 25 weeks, at 24 weeks, at 23 weeks, and, like Ellie Schneider, who attended the State of the Union Address with her mom, at 21 weeks. Yet, in this country it is legal to kill babies at 40 weeks, right up until the very last moment of pregnancy. That makes no sense.

How can a child born at 23 weeks be regarded as a human being, deserving of care, and yet an unborn child who is that very same age be regarded as less than human? The moment of birth does not magically confer humanity, and yet our law acts like it does.

I would like to think that a bill to ban late-term abortions like the President proposed would be a no-brainer in Congress. At the very, very least, we should all be able to agree that we shouldn't be aborting babies who can live outside their mothers. But, unfor-

tunately, abortion extremism has grown to such an extent that leading Democrats, including a Democrat Presidential candidate, not only rule out banning late-term abortions, but they actually refused to rule out infanticide.

Last year, after the Democrat Governor of Virginia implicitly endorsed infanticide, the Senate took up legislation that simply stated that a baby born alive in an abortion clinic is entitled to the same protection and medical care that a baby born in a hospital is entitled to, and 44 Democrats, almost the entire Democrat caucus here in the Senate, voted against that legislation. It was a grim day for human decency and for human rights.

Although we have a long way to go to protect unborn babies in this country, I remain hopeful, and I am never more hopeful than when I see tens of thousands of Americans—so many of them young people—descend on our Nation's Capital every year to march for life. We may not win this battle today or tomorrow, but we are turning the tide. The arc of the moral universe is long, but I believe that it does bend toward justice and in the end right will prevail. I look forward to the day when every child born and unborn is protected in this country.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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.

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today the Senate will vote on a bipartisan War Powers Resolution offered by Senator KAINE directing the President to terminate the use of U.S. Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran.

The Constitution is clear: Congress has the power to declare war. The President has no authority to enter the United States into another endless conflict in the Middle East, but I fear that the President's erratic decision-making, his lack of strategy, his inability to control his impulses may bumble us into a war nonetheless, even if he doesn't intend it.

With this bipartisan resolution, the Senate will assert its constitutional authority and send a clear bipartisan message that the President—this President or any President—cannot sidestep Congress when it comes to matters of war and peace. It is important to do this now.

The President's actions in the Middle East have escalated the confrontation. Before the State of the Union, the President himself said that war with Iran was “closer than you thought”—

his words. Now, let me be clear, nobody in this Chamber will shed a single tear over the death of Iranian General Soleimani, but that doesn't mean that we disregard the potential consequences of the strike or any comparable action. It is more than appropriate for Congress to affirm that it has authority over any major long-term hostilities with Iran, as the Constitution prescribes.

Yet, still, some on the other side have claimed that this War Powers Resolution is nothing more than an attempt by Democrats to embarrass President Trump. The Founding Fathers would laugh at that assertion. One of the great powers they gave Congress—not the executive—was the power to declare war. This resolution is partisan? Well, then, why are a good number of Republicans supporting it?

Let me say this again. This resolution is going to pass with a bipartisan majority of Senators in support—a rarity these days. If this is purely an attempt to embarrass the President, well, it is going to be a bipartisan one.

We need to stop pretending as if both sides of the aisle aren't concerned about the President having too much leeway over matters of war and peace. That is why this resolution is bipartisan, because both sides of the aisle agree that for too long Congress has ceded our constitutional authority to the executive branch, and we are taking an important step today to claim that authority back.

Now, today there will be amendments offered that will seek to do one thing and one thing only: undermine what we are trying to achieve today and provide the President's lawyers with get-out-of-jail free cards. My colleague from Arkansas has an amendment that will create an exception for operations against foreign terrorist organizations. It sounds reasonable at first, but any enterprising lawyer in the administration could use this amendment to justify the type of unilateral escalation of hostilities that this legislation would prohibit. My colleague from Florida has an amendment that seeks a similar outcome. My friends on both sides who wish this resolution to pass should vote down these amendments. They cut against the core of the legislation. Senator KAINE told me that if this amendment passed, the Cotton amendment, he would be forced to vote against his own bill. What good would that do for those of us who want to pass it anyway?

One final point. With respect to the situation in Iran, we still don't have a clear picture from the administration about our strategy in the region. The only gesture of transparency that this administration has been able to muster was a classified all-Members briefing conducted more than a week after the strike. There were 97 Senators who attended, but only 15 Members got to ask questions before the administration, led by Secretary Pompeo, practically sprinted out the door with a less-than-

genuine commitment to return. Our demands for a followup briefing have been ignored by the White House, Secretary Esper, and Secretary Pompeo. Those briefings should have occurred before the action. I learned about what we were doing in the news, and 2 hours later got a call from the administration.

I fear that by keeping Congress and the American people in the dark, President Trump may be directing military operations in a manner that doesn't stand up to public scrutiny. When you are forced to consult with Congress and when Congress has the power to declare war, quick and sloppy thinking evaporates because people have to at least examine the issues in some detail, and the American public has some say.

That is why Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution is a matter of necessity. I commend Senator KAINE and his colleagues on the job he has done, including my colleague from Illinois, sitting right here, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Madam President, now on the Department of Justice. In the short week since the conclusion of the President's impeachment trial, the President has reminded us of all the reasons why Congress must serve as the check on the Executive.

The President has dismissed members of his administration who testified in the House impeachment inquiry, including, for no reason, the twin brother of one of the witnesses. The administration has reportedly withdrawn the nomination of a senior Pentagon official who merely advised her colleagues about the legal implications of delaying assistance to Ukraine. Truth—when the President doesn't like the truth, it has no place in this administration, and people who speak truth to power are summarily dismissed.

On Tuesday, after career prosecutors made sentencing recommendations for Roger Stone, who was found guilty of witness tampering and lying to Congress, the President tweeted that his former colleague and confidant was being unfairly treated. Soon afterward, it appears the Attorney General or other political appointees at DOJ countermanded the sentencing recommendation and will instead advise a more lenient sentence for the President's friend. As a result, all four career prosecutors connected to the Stone case withdrew from the case or resigned from the Justice Department entirely—a clear signal they believed the revised sentencing conflicted with their professional and ethical obligations as prosecutors.

Of course, it was not enough for the President to just lean on the Justice Department to make it easy on his old pal. The President went on publicly to attack the judge who would decide Mr. Stone's fate—another example of the President's blatant contempt for the independence of the judiciary.

In the past, Chief Justice Roberts has spoken out in defense of the independ-

ence of the judicial branch. When the President, during his campaign, attacked Judge Curiel, the Chief Justice released a statement saying:

We do not have Obama judges or Trump judges, Bush judges or Clinton judges. We have an extraordinary group of dedicated judges doing their level best to do equal right to those appearing before them. The independent judiciary is something we should all be thankful for.

That is what Chief Justice Roberts said.

Well, President Trump is once again attacking a Federal judge—in this case, Judge Amy Berman Jackson, who is presiding over the Stone case. The Nation now looks again to Chief Justice Roberts to make clear to President Trump that these attacks are unacceptable. Speaking of the independence of the judiciary in broad and general terms is well and good. It is a good thing to do, but to not speak up now, when in the middle of this brouhaha a judge is being attacked by the President before she makes a sentencing decision, that is when we really need the Chief Justice to speak up. Now would be the time for Chief Justice Roberts to speak up. Now would be the time for the Chief Justice to directly and specifically defend the independence of this Federal judge. I hope he will see fit to do that and to do it today.

I have also called on the inspector general of the Justice Department to investigate the Roger Stone matter. The Judiciary Committee in the Senate should do the same, but even without formal investigation, it is abundantly clear that something is rotten in the Justice Department.

The President can corrupt our Justice Department in two major ways: pressuring it to investigate his opponents or using its power to reward his friends. The impeachment of the President concerned the first abuse: The President wanted a foreign power to announce an investigation into one of his political opponents or funnel allegedly incriminating information to our Justice Department. The President explicitly mentioned the Attorney General during his phone call with the Ukrainian President. More recently, Attorney General Barr has publicly said that the Justice Department has now set up a channel to receive information from the President's personal attorney, Rudy Giuliani, about the Ukraine scandal. It seems to be an attempt to accomplish the same goals the President was just impeached over.

The events surrounding Mr. Stone's more lenient sentencing recommendations are an example of the second way Presidents can corrupt the Justice Department: improperly rewarding the President's friends. In the wake of Watergate, Congress passed laws and made crucial reforms so this kind of abuse of the levers of power will not happen again, but here, right now, the President is using the hallowed Justice Department—the only Cabinet agency named for an ideal, Justice—as his personal law firm. He is using the Justice

Department named for an ideal, Justice, as his personal law firm.

What a shame. What a defamation of what the Constitution is all about.

My Senate colleagues who believed the President would be chastened by impeachment have been completely and disastrously wrong. The only lesson the President has learned is that there is nothing he can do that Senate Republicans will not forgive or rationalize or simply ignore. The lesson the President has learned is that the courts are unlikely to stop him, too, because the Senate Republican caucus has voted to confirm virtually every judge he has nominated, no matter how unqualified or ill-suited to the bench.

We are staring at a crisis of the rule of law. The institutions designed to check Executive power are crumbling before our very eyes. The crisis was the President's own making, but it was enabled and emboldened by every Senate Republican who has been too afraid to stand up to the President and say no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 3 minutes in debate.

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

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise in strong support of S.J. Res. 68. Senator Kaine, a distinguished member of the Foreign Relations Committee, has done an extraordinary job here in riveting our attention to a congressional responsibility that is paramount. It calls for the removal of U.S. troops from hostilities against Iran that Congress has not authorized.

One of the most consequential decisions we make as Members of Congress—I have been called on on more than one occasion between the House and the Senate—is whether to send our sons and daughters into battle. It is a decision that is about life and death and national security. The Constitution delegated that power to only one institution of the entire Federal Government—the Congress of the United States—to declare war, because of the severity of the consequences of the decision. It is up to the Congress to ensure that the executive branch, whoever sits there at any given time, utilizes all the tools of diplomacy it has to keep Americans safe and that there is an effective check on executive power before we send our children off to war.

I stand in strong support of the resolution. This body must assert its congressional privilege.

Of course, the President has the right to take action to defend against imminent threats to the homeland and to Americans abroad. No one disputes that. Senator Kaine doesn't dispute that. None of us do. But the President does not have the authority to engage in any military action he likes.

We have been hearing from this administration that there is a redline—

Iran cannot have a nuclear weapon. I agree. But if, at the end of the day, that means that to enforce your redline, you are going to take America to war, then you must come to the Congress of the United States and seek that authorization for war.

What I hear from the administration: Oh, no, we have article II powers. Oh, no, the 2002 resolution—which had nothing to do with Iran. Never envisioned. It is so tortured to suggest that is authorization for us. Can we sit back and contemplate that possibility? We cannot. We cannot.

So as someone who voted against the war in Iraq and served in Congress during the debate on whether to authorize military action, I can assure you that the 2002 resolution—that was not its intention, and it doesn't comport with the history, the use, or the plain reading of the text.

I am gravely concerned about the administration's efforts to build a shaky legal foundation for the explicit purpose of carrying us into ever-longer wars, including potentially against Iran.

Before we vote to ultimately decide that, it should be the Congress of the United States that should make that decision on behalf of the American people, looking our sons and daughters in the eyes and saying, yes, this is worthy of the national security of the United States.

I will vote to send my son and daughter if the cause is right, but if the cause is not right, I will not vote to send my son and daughter or anyone else's sons and daughters. That is the debate that should be had here. That is what Senator Kaine is trying to do with this resolution. I am concerned that some of the amendments being offered are simply to undermine that.

I look forward to joining with Senator Kaine to pass that resolution, as well as oppose some of the amendments.

I will submit a longer statement for the RECORD on this resolution, S.J. Res. 68, and the War Powers Resolution more broadly when we return on Monday, February 24. I urge my colleagues to read that statement.

With that, I yield back.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1301

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate equally divided prior to a vote in relation to Cruz amendment No. 1301.

Who yields time?

Mr. Kaine. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise to speak in opposition to the Cruz amendment.

The Cruz amendment is contrary to the purpose of the resolution before the body. The resolution before the body is to make sure that Congress is involved in decisions about war. The Cruz amendment is contrary to that purpose by praising the President for a military action taken not only without congress-

sional approval but without notification to Congress.

Second, we are all glad General Soleimani is dead. That is good for the world. But there are legitimate questions about the mission—particularly, should it have been taken out on Iraqi soil over the objection of the Iraqi Government? That has now led the Iraqi Parliament to ask U.S. troops to withdraw from the region, which would empower Iran and empower ISIS.

Finally, the Cruz amendment talks about President Trump. This resolution is not about President Trump. I had an original version of it that referenced activities of the administration, but my Republican colleagues—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. Kaine. Asked me to remove those.

I ask for a vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does anybody want to use time in favor of the amendment?

Mr. Risch. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. Risch. Madam President and fellow Senators, I rise in support of Senator Cruz's amendment.

This is just a continuation of this animosity toward this President. This President did a great service to the United States of America, to the people of America, and to the world by dispatching General Soleimani as he did.

All of us listened to the intelligence. We had the secret and top-secret briefings on this. In addition to that, those of us on the Intelligence Committee actually got information that was compartmented. They had very clear information, proof to a very high degree that he was imminently attacking—he was imminently planning to attack Americans and American forces.

This was the right thing to do. It rid the world of a person who really rose to the same level as Osama bin Laden and some of the other people who have done these awful things to Americans. We should congratulate this President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. Risch. Just as we did with President Obama.

Thank you. I urge an affirmative vote.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. Durbin. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Scott of Florida). Are there any other

Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Leg.]

YEAS—64

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

NAYS—34

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Schatz
Bennet	Harris	Schumer
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Smith
Booker	Hirono	Tester
Brown	Kaine	Udall
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Cardin	Leahy	Warner
Casey	Menendez	Warren
Coons	Merkley	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Reed	

NOT VOTING—2

Markey Sanders

The amendment (No. 1301) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1322

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Reed amendment No. 1322.

The majority whip.

Mr. THUNE. 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.

Senator REED.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to offer my amendment noting that as a result of Iran's recent ballistic missile strike against U.S. air bases in Iraq, over 100 servicemembers have sustained traumatic brain injuries, or TBIs, as a result of their proximity to the blasts.

It is vitally important that all U.S. Government personnel—military and civilian—who incur such injuries be given the care they deserve and that their medical records be properly annotated to ensure they receive the care they are entitled to in the future.

My amendment recognizes the seriousness of these injuries and honors those who will now have to deal with these wounds, possibly for the rest of their lives.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, colleagues, I urge an affirmative vote on this. Just as we congratulated the President on the last amendment—the Commander in Chief, who made the very difficult decision to do what needed to be done to rein up the terrorists and the people who are operating out of Iran—we also need to recognize the people on the frontlines, our brave young men and women who are in Iraq, pushing back on Iran's attempt to influence and to infiltrate the country of Iraq. They are doing our work for us. We need to recognize that.

I urge an affirmative vote.

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

The yeas and nays appear to be in order.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 99, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Leg.]

YEAS—99

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

NOT VOTING—1

Markey

The amendment (No. 1322) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1305

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the vote in relation to Cotton amendment No. 1305.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment and will be making a motion to table it following Senator COTTON's presentation.

The Cotton amendment would establish a very dangerous precedent. I say that with all respect. It would basically allow military action against actors on the designated list of foreign terrorist organizations without there being a declaration of war against them.

There are currently 69 FTOs on the list, including the Basque Fatherland and Liberty, the Kurdistan Workers' Party, the Irish Republican Army, and the Communist Party of the Philippines.

The FTO list has never been a war authorization. The FTO list is created by the administration. It adds the names to it. This would suggest that, by being on the FTO, the U.S. military could take action against you even without there being congressional authorization. The list is so long, and it can be added to by a President. This would basically destroy the underlying bill by allowing a President to add to the FTO list rather than coming to Congress and then taking military action.

I know the speaker's intention is that this goes to the IRGC. If we need to defend ourselves under article II, we can or we can declare war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, this is not about the Basque, and this is not about the IRA. This resolution applies only to the Government of Iran. This is, indeed, only about the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

Let me tell you a story about the last 17 years in Iraq.

For 17 years, the most deadly weapon our troops have faced has been something called an explosively formed penetrator. It takes a slug of copper, superheats it into a ball of magma, and sends it hurtling through the air at 6,000 feet per second at our troops. I will spare you the graphic details of what a liquid ball of copper magma does when it travels at 6,000 feet per second into the human body, but I will tell you that those were smuggled into Iraq by, yes, the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

The vote here is simple: Do you want to vote to stand with our troops, hundreds of whom have died at the hands of Iran, or do you want to vote to be a lawyer for Iranian terrorists?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I move to table Cotton amendment No. 1305, and 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.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—46

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

The motion is agreed to; the amendment is tabled.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1314

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to the Risch amendment, No. 1314.

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I want to be very clear. I oppose this resolution, as it is misguided and it sends a terrible, confusing message to Iran and to our allies in the region.

The purpose of my amendment is to make clear to Iran and to our allies that, under the Constitution, the President of the United States has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its Territories, possessions, citizens, servicemembers, and diplomats from attack.

Who could disagree with that?

Let's make this clear to Iran and to our allies that that is the state of play—notwithstanding the fact, of course, that this resolution will not become law. It is going to get vetoed, and the veto is going to be sustained.

The clear language of this is very short:

The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, servicemembers, and diplomats from attack.

Senators, make this clear. Vote yes on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, though my friend from Idaho opposes my resolution, I do not oppose his amendment. I view the Risch amendment as a basic restatement of constitutional law, and it is essentially the same concept as the rules of construction in the resolution, so I do not oppose it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1314.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Leg.]

YEAS—93

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

NAYS—7

Gillibrand	Murphy	Warren
Leahy	Sanders	
Markey	Udall	

The amendment (No. 1314) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 1320

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to the vote in relation to the Rubio amendment No. 1320.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, this amendment is a statement of three facts: No. 1, that we are not engaged at this moment in hostilities with Iran—we are not at war with Iran; No. 2, that the actions that were taken against Soleimani were, frankly, lesser in scope, nature, and duration than what the previous administration did and the way they behaved in their exercise of war powers, also a statement of fact; and No. 3, that the maximum pressure of strategy against Iran has reduced Iran's resources that they can use to sponsor terrorism and proxy groups, also a statement of fact. Whether you agree with maximum pressure or not, it is a fact that this year, and last year, Iran has billions of dollars less than they otherwise would have, had it not been for the maximum pressure campaign.

Those three things are statements of fact, and I think if we are going to have a resolution like this, it should

accurately describe the situation, and that is why I urge your support and a negative vote against any effort to table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I ask my colleagues to vote to table the Rubio amendment No. 1320. Let me explain why. The gist of the amendment is basically to say that we are not in hostilities with Iran. If you read the newspaper, we now see that 100 American troops are suffering from concussions—closed-head injuries—that could potentially lead to other significant consequences because of the Iranian attack on the Al-Asad Air Base.

The United States sent the military strike that killed Iran's key military leader and Iraqi militia leader. The United States took a previous strike a week before that killed 25 Iranian-connected militia members in 5 sites in Iraq and Syria. The War Powers Act has a definition of what armed conflict and hostilities are, and it is clear that Congress was meant to be able to file this exact motion either during armed conflict or even before armed conflict if it were imminent.

I would argue that the 100 servicemembers who are suffering from head injuries and the American contractor who was killed is definitely proof that there are hostilities. I ask to table.

I now move that Rubio amendment No. 1320 be tabled, and 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.

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—46

Alexander	Enzi	McConnell
Barrasso	Ernst	McSally
Blackburn	Fischer	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Braun	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hawley	Romney
Capito	Hoeben	Rounds
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Sasse
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	
Daines	Loeffler	

Shelby Thune Toomey
Sullivan Tillis Wicker

The motion is agreed to; the amendment is tabled.

AMENDMENT NO. 1319

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be 2 minutes of debate, equally divided, prior to a vote in relation to Sullivan amendment No. 1319.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President.

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, no one wants war with Iran, but while I respect Senator KAINE and my other colleagues who are supporting the broader AUMF, it has fatal flaws.

First, it says the United States should cease its hostilities against Iran. This is completely backward. The United States is not actively conducting hostilities against Iran, but Iran has been actively conducting hostilities against us and our troops for decades. Just look at the long, bloody list: thousands of Americans dead and wounded, Marine barracks in Lebanon, Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, Soleimani, and deadly IEDs in Iraq.

Second, the broader AUMF of Senator KAINE dramatically limits our ability to protect these very forces from future attacks, which we know the Iranians are planning. Close to half of the forces in Iraq right now are Alaska-based military forces, our friends and neighbors in Alaska. I want to make sure they are protected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SULLIVAN. My amendment does that by making sure the President has clear authority to protect our troops.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Who requests time in opposition?

Mr. LEE. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I have great respect for my distinguished colleague from Alaska, and I appreciate his service to our country and his thoughts today.

I stand in opposition to his amendment because, if there is one thing we don't need right now, it is anything else that would give more authority to the military-industrial complex to start and finish wars without authorization from Congress.

Anytime we introduce additional ambiguity into a field that is already ripe with ambiguity, given the inherent tension between ambiguities surrounding the inherent article II Commander in Chief power and the article I power that Congress has to declare war, we run into problems. This would open up that ambiguity.

The legislation we are addressing here, this resolution, is bipartisan. It has as its object to clarify that, for future, offensive action, we need congressional authorization. We have been lied to by the Pentagon for years regarding a war that has gone on for two decades. That is long enough. We don't want to

create additional ambiguities. We don't want any more wars without the people's elected representatives being able to debate it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I move to table the Sullivan amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—49

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

The motion is agreed to; the amendment is tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I think President Trump's decision to take out General Soleimani was the boldest defense policy decision of his Presidency to date. Even in a single strike, the President defended American lives and showed Iran that terrorism and, most importantly, spilling American blood is something that will come at a price, unlike what we have gone through with the predecessor, when the redline didn't mean anything. It means something now. Everybody knows it.

The result is that we are now in the best negotiating position with Iran since 1979, and Iran's escalation, which includes attacks on tankers, Saudi Arabia's oil facilities, and the killing of an American citizen, has ended, at least for now.

Yet some Democrats would have you believe in a vote for a War Powers Resolution, pretending as though the President is rushing to war. It is just

not happening. The facts are not there. There is no war with Iran. An airstrike is not a war. Punishing Iran for killing an American citizen is not a war, nor has the Soleimani strike started a new war, as Democrats would have you believe. It just hasn't happened.

It has been 3 weeks now since the Democrats first tried to vote on this resolution, and during those 3 weeks, nothing has happened. Let me just repeat that. Nothing has happened. There have been no new Iranian attacks against us, and we have not attacked them. How can anyone claim that we are at some kind of a war?

Moreover, nobody wants war with Iran. The President has made it very clear that he doesn't want war with Iran. In fact, the President's decision to eliminate Soleimani has made war much less likely because it showed Iran that its terrorism would come at a price. That wasn't the case before.

Despite this success, today we are debating whether we want to tie the hands of our Commander in Chief—or any Commander in Chief—to respond when American lives are put at risk, as the Constitution gives them the authority to do.

I want to be sure that all of my colleagues are crystal clear on what exactly this War Powers Resolution means, what it will actually do. The resolution calls on the President to terminate the use of American Armed Forces for hostilities against Iran. But there are no hostilities against Iran. There is no war with Iran.

The resolution calling for the termination of hostilities against California would have the same effect. Practically speaking, this vote will do nothing. It is nonsense, but we should be very concerned about the symbolic effect this vote will have.

This will send a very damaging message to Iran. The Iranians will interpret a vote in favor of this resolution as tying the President's hands, and that would lead Iran to believe, once again, that it can get by with anything.

Remember, it wasn't that long ago that they really believed that. Nobody wants that. Congress doesn't want it. The White House doesn't want it and certainly not the American people. So I don't know why we are even debating a resolution that could make war more likely, when we are trying to do just the opposite.

If the Democrats insist on tying the President's hands, the least we can do is minimize the damage. While I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution, I also urge them to support amendments to minimize the damage.

I want to comment briefly on the amendment offered by the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, my friend the Senator from Rhode Island. He is correct to highlight the traumatic brain injuries that a number of our troops suffered during the January 8 Iranian strike on Iraq. We understand that.

However, I would like to clarify: I believe we were not misled in this at all. Mild TBIs can only be confirmed through MRI scans. The Department of Defense implemented its screening procedure properly and made sure that all troops in the vicinity of the strike were screened. I think we need to understand that. All of this was done, and it is as if that wasn't done at all.

Once those results were made available, the Department of Defense notified the public in a press release. It then briefed our committee, the committee that I chair. I therefore want to commend the Department of Defense for taking all the right measures to protect our forces during the Iranian strikes and for appropriately screening our forces for aftereffects.

This is why I think it is extremely important that we vote this resolution down. Even as it is amended now, it will signal to the Iranians that there is no price for aggression. It will undermine deterrence, and it will leave our troops, diplomats, and citizens vulnerable. Nobody wants that.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, I rise to speak with respect to final passage of S.J. Res. 68, which will be the next item of business before us. I will speak briefly because I have been on the floor about this a few times in the last week or two.

First, I want to thank my colleagues for this process, including the President. It has been a very collaborative process, with a lot of dialogue, a lot of listening, a lot of changes in amendments, and back and forth since early January. My colleagues, however they voted on things that I hoped they might support me on, were very willing to dialogue and ask hard questions. I understood why people were where they were. I just want to thank the body for it.

I also note what a cool thing it is to actually have a bunch of amendment votes on the floor. I hope we might do more on other items.

This is an issue that is extremely important to this body, and it is extremely important to me. Of the variety of issues—I didn't serve in the military—why would it be important to me? Having a child in the military and coming from a State that is so connected to the military, I have been nearly obsessed with this issue since about 2002.

I never knew I would have an opportunity to work on it as a U.S. Senator, but when I came here in 2012, I started to look for colleagues on both sides of the aisle and in both Houses who would stand for the proposition that war is the most solemn responsibility we have, and it cannot be outsourced to anyone.

I was willing to stand up to a friend—a Democratic President—and challenge him when he was undertaking military action without coming to Congress. I

have done the same with President Trump, but with no disrespect to the office. I want an article II President who will inhabit fully the article II powers of the office of Commander in Chief. But what I have hoped for since I came is an article I branch that would fully inhabit the article I powers that are vested only in Congress.

For that reason, I put the resolution forward and worked with you and others to make sure the resolution was bipartisan. It is not only bipartisan, but folks from different parts of the political spectrum and from different parts of the country and new Members and veteran Members have come together to say—after many decades of abdicating responsibility, under Presidents of both parties and under majorities of both parties in both Houses—it is time for Congress to take this very seriously. That is why I will be voting in favor of the resolution and encouraging other colleagues to do the same.

The last thing I want to say is this. I talked about these two young men briefly yesterday on the floor. I am struck by their stories. The last two men who were killed in combat for the United States in the 19-yearlong war against terrorists that was sparked by America's righteous outrage over the attack of 9/11 were two sergeants first class, Javier Gutierrez and Antonio Rodriguez. They are both from the Southwest, one from San Antonio and one from Las Cruces, NM.

They were both killed last week in Afghanistan by an insider attack. It was somebody who was wearing a uniform—potentially, a member of the Afghan National Security Forces or posing as one. These are the security forces that we have invested billions and billions of dollars in training and equipping—\$45 billion this year alone. Someone wearing that uniform of an ally of the United States turned a weapon on these two gentlemen and killed them.

I read their bios, and I was just so struck by their stories. They were 28 years old, which means they were 9 years old when 9/11 happened and when Congress passed the war authorization under whose terms they were then serving when they lost their lives in Afghanistan. They really never knew in their life anything but war.

By the time they were 9 years old the Nation was at war. Nineteen years later, we are still in the same war, and that authorization has been used now all over the globe to engage in military activity virtually in so many countries and so many continents. They never knew anything but war.

I just want to say a word about each of them.

Sergeant Gutierrez was a young man, a 28-year-old from San Antonio. Sergeant Gutierrez's grandfather was an aviator in World War II who was shot down and imprisoned in a POW camp in Germany. His name was Mr. Ortiz. He was then liberated when the Russians liberated that POW camp. That was the

grandfather. Sergeant Gutierrez's dad was a marine during the Vietnam era.

Sergeant Gutierrez was born in Jacksonville, NC, near the Lejeune base in North Carolina. All he wanted to do was serve his country. He joined the Junior ROTC Program at his local high school because, he said, "I want to be like my grandfather and I want to be like my dad." By all accounts, he served in such a wonderful way.

This was his third deployment. He had one in Iraq and one in Afghanistan previously. This was his third deployment.

He leaves behind a wife, Gabby, and four children ages 2 to 7.

Sergeant Rodriguez was from Las Cruces, NM. He also leaves behind a wife, Ronaleen, no children, but a lot of devoted family.

When I read this in the news, I thought it was a misprint. This was Sergeant Rodriguez's 11th deployment to Afghanistan. He was only 28 years old. He probably didn't go into the military until he was 18, but he was Special Forces. Those deployments tend to be often, more frequent and maybe not as long in duration. But think about it—10 times in Afghanistan, and on the 11th deployment, he gave his life. The sacrifices are just kind of staggering for me to contemplate.

I will just conclude and say this: I know that everybody in this Chamber goes to VA hospitals to visit. I have three VA hospitals in Virginia. I was in one in Hampton last Friday. We do this because we want to see our great care providers. We talk to our veterans. We get inspired by stories of resilience and see cutting-edge treatments and technologies.

Often, those visits are empowering and inspiring. One thing you will always feel when you leave after a visit to a VA hospital—and I felt this way when I left the VA in Hampton last Friday afternoon—is the enduring consequences of war. When I was visiting a mental health unit, when I was visiting the women's clinic that now deals with the increasing number of women veterans, what you grapple with are the enduring consequences of war.

Under the best of circumstances, when we get it right and we win, there are still horrible consequences of war—people's health and people's lives and then the lives and health of the caregivers and friends of those who serve. Because those consequences are so momentous and so enduring, those of us in this body—and maybe especially those of us in this body who didn't wear the uniform and didn't serve—we have a special obligation to make sure that we deliberate and deliberate carefully before we send troops into harm's way.

The President of the United States—this President and every President—always needs the ability to defend the United States against imminent attack without asking for anybody's permission. I think the world knows we will do that. This body, though, is a body

that needs to decide if we go on offense and engage in military action. Guess what. The world knows we will do that too.

We took that vote on the war authorization in 2001, and 18 years later, we have tens of thousands of troops deployed and people still losing their lives. We are spending \$45 billion a year in Afghanistan to preserve the gains that we won. No one can question America's resolve. But this resolution is about a level of deliberation to match the sacrifice that we expect. The sacrifice is momentous, so our deliberation should be careful. That is what this bill is designed to do. That is why I am so proud to have worked on it with my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, fellow Senators, we are about to vote on an important piece of legislation. Of course, it is a piece of legislation that will never become law, but nonetheless it deserves our attention, and certainly it deserves serious consideration.

We know two things as we approach this. No. 1, under the Constitution, it is absolutely crystal clear that only Congress can declare war. No. 2, which is crystal clear, we know the President of the United States has the authority to defend the country. Finally, No. 3—and this is very important, as it relates to this—no one wants war with Iran. No one agrees that we should proceed to war with Iran. That is simply not the situation here today.

There are constitutional questions here that we know we have to wrestle with, and they are difficult ones.

It is important to note here, first of all, that the dispute that has been going on with Iran for a long, long time has really nothing to do with the Iranian people. We support the Iranian people. They have a long history, a proud tradition, and they deserve substantially better than what they are getting in leadership today.

This is an important debate we are going to have today about war powers and the use of military force.

One thing also that is clear but that muddies the water is that there is no clear line of delineation between actual war and the use of kinetic force.

As I said, it is important to have this debate. I really believe it should not be held in this context. It should be a policy that we are debating that is useable in all contexts. I have sat through dozens of hours of debate on war powers, the war powers of the President. It is an age-old debate that has gone on since George Washington was President. It is a hard debate because all these words were written in the 18th century, and things were a lot clearer then. Things are much less clear today. These debates were long. There were many lawyers involved. Indeed, no conclusion can be reached.

It is one of those areas where I have come to the conclusion that the words

that need to be written in order to clearly specify the place that the President occupies and the place that the Congress occupies is a very, very difficult one.

There are things on this Earth—and I really believe this may be one of them—where we know it when we see it, but we can't define it. We know war when we see it. We also know what kinetic action is, in order to protect the people of the United States, that is more isolated in the hands of the President doing the defensive measure. We know that when we see it. But defining the distinction between the two when one blurs into the other is very, very difficult.

The President needs the authority that he has to defend the United States, and it is clear that authority comes from three buckets: No. 1, it comes from article II of the U.S. Constitution; No. 2, it comes from the War Powers Act; and No. 3, it comes from the AUMFs that have been passed by this body for some time.

Iran, as you are listening, understand that the President has that authority. He has specific authority from all of those buckets. Notwithstanding the arguments that have been made here by some Members of this body, the President unquestionably has those powers. This power has been used very sparingly by this President. Compared to the last administration, the numbers are really, indeed, striking. The drone action, drone strikes that have been taken then and now—during the Obama administration, there were 540 of them over 8 years. In this particular administration, they are very, very few and far between and can only be described as a handful.

This is a President who abhors the use of military force. I have had the opportunity to discuss it with him at length. I have actually been in the room when he has been confronted with these questions and had to make the decisions. He is deeply moved by these kinds of questions and understands how difficult they are. When he talks about how he has to write letters to the families of the men and women who didn't come home, about having to make those phone calls, about having to go to Dover to receive the remains of our brave men and women who didn't make it home alive, he is deeply, deeply disturbed by these matters. I can tell you, as I said, having been there, when he has had to make these decisions, they weigh heavily on him.

So what are we doing here today? It certainly isn't to rein in this President. He has not used his power willy-nilly, as I have indicated. It has been used very, very sparingly, and it has been used in great contrast to the previous administration.

Well, what we are doing here today is we are trying to get our arms around the question of, when is it appropriate for the President to use military force? We all have our ideas on that. We have the words that the Founding Fathers

left us, so we are going to debate it here today. And it is important.

The unfortunate part about this is that we are also sending a message to Iran. Iran is listening. There is no question that they are listening to this debate. They are listening to what people are saying here on the floor of the Senate.

One of the messages that will come out of this and the way this is drawn is that the drafters of this want to send a message of appeasement to Iran. This has been tried. It hasn't worked. The last administration bent over backward to offer appeasement to Iran. They were greatly betrayed by it. It was tried with the JCPOA, and it didn't work. The reason it didn't work is that we are not dealing with people here who are acting in good faith.

What we need to do is to send a message of firmness and not weakness. At the end of the day, when we are all done with this, there will be such a message. It needs to be a consistent and a uniform message when it comes to messaging to Iran and when it comes to the messaging of our foreign policy as it relates to Iran. It will not be this law that is before us, because it is going to be vetoed. We all know it is going to be vetoed. It takes a two-thirds majority to override that. It is not going to happen.

So the mixed message is there. Iran will listen to it. The hard-liners will take it one way, and other people will take it the other. That is not a good situation. Hopefully, we will be able to lay this out in a way in which they can read between the lines and get the message that is important.

The President took an action that people have criticized here that was difficult. It was a tough decision. He was a really bad guy—a guy who was worse than Osama bin Laden. He was the person who was executing Iran's malign policies in the world and in the region. His killings and loss of limbs have become legendary in the world today. Whenever I see one of our young men or women who is missing an arm or a leg, he or she owes that to General Soleimani. He killed hundreds of people. He was responsible for the IED program that took the lives of so many and maimed so many of our men and women who were fighting in the Middle East. It got to the point at which he was wandering around, really, with impunity and was not worried about what he was doing or that anybody was going to take any action against him.

Let's look at the timeline over the last year.

The Iranians started by blowing up oil tankers, and nothing was done about it. They attacked the Saudi oil fields, where 100 Americans were working, and nothing was done about it. They took down a drone of ours over international space, and nothing was done about it. Finally, over the fall, they ratcheted it up with 13 attacks on U.S. soldiers at U.S. bases in Iraq. These were our men and our women

whom we had asked to go over there and push back against Iran's attempt at infiltration into Iraq. They took 13 attacks. Finally, on one of those attacks, somebody was killed. The President laid down a redline that, if an American were killed, there was going to be a price to pay. They finally killed that person. They attacked our Embassy in Baghdad and attempted to set it on fire.

Eventually, the President made the choice to do what he did. This was in response to Iran's continual pushing of the envelope and the miscalculations that Iran made. General Soleimani had been traveling from place to place, putting in place the final plans of coordination for the execution of an attack against the American people. It was imminent.

You have heard my friends here say: Oh, no. It was not imminent. We listened to the intelligence.

I sit on the Intelligence Committee. I sat through all of the briefings that were given that were at the secret level and at the top secret level that were given to the people who are here in the body. I also sat through the ones that were given to the Intelligence Committee, which were compartmented and much more granular. There was no doubt that this man was planning an imminent attack to kill Americans. He didn't get the chance.

Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you for what you did.

We have heard the argument here that it was not imminent. This person was substantially more of an imminent danger to the United States of America and to Americans than Osama bin Laden was. Yet, when the President of the United States, Barack Obama, took out Osama bin Laden, we all cheered it. In fact, we passed a resolution here—100 to 0—commending the President of the United States for what he did.

Mr. President, you heard us today pass such a resolution that thanks you. Thank you, Mr. President, and farewell, General Soleimani.

Iran, do not miscalculate and read what is happening here as being capitulation or weakness or appeasement. It is not. It is a disagreement between this branch of government, the legislative branch, and our second branch of government, the executive branch, as to how we should defend ourselves. Make no mistake about it: We will defend ourselves.

In America, we operate under the rule of law. This joint resolution that is in front of us that we are debating today will not become law. It will not be part of the body of law by which we live. It will be vetoed.

Iran, take note: If you continue on the path that you are on with your malign activities, it is going to take you to a very bad place.

I urge a "no" vote. I understand how it is going to come out. I will be standing here again to sustain the President's veto, and it will be sustained.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled 1:45 p.m. vote commence now.

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

The clerk will read the joint resolution for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution, as amended, pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 52 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Hassan	Reed
Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Jones	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Leahy	Smith
Carper	Lee	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Cassidy	Markey	Udall
Collins	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cooms	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Moran	Warren
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	Young
Gillibrand	Paul	
Harris	Peters	

NAYS—45

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. J. RES. 68

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress has the sole power to declare war under article I, section 8, clause 11 of the United States Constitution.

(2) The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, service members, and diplomats from attack.

(3) Congress has not yet declared war upon, nor enacted a specific statutory authorization for use of military force against, the Islamic Republic of Iran. The 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force (Public Law

107-40; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) against the perpetrators of the 9/11 attack and the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (Public Law 107-243; 50 U.S.C. 1541 note) do not serve as a specific statutory authorization for the use of force against Iran.

(4) The conflict between the United States and the Islamic Republic of Iran constitutes, within the meaning of section 4(a) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1543(a)), either hostilities or a situation where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances into which United States Armed Forces have been introduced.

(5) Members of the United States Armed Forces and intelligence community, and all those involved in the planning of the January 2, 2020, strike on Qasem Soleimani, including President Donald J. Trump, should be commended for their efforts in a successful mission.

(6) Section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1544(c)) states that "at any time that United States Armed Forces are engaged in hostilities outside the territory of the United States, its possessions and territories without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization, such forces shall be removed by the President if the Congress so directs".

(7) More than 100 members of the United States Armed Forces sustained traumatic brain injuries in the Iranian retaliatory attack on the Ain al-Assad air base in Iraq despite initial reports that no casualties were sustained in the attack.

(8) Section 8(c) of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1547(c)) defines the introduction of the United States Armed Forces to include "the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular forces of any foreign country or government when such military forces are engaged, or there exists an imminent threat that such forces will become engaged in, hostilities".

(9) The United States Armed Forces have been introduced into hostilities, as defined by the War Powers Resolution, against Iran.

(10) The question of whether United States forces should be engaged in hostilities against Iran should be answered following a full briefing to Congress and the American public of the issues at stake, a public debate in Congress, and a congressional vote as contemplated by the Constitution.

(11) Section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a) provides that any joint resolution or bill to require the removal of United States Armed Forces engaged in hostilities without a declaration of war or specific statutory authorization shall be considered in accordance with the expedited procedures of section 601(b) of the International Security and Arms Export Control Act of 1976.

SEC. 2. TERMINATION OF THE USE OF UNITED STATES FORCES FOR HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN.

(a) TERMINATION.—Pursuant to section 1013 of the Department of State Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1984 and 1985 (50 U.S.C. 1546a), and in accordance with the provisions of section 601(b) of the International Security Assistance and Arms Export Control Act of 1976, Congress hereby directs the President to terminate the use of United States Armed Forces for hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran or any part of its government or military, unless explicitly authorized by a declaration of war or specific authorization for use of military force against Iran.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to prevent the United States from defending itself from imminent attack.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MAKING TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS—S.J. RES. 68

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerks be allowed to make technical corrections to the engrossing of the amendments to S.J. Res. 68.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 384.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

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 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 Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

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. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 491.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

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 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 Silvia Carreno-Coll, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Rob Portman, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

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.

AMENDING TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PROTECT PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILDREN—Motion to Proceed

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 420.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 3275, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

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 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420, S. 3275, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tim Scott, Joni Ernst, Roy Blunt, Tom Cotton, Kevin Cramer, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Chuck Grassley, Marsha Blackburn, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Mike Lee, John Hoeven, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Braun, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 17, S. 311, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

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 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 17, S. 311, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

Ben Sasse, John Boozman, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, Tim Scott, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Braun, Mitch McConnell.

WITHDRAWAL OF MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. I withdraw the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 569.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

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 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 Katharine MacGregor, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of the Interior.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Kevin Cramer, Tim Scott, Mike Rounds, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Todd Young, Pat Roberts, John Thune, David Perdue, Lisa Murkowski.

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. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session and consider Calendar No. 416.

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

The clerk will report the nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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 Travis Greaves, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Thom Tillis, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Shelley Moore Capito, Todd Young, John Boozman, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Lindsey Graham, Roger F. Wicker.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. For the information of the Senate, the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 420 was not agreed to; it was only made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

5G

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk for a few minutes today about 5G, the Federal Communications Commission, and swamp creatures.

We have all heard a lot about 5G, and 5G is just incredibly fast internet. It will make possible things like driverless cars, telemedicine, and the internet of things.

I want to caution all of us that these things are not going to happen overnight. In fact, some parts of our country already have 5G, and we don't have driverless cars and the internet of things and long-distance surgery.

These innovations are going to happen over a long period of time, and in the meantime, there is going to be a lot of hype from the telecommunications companies. Why? Because they want to sell you 5G. They are going to tell you that 5G can do all these incredible things. They are going to tell you that 5G can grow hair, that 5G can cure erectile dysfunction, that 5G can do this and it can do that.

Look, I want to be on record as saying 5G is going to be extraordinary, but it is not going to happen overnight. The emergency that some of our telecommunications companies are trying to create is not nearly the emergency that really exists because they have something they want to sell you. I am not putting them down. That is free enterprise.

How does 5G work? Well, it is wireless technology. When I have 5G on my phone and you have 5G on your phone, we communicate—whether it is 5G wireless technology or otherwise—through radio waves. Radio waves go from my phone to your phone, and they carry data. It is called electromagnetic radiation, but all it is, is really radio waves. And there are all different kinds of radio waves. It depends on the frequency.

Do you know who owns those radio waves? The FCC doesn't. The telecommunications companies, which use those radio waves, don't. The Federal Government doesn't, except in this sense: You own those radio waves. The American taxpayer owns those radio waves. And they are incredibly valuable because telecommunications companies line up when the FCC has new radio waves available for them. They line up to bid on those radio waves, which they can use. We call that spectrum.

There is a certain type of radio wave going through the air—or spectrum, if you will—that is perfect for 5G. It is like Goldilocks' porridge—it is not too hot; it is not too cold; it is just right. The telecommunications companies want to use that C band, we call it, or midrange spectrum. I am going to call it C band. They want the FCC to license it to them.

Well, right now, using that spectrum, that C band—remember, these are the radio waves, the spectrum, that are just perfect for 5G. Right now, using this C band spectrum are a number of satellite companies, most of which are foreign-owned. The major satellite companies that are using it right now happen to be domiciled in Luxembourg—wonderful country and wonder-

ful people. Do you know what they pay to the American taxpayer to use that spectrum? Nothing. Zero. Nada.

You say: Well, how did that happen, KENNEDY? You just told me that these radio waves are very valuable and that the telecommunications companies are lined up to lease them. How did the foreign satellite companies get the C band for nothing if they are using it right now?

I don't know. It wasn't this FCC, but some FCC just gave it to them and said: Here, use it for free.

I wasn't there. I am not necessarily criticizing them. I am just telling you they got it for nothing. But they didn't get a license. They don't have a lease. They have a privilege to use it. In the fine print of the document that gives them this privilege, at any time, the FCC can take it back because the foreign satellite companies don't have a property interest. They don't own it. They don't have a lease. They didn't pay anything for it. They just have the privilege to use it until the FCC wants to take it back.

Now, the foreign satellite companies—and I am not criticizing them. God bless them. They are making a lot of money using this spectrum that belongs to the American taxpayer for free. Well, that is the way it has been for a while. Now, some telecommunications companies like Verizon and others—good companies—they say: We need that C band, FCC. We need that C band to use for 5G.

Well, the satellite companies—I will call them the Luxembourg satellite companies—once again, good people. Luxembourg is a good country. They said: Well, we are using the C band right now. We don't want to give it up to the telecommunications companies, but we will make you a deal.

They went to the FCC. The satellite companies said to the FCC: We are using the C band right now, and even though we didn't pay a single solitary dime for it, we know the telecommunications companies want it to implement 5G, so here is what we will do. You, FCC, give us the C band. Give it to us, and we will turn around and make sure that the telecommunications companies get to use it. We will lease it to them.

The amount of money that the foreign satellite companies would have made was about \$70 billion. I call it "The Bank Job" robbery. Remember that movie that came out in 2008, "The Bank Job"? It was a 2008 heist movie. It was about the 1971 Baker Street robbery in London. I call this proposal "The Bank Job" robbery. I don't see how the foreign satellite companies made the proposal with a straight face. Give us this C band that belongs to the American people. Just give it to us, and we are going to sell it to the telecommunications companies and pocket the \$70 billion.

Do you know what? Our FCC almost did it. They were this close. They said: Oh, we have to do this because we have

to get this C band to the telecommunications companies because it is an emergency. We have to get 5G tomorrow, so let's just give the satellite companies that are using it now—didn't pay a red dime for it—let's give them the spectrum that belongs to the American people and let them sell it to the telecommunications companies and pocket the \$70 billion because our hair is on fire and we have to do it.

Swamp creatures. They came this close to stealing \$70 billion from the American people, but they didn't pull it off because a number of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives started raising fresh hell—fresh hell.

I went to see the President of the United States.

I said: Mr. President, do you know what is going on here? Here you are every day saying "Buy American. We have to take care of America first." It doesn't mean we don't care about the rest of the world, but we have to buy American, and your FCC over here is giving away this C band to Luxembourg satellite companies.

He said: What in God's name?

He was like Rocketman. He got mad. I don't speak for the President, but I am just telling you what happened.

So the FCC, to its credit, backed off. They said: No, we are not going to give it away. We are going to do what we should have done in the first place; that is, auction it off.

They are going to hold an auction like on eBay, and these satellite companies—rather, these telecommunication companies can come in and bid. If the FCC would do it right, we would take in \$70 billion for the American taxpayer, and we could use that money to implement rural broadband, and then everybody would be happy.

It would have been great, but no, here comes the "Baby Driver" heist. Did you see that movie, "Baby Driver"? Now there is a new proposal on the table. The Chairman of our FCC—who is a good man, by the way; I am going to come back to him—he has come up with a new proposal. To his credit, the Chairman says: We are going to bid it out, but we are going to take \$15 billion of the money that comes in, and we are going to give it to the foreign satellite companies.

For what? They don't own it. They don't have a license; they just have a privilege. He is going to give \$5 billion to them to relocate to different spectrum, and then he is going to give them \$10 billion—that is nine zeros—in walking-around money just to go away. That is why I call it the "Baby Driver" heist. That was a great movie. Did you see that, starring Jamie Foxx? Wonderful movie.

Let me say this about the FCC Chairman: He is a friend of mine, and he is smart as a whip. He went to Harvard undergrad, honors degree, Chicago Law School, Chicago Law Review, and worked as an executive at Verizon Communications for a while. I consider

him a friend, and I have the utmost respect for him, and I thank him for finally agreeing to do a public auction and not give the C band away to the foreign satellite companies. But as much as I respect the Chairman, I wouldn't take him with me if I was going to buy a car because he would pay the full sticker price. If I needed somebody to explain string theory to me or the Doppler effect or quantum engineering or genome sequencing, I would probably go to the Chairman of the FCC because he is that smart. But I don't agree with him that he has made a good deal to give \$10 billion away to these foreign satellite companies—\$10 billion of American taxpayer money that ought to be going to things like rural broadband.

The Chairman is going to present that to the FCC to vote on it on February 28. He says he has the votes to pass it. I can tell you this, it is not going to be unanimous, and it is not going to be noncontroversial to give away \$15 billion to somebody who doesn't have a property interest.

He says: We have to do it because we are in a race with China.

OK. I agree with that. And your point is?

He says: Well, if we don't do it, the satellite companies are going to sue us.

That is another straw man. Let me tell you something. The FCC gets sued every day. Do you know what the FCC Chairman needs to tell the satellite companies? He needs to tell them: Hey, do you need me to draw you a map to the courthouse? Go sue. We get sued every day, but I am not going to give you \$15 billion of taxpayer money to go away because it is wrong.

I am not sure the FCC has any authority to do this. Last time I checked, it was Congress that appropriates money, not the Federal Communications Commission.

I told you that the FCC Chairman's proposal is to give the foreign satellite companies \$5 billion to buy new satellites and to move to a new spectrum, and \$10 billion just to go away because they say: Oh, we are scared of a lawsuit. We are scared of a lawsuit.

I don't know how he arrived at \$10 billion to give to them. I wish somebody would give me \$10 billion. Why not \$11 billion? Why not \$8 billion? Why not \$7 billion? There is no explanation. We are just going to give them \$10 billion of taxpayer money, and they are going to go away.

Of course, the satellite companies, they are happy as clams. They are as happy as a gopher in soft dirt because they are getting \$10 billion for nothing. And they are also getting \$5 billion to buy new satellites, but if you check, all the satellites now are worn out, so they would have to buy new satellites anyway—5G or not.

The FCC needs to wait. On February 28, they need to announce and vote to have the public auction as they had promised. It will be held in December of this year. There is absolutely not a

single solitary reason why the Chairman of the FCC has to put a vote in front of the FCC to give away \$15 billion of taxpayer money. We can negotiate a better deal. We can negotiate a better deal.

The Chairman of the FCC does not need to become known as the \$15 billion man. He needs to hold up and let us talk to the satellite companies and negotiate a better deal.

Now, if he is not willing to do that, he needs to at least tell President Trump because do you know who is going to get blamed for this? The President. It will not be his fault, but he is going to get blamed for it because it happened on his watch.

Here he is, out there talking about the American economy, we have to protect our economy, and we have to buy American first. It doesn't mean we don't love the rest of the world, but his FCC is just giving away \$15 billion of taxpayer money—of taxpayer money—to our friends and foreign satellite companies, and the President will get blamed. So I am hoping the FCC at least goes to see him and tell him what they are going to do.

When the American public finds out about this, you are not going to be able to find the FCC members who came up with this idea. You are not going to be able to find them with a flashlight, with a map, or with a search party. You will not be able to find them with Google. They are going to be hiding. It is an embarrassment.

They may have the votes to do this, but I am not giving up. I have a bill, along with Senator SCHUMER—yes, CHUCK and I are working on a bill together—Senator CANTWELL, Senator SCHATZ, and we are going to have some others on the bill, that says: Look, this is Congress's decision, not FCC's decision. It would allocate a much more modest sum to these foreign satellite companies. I would like the FCC, if it would, to step back, continue on with its auction planning and give us a chance to negotiate on behalf of the American taxpayer.

I am going to close with this point: Not a single day passes in this Chamber that I don't hear one of us, Democrats and Republicans, talking about the deficits, and, boy, are they high—\$22 trillion and climbing. We borrow \$1 million a minute to run this place. So \$1.4 billion a day, that is how much more we spend than we take in. We are mortgaging our kids' future. Everybody talks about it and says we have to do something about it.

We are like a problem gambler chasing his losses. Some say we are like a drunk sailor, but we are worse than a drunk sailor. A drunk sailor stops spending when he runs out of money. We don't. We just borrow it.

Here we are, in the middle of all of this, and our Federal Communications Commission is going to give away \$15 billion. Our Chairman, henceforth, will be known as the \$15 billion man.

If they do this without telling the President, without consulting with

Congress, and without trying to negotiate a better deal for the American taxpayer, then we ought to change their name from the Federal Communications Commission to the "Federal Sucker Commission" because that is all they are.

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

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

BLACK HISTORY MONTH

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in 1924, when Oklahoma was a very young State, a young lady named Ada was born in Chickasha. Now, you would get that joke if you are from Oklahoma because we have a town in Oklahoma called Ada and a town in Oklahoma called Chickasha. This is a young lady named Ada born in Chickasha.

She thrived. She was an excellent student. In fact, she was the valedictorian of her high school, Lincoln High School. She left that and went to college. She stayed 1 year at one college, then transferred to another college and graduated with honors in 1945.

She dreamed of being a lawyer. She had graduated with honors. She had graduated valedictorian. She had all the credentials and all the capabilities to do it, but she had one big problem: She was Black. In Oklahoma in the 1940s, there were no law schools that would allow a Black student to attend. So, in Oklahoma, the policy was to help Black students who wanted to be a lawyer leave the State to study somewhere else.

She really didn't want to do that. She had graduated from the great Langston University and had a great education there and had every ability to do that. She interviewed with the University of Oklahoma—interviewed, actually, with the president of the school at that time—to go through the process to get into the University of Oklahoma law school.

She was found to be fully qualified, but the problem was, again, she was Black. And it wasn't just a problem with the University of Oklahoma. At that time, there was State law that did not allow Black students and White students to study together—and certainly not to study law together.

So she did a radical thing. On April 6, 1946, she filed a lawsuit against the State of Oklahoma saying that she wanted to study law at the very good University of Oklahoma law school. A young lawyer took up her case, a gentleman named Thurgood Marshall, a young lawyer who later became Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall. Young Thurgood Marshall took up her case to argue in front of Oklahoma district court, where they lost, arguing it all the way to the State supreme court, where they lost, lost, lost.

Then they took it into Federal court, saying that, constitutionally, neither the United States of America nor any State in the United States could block a student from studying law simply because they were Black. They won that case.

Probably returning back to Oklahoma to study, the Oklahoma Legislature hurriedly put together a new law school and called it Langston Law School and opened up a room in the State capitol and put a few books there and said: There is your law school.

Thurgood Marshall and Ada Fisher did not accept that—nor should they have—and started the process again of saying: We can't have a separate but "equal" law school in Oklahoma. They argued again in State courts, eventually ending up again heading all the way back to the Supreme Court.

Before it got to the Supreme Court and Oklahoma would lose again in front of the same nine Justices, they determined that they would break, and they would give. On June 18, 1949, more than 3 years after she started the process of getting into law school, she was admitted into the University of Oklahoma College of Law, where she was given a seat in the back of the room with a sign directly in front of her that read "coloreds only," and she could sit in that row in the back of the room.

In 1950, just the next year, those barriers would come down, and in August of 1952, Ada Fisher graduated from the University of Oklahoma law school and became a lawyer. She set the pace for thousands and thousands of others who are lawyers behind her now and get the chance of having that same joy.

Interestingly enough, if you were to visit the courthouse in Oklahoma City, the Federal district court there—if you were there a couple years of ago, you would have bumped into Vicki Miles-LaGrange. That African-American judge, the pace was set for her by Ada Fisher. If you drop by and visit it today, you would bump into Bernard Jones, that African-American judge who serves there for the Western District of Oklahoma. The pace was set for him by Ada Fisher decades before.

Quite frankly, we can't even fathom, in this current time period, how different things really are, but it is interesting to notice that time period and that generation and some ladies who really stood up and made a difference in Oklahoma because at the same time that Ada was at Langston University, another lady named Clara was at Langston University.

We know her affectionately in Oklahoma as Clara Luper. Now, some folks may not know Clara Luper's name, but they know what she did. Clara Luper was at Langston University as well in the early 1940s. She finished her study, got her bachelor's degree there, went and got a master's degree, and continued on through the process. She became the Youth Council leader for the NAACP in 1957, and in 1958 she helped her students—her youth whom she

worked with—do a really, really radical thing to deal with segregation in Oklahoma. She talked about non-violence, and she talked about how to step out and take a stand. She and a group of kids went to Katz Drug Store in Oklahoma City and sat down at the counter and ordered Cokes. And they sat there all day, never being served—all day. It was the birth nationwide of what we know of as the sit-in movement, where young men and women who were African American would go and sit down at a place and just wait to be served. It started a movement that shook the Nation into this issue of segregation. Those two ladies made a remarkable change for the better in our history: Clara Luper and what she did; Ada Fisher and what she did.

As we look back on tomorrow, Frederick Douglass's birthday, and we celebrate February as Black History Month, we realize how much history has really happened around us—just in the past 100 years even. We can go back as far as we want to and talk about the great Frederick Douglass and the influence he had on Abraham Lincoln and the influence he had on the Nation.

Quite frankly, in Oklahoma, there are Black leaders today who are making history, and 50 years from now and 100 years from now we will be talking about them like we talk about Clara Luper and like we talk about Ada Fisher.

We will be, 100 years from now, still talking about Russell Perry and the business work that he and his son Kevin have done in radio, what they have done in real estate, and what they have done in leadership in our State. Russell Perry was a barrier breaker. He was a cabinet member for a Governor. He has been a great leader and is a great leader in our State.

We will still be talking, years and years from now, of Dr. Kent Smith, the current president of Langston University, and what he has done at Langston and the leadership model that he has in our State.

For years, we will be talking about the members of the 1921 Race Massacre Commission and those individuals around Tulsa who have gathered around to say: What are we doing to help bring a community together and break down the barriers of segregation and of racism that still exist?

We will be talking for years about Hannibal Johnson. He is a lawyer and a brilliant man, a historian, and a leader in his community.

We will be talking for years about Wayland Cuban, an Oklahoma City police officer and a person who has spent a tremendous amount of time helping those around him and helping youth, especially those in trouble, to have a radical turnaround.

We will talk for years about Terry Munday and what he has done on the radio.

We will talk for years about pastors scattered all over our State that, in the African-American community,

have made a very real difference in the lives of a lot of families.

We will talk for years, quite frankly, about Dr. Lester Shaw and what he has done at A Pocket Full of Hope and how he has helped so many kids. He has, for years, mentored students and has had a 100-percent success rate, year after year after year, of just loving on kids and helping them in every way he can. Dr. Shaw has made a remarkable difference in our State.

We will talk for years about Clarence Hill and about what he has done for race relations in our State and how he is quietly bringing people together to sit down around a dinner table and develop friendships that should have existed long ago.

We will talk for years about Stephan Moore and his family, what they have done in the inner city, what they have done to pull kids out and look at them eyeball to eyeball and give them a sense of hope and a sense of joy.

See, in our State and around my city, Oklahoma City, where Frederick Douglass High School is, February is not just another month. We understand what Black history really means because we are living it with legacy-leavers like Ada Fisher and Clara Luper and so many others who have left such a mark.

I am proud to say I have neighbors and friends all around me who continue to make history in what they continue to do in our State. I am grateful to call them friends, and I am grateful we have the opportunity to celebrate Frederick Douglass's birthday together.

I yield back.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MAKE CENTS ACT

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, there is really no way to sugarcoat it. Washington's budget process is broken. Every year, it is like clockwork. First, the President submits his budget, like we saw this past Monday. Then the House tears it up—no pun intended, really. They ultimately fail to pass their own budget, and then Congress kicks the can down the road before finally cramming through a budget-busting bill at the eleventh hour.

There is no question this process is dysfunctional, but maybe, more importantly, its lack of transparency allows for wasteful spending to continue year after year—unchecked.

Folks, this cycle has to end. We have to start chipping away at this ballooning debt, and we have to work toward cutting our government's most wasteful spending.

One of the best ways to do this is to call it out when we see it. As some of

you may know, every month, I give out my Squeal Award to call out the parts of our government that are wasting hard-working Americans' tax dollars. I highlight the most egregious waste found within the bowels of Washington, and then I put it forward and offer up a solution to stop it.

Take, for example, what I like to call the binge buying bureaucrats. Every year at the end of September, the bureaucrats charge billions of dollars to taxpayers during Washington's annual use-it-or-lose-it spending spree. We have seen the compulsive buying include items like millions and millions of dollars of lobster and crab. We have even seen spending on games and toys or even on something like a \$12,000 foosball table. Is that what we need in Washington, DC—foosball?

I have also called out Washington's boondoggles that are just bottomless money pits for projects that never really even get off the ground. As for the contractors who are working on these boondoggles, the ones who are failing at their jobs, guess what—they are getting big, fat bonuses.

A primary example of this egregious misuse of tax dollars is what I like to call the moonoggle. Right there. There you have it. Look at that—the moonoggle. I am talking about the rockets that are being developed for NASA's next Moon mission. This project is billions of dollars over budget and years—folks, not months but years—behind schedule due to poor performance. Yet NASA still handed out generous bonuses that totaled over \$300 million to the contractor who is working on the project.

Folks, it is absurd. This is absurd. We have to put an end to it, and thankfully I believe we might actually be on a path that will do that.

Taxpayers should be encouraged that all of this "squealing" has finally been heard at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Both of these Squeal Award recipients—the binge buying bureaucrats and the infamous moonoggle—have been targeted by President Trump in his latest budget proposal.

Within its pages, the President states that his administration is committed to stopping improper end-of-year spending and will begin closely scrutinizing how money is being spent at the end of the fiscal year to curtail waste. The President's budget also calls out the poor performance of the NASA contractor and proposes management improvements that would shave \$300 million off the cost of the mission. This is encouraging, no doubt about it.

In order to codify these efforts, I am putting forward a package of common-sense reforms to join the President in urging Congress to actually address Washington's spending addiction, get our budget process back on track, and ensure Iowans understand exactly how their hard-earned dollars are being spent.

In order to force Congress to do its job and become a better steward of tax-

payers' money, I have introduced the MAKE CENTS Act. This comprehensive package combines five simple ideas I have previously introduced.

First off, it requires an annual report listing every government-funded project that is \$1 billion or more over budget or 5 years or more behind schedule.

Second, it requires every project supported with Federal funds to include a pricetag that is easily available for taxpayers.

Third, it eliminates use-it-or-lose-it impulse purchases by limiting an agency's spending in the last 2 months of the fiscal year to no more than the average spent in the other months.

Fourth, it prohibits Congress from going on recess without passing a budget on time.

Fifth and lastly, it prohibits Congress from getting paid without its passing a budget on time.

Folks, these are not new or radical reforms. Many folks in the Senate and in the House have proposed various versions of these items, recognizing the serious problem we face. Like the bill title reads, these ideas just make sense. If hard-working Iowa families have to manage their budgets, we really should expect Washington to do the same. So let's get at it.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF LEE COUNTY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today it is a privilege for me to join Kentuckians in Lee County in marking 150 years of their distinguished history. Found in Eastern Kentucky, where tall hills meet dense forests, Lee County is home to a special rural heritage. I would like to spend a few moments today to look back at the area's wonderful traditions and to celebrate its great potential for the future.

To fully understand Lee County's history, we must appreciate its geography. The county seat, Beattyville, sits at the birthplace of the beautiful Kentucky River. The Commonwealth's

namesake waterway has historically provided Lee County residents a ship-ping avenue and a scenic venue for out-door recreation. Lush valleys led local farmers to grow a wide range of crops, including tobacco, corn, and apples. The Daniel Boone National Forest, which covers thousands of acres of the county, provides an abundant source of hardwood. Taking advantage of the beautiful Appalachian Mountains, coal operations in the county have been a historic aspect of this region.

Formed in the years following the Civil War, Lee County did not take long to become a center of regional ground and water transportation. At the beginning of the 20th century, the Louisville and Atlantic Railroad extended its line to Beattyville, encouraging new opportunities for local growth. The following decades saw a strengthening economy and growing population.

As the county developed, so did its rural traditions. One of them, the local Woolly Worm Festival, celebrates Lee County's mountain culture. Each October, the community gathers for a variety of events, including a pet show, a parade, and a pageant. The most interesting day is the Woolly Worm Races, where young people see whose banded woolly worm is the fastest to climb a string. The winning worm is given the responsibility of predicting that year's upcoming winter based on its body's coloration. This is just one example of the pride every Lee County resident can enjoy in their home county.

I frequently get the chance to visit with families in Lee County and consistently work to advance their priorities in the Senate. For example, I have partnered with local officials to secure millions of Federal dollars to upgrade their water infrastructure and to build a hiking and mountain biking trail. It has also been a privilege to support the brave drug eradication efforts of law enforcement and the Kentucky National Guard in the Daniel Boone National Forest. Answering the call of Kentuckians is one of the best aspects of my service in the Senate, and I look forward to continuing to deliver for communities in Lee County and across Kentucky.

Lee County will kick off its year of festivities on March 1, the same day the county was established in 1870. In addition to many community events, the county is also presenting an oral history project, featuring community members discussing local artifacts and historical events. There is certainly a lot to celebrate about the last 150 years. I am delighted to join all the families throughout Lee County in marking this impressive milestone, and I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in paying tribute to this wonderful Eastern Kentucky community.

S.J. RES. 68

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier today, we voted on an amendment to

S.J. Res. 68 that was offered by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator RISCH. That amendment consisted of one sentence, as follows: "The President has a constitutional responsibility to take actions to defend the United States, its territories, possessions, citizens, servicemembers and diplomats from attack."

On its face, the Risch amendment seems reasonable. The President does have a responsibility to defend the country. But, as is so often the case, the devil is in the details, or the absence of details, and when it involves engaging U.S. Armed Forces in hostilities, we should pay particularly close attention. I was among those who opposed the amendment and I want to explain why.

First, it is important to note that the underlying resolution already states that "[nothing] in this section shall be construed to prevent the United States from defending itself from imminent attack." So there is no question about the President's authority to defend the country. But the central purpose of the resolution is to give meaning to the Congress's constitutional authority—the Congress's sole power—to declare war. For far too long this body has surrendered that duty to the executive branch.

In 2002, when the Senate considered whether or not to authorize President George W. Bush to invade Iraq, many in this body argued that providing the President with that authority was needed to convince Saddam Hussein to back down. I, instead, saw it as Congress abdicating its constitutional duty by providing the President with open-ended authority to use military force against Iraq. For that reason, among others, I voted no.

In fact, my worst fears were realized. Not only was the justification for that war based on lies, but thousands of Americans died, trillions of dollars were wasted that could have been used to fix what's broken in this country, and the American people are no safer. Today that authority is being used in ways that no one envisioned or intended to justify an attack against another country, Iran, nearly two decades later.

We should learn from that costly mistake. The obvious implication of the Risch amendment is that any President is authorized, and has an affirmative responsibility, to use military force at anytime, anywhere, indefinitely, to prevent an unspecified attack that might occur sometime in the future. There is no requirement that it be "imminent". There is no requirement that such an attack be anything other than speculative or imagined.

Given the way this and past administrations have expansively interpreted past authorizations for the use of force, the Risch amendment could be interpreted to further erode Congress's ability to prevent a President from unilat-

erally sending U.S. forces into hostilities without prior consultation with, or further authorization from, the Congress. Such an endorsement—even if unintended—of unchecked Executive power undermines the purpose of the underlying joint resolution, and it makes a mockery of the Congress's sole power to declare war. That is not something any of us should condone.

THE CLEAN ECONOMY ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to discuss solutions to the climate crisis, which threatens the health and well-being of my constituents in Maryland and Americans across the Nation.

The urgency of climate change asks us to be our most cooperative and collaborative selves and to seek policy solutions that far outlast our legacies in office. As the threat of climate change becomes more and more visible to the American public, people are demanding action from their Federal Government. This year, we have seen an unprecedented level of interest from Americans of all ages and walks of life on real solutions to this complex problem. A variety of comprehensive solutions have been proposed, some that represent a departure from how the Federal Government has addressed climate change in the past, while others utilize existing Federal frameworks to drive climate action.

History tells us that our Federal agencies have an incredible capacity to evolve to meet the threats of their time. In previous administrations, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency has been a dynamic steward of domestic environmental law throughout the last half-century and is well-practiced in addressing environmental concerns as they emerge. Unfortunately, Congress and the President have failed to provide the EPA with the direction and funding it needs to address the issue of climate change in earnest. I support Senator CARPER's Clean Economy Act for this very reason. The Clean Economy Act understands that the EPA lies at the center of America's climate future and empowers it to address climate change proactively.

The Clean Economy Act provides the agency with the clear goal of net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2050 to match the urgency to reduce warming global temperatures. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's—IPCC—October 2018 Special Report on climate warns that warming above 1.5 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels will have a catastrophic impact on our global systems. The United States reaching net-zero is an essential component to keep global temperature warming below the 1.5 degrees Celsius cap.

Many of this administration's nominees are fond of pointing out that they are not scientists, implying that they are not qualified to make decisions related to climate change. I will point out that most of us are not economists

either, but that doesn't stop us from making decisions that affect the economy. We have a responsibility to make informed decisions affecting our climate, environment, and natural resources, which are at the heart of our ability to maintain a healthy sustainable economy. There are some tough decisions to make in the face of climate change that reasonable people will disagree about, but the basic science should not be ignored. Whether to accept the facts of the matter should not be a partisan debate.

Fortunately, the IPCC, to which the U.S. Government and scientific community is a leading contributor, continues to provide a well-documented guide for what we need to do to respond to the climate crisis. According to the IPCC's landmark Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, the model pathways that would enable us to limit global warming to the critical benchmark of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels reach net zero global net anthropogenic CO₂ emissions by approximately 2050. This bill is based on the science that demonstrates the importance and value of reaching net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by not later than 2050.

We can do this, and making the necessary investments to do so will strengthen our economy, create jobs, and protect our public health and national security. The most expensive and unrealistic course of action is to ignore the mounting costs of climate change and fail to respond.

The legislation ensures that the EPA's plan incorporates greenhouse gas reduction, while expanding opportunities for the U.S. labor force. After all, any conversation about a new U.S. energy future without the participation of working people is incomplete. The Clean Economy Act ensures the EPA has the power to invest in the development and deployment of low- and zero-greenhouse gas emitting technologies and that the U.S. workforce reaps the benefits of an equitable transition away from fossil fuels. The support of the Blue Green Alliance, a coalition of labor unions like the United Steelworkers and the Utility Workers Union of America and environmental organizations like the League of Conservation Voters and Natural Resources Defense Council demonstrates that a diverse collection of interests see a net-zero future for our country.

This legislation builds off bipartisan progress we have made this Congress using existing Federal frameworks to reduce emissions and prepare for the effects of climate change that are already here. In November 2018, the Fourth National Climate Assessment concluded that climate change is affecting the natural environment, agriculture, energy production and use, land and water resources, transportation, and human health and welfare across the U.S. and its territories." The Senate Environment and Public Works Committee favorably reported the American's Transportation Infra-

structure Act in July 2019 that for the first time included a Climate Title. The Federal assistance in it will help the transportation sector lower emissions through infrastructure for electric and alternatively fueled vehicles. The bill also supports States and local agencies preparing our Nation's roads and bridges to withstand climate impacts.

I encourage my colleagues across committees to work together to enact both pieces of legislation to prepare all sectors of the clean economy for the climate reality before us today.

One of the most critical climate change impacts that we must take immediate action on is the threat to our water infrastructure. This week, GAO is releasing a report on water infrastructure and climate change in response to a request I made with my colleague Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island. We asked the GAO to study what is known about the effects of climate change on the Nation's domestic water systems and the potential fiscal risks posed by those effects and evaluate Federal actions that may be taken to reduce such risks.

Therein, EPA estimates that drinking water and wastewater utilities need to invest almost \$744 billion to repair and replace their existing infrastructure over the next 20 years. GAO finds climate change is increasing these costs. In 2017, it cost the Federal Government over \$300 billion to repair damage resulting from climate- and weather-related events, including damage to drinking water and wastewater infrastructure, according to NOAA.

The faster we act to make our water infrastructure resilient to climate change impacts, as well as address the root cause of climate change through legislation such as the Clean Economy Act, the better we can reduce the risks and control the costs. Our drinking water and wastewater treatment systems are at great risk from climate change impacts such as heavy rainfall, sea level rise, and flooding that local managers are experiencing today.

The GAO report shows a path toward minimizing future damage. This study documents the need for the Federal Government to work with States and local utilities to strengthen the resilience of water infrastructure to climate impacts and makes practical suggestions that we should implement immediately through incorporating climate effects into infrastructure planning and providing enhanced technical and financial assistance.

My colleague Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia and I introduced S. 2636, the Clean Water Infrastructure Resilience and Sustainability Act to prepare our publicly owned wastewater treatment facilities for the impacts of climate change. These efforts will work in tandem with the goals of the Clean Economy Act to seek net-zero emissions while preventing further damage to our national infrastructure by the extreme weather events we are already seeing.

The Clean Economy Act directs the EPA to coordinate with other Federal agencies to encourage the restoration of ecosystems such as forests and wetlands that sequester carbon and improve climate resilience, particularly on Federal and Tribal land.

The fight to reduce the greenhouse gases that cause climate change is not unlike the challenge we face in cleaning up and restoring water quality in the Chesapeake Bay and its rivers and streams. Many of the solutions, such as restoring natural carbon sinks like wetlands, are the same. Wetlands act like natural sponges, storing excess carbon in soils, as well as soaking up stormwater and trapping pollutants before they reach rivers, streams, and the Chesapeake Bay.

The original Chesapeake Bay Agreement was a simple, one-page pledge signed in 1983 recognizing that a cooperative approach was necessary to address the bay's pollution problems. The 1987 Chesapeake Bay Agreement set the first numeric goals to reduce pollution and restore the bay ecosystem. Today, the EPA-led Chesapeake Bay Program partnership engages dozens of agencies and organizations in the effort to restore the bay and its rivers. I am encouraged to see a number of the agencies named in section 2 of the Clean Economy Act are Federal agency partners, including the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—U.S. Department of Defense—DOD—and U.S. Department of the Interior—DOI.

This body recently unanimously passed proposals I authored that will benefit the Chesapeake Bay watershed and wetlands nationwide. Foremost was a provision increasing the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program Reauthorization to a historic \$92 million. The bills were part of a bipartisan package of wildlife conservation legislation, the America's Conservation Enhancement—ACE—Act. The ACE Act served as a substitute amendment for the North America Wetlands Conservation Extension Act—NAWCA—which provides grants to protect wetlands.

We have demonstrated our ability to respond legislatively to challenges that seemed insurmountable 30 years ago. I urge all of my colleagues to cosponsor this new consensus bill.

SOUTH SUDAN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to express strong concern about the situation in South Sudan and to call on the administration to step up its diplomatic efforts to avert a return to conflict and help achieve a lasting peace. For 6 years, the people of South Sudan have suffered the effects of a brutal civil war. International efforts to find a diplomatic solution have failed, and the humanitarian situation in South Sudan remains one of the worst in the world.

In September 2018, President Salva Kiir and his main political opponent,

former Vice President Riek Machar, agreed to form a unity government in the capital, Juba, by March of 2019. Though this so called “revitalized agreement” is not perfect, it is what we have to work with. The ceasefire between Kiir and Machar that was part of it has largely held, sparing the South Sudanese from the violence and brutality so many experienced at the height of the civil war. I am also encouraged that the government and political opposition groups that had refused to sign the 2018 revitalized peace deal reached an accord last month.

However, two successive delays in the establishment of the unity government have made me skeptical about the chances that the latest deadline, February 22, will be met. While both parties have stated their commitment to it, they have yet to effectively address two fundamental sticking points: the boundaries of South Sudan’s states, and the formation of an inclusive national army. Absent an agreement on these two issues, lasting peace may prove elusive.

At the end of the day, Kiir, Machar, and others who claim to represent the South Sudanese people are responsible for peace in their country. However, given our historical role in South Sudan, the United States has a significant role to play. I would like to remind my colleagues that the United States was heavily involved in brokering the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement which helped create the conditions for South Sudan’s independence. Since independence, the United States has provided nearly \$3.8 billion in emergency humanitarian assistance since the outbreak of civil war. We have supported the UN peacekeeping force in South Sudan, UNMISS, which is protecting 200,000 civilians sheltering in or near its bases, investing more than \$342 million last fiscal year. These dollars are and have contributed to keeping thousands of people alive. But the South Sudanese deserve more than mere life support. They deserve to live in peace. We have influence with all of the key actors in the region, yet the administration has failed to use it. The administration must effectively use its influence to help the millions of South Sudanese who aspired to liberty but found misery instead.

Previous administrations made South Sudan a priority in their foreign policy. The Bush administration helped negotiate the aforementioned Comprehensive Peace Agreement. The Obama administration help shepherd the country to independence and remained actively engaged as the security and humanitarian situation devolved.

At his confirmation hearing, Assistant Secretary of State for Africa Tibor Nagy promised that under his leadership, “The South Sudanese will realize just how involved the United States is.”

However, administration engagement has been weak and inconsistent, and it

is not guided by a clearly articulated strategy. In May 2018, the White House announced it was conducting a review of our assistance programs to South Sudan. In a statement, it expressed frustration that, “the leaders of this country have squandered this partnership, pilfered the wealth of South Sudan, killed their own people, and repeatedly demonstrated their inability and unwillingness to live up to their commitments to end the country’s civil war”—a bold statement but it has been more than a year and a half since the review was announced, and it remains incomplete. Since that time, what has the administration done? Well, 3 years into the administration, it has finally designated a special envoy, something for which I have been advocating for years, but the envoy will not answer directly to the President or the Secretary of State, which I fear may limit his stature and, therefore, his effectiveness.

Additionally, the administration has imposed targeted sanctions. Last year, the Treasury Department sanctioned two Cabinet ministers, Elia Lomuro and Kuol Manyang Juuk. Last month, they also sanctioned South Sudan’s First Vice President Taban Deng Gai. Deng is credibly accused of influencing the government to execute to dissidents; he should be sanctioned for human rights abuses. But, as I have said many times before, sanctions are not a strategy. Sanctions are a tool to be used selectively to apply pressure towards a specific political goal. In this case, support for a comprehensive and durable peace agreement.

Last month, a year and a half since his confirmation, Ambassador Nagy visited Juba. While I applaud Ambassador Nagy’s trip—I believe that the U.S. should be increasing its diplomatic engagement—one visit does not a policy make. It is unclear what the trip was meant to accomplish in the absence of a comprehensive strategy.

At this critical juncture, I am still hard pressed to understand the administration’s approach towards South Sudan, and I am worried that we do not have a plan of action should this latest deadline not be met. Time is of the essence; I urge the administration to take several actions.

First, ensure that Special Envoy Symington has the appropriate staff and resources to effectively undertake his responsibilities. The administration has moved from no envoys for Sudan and South Sudan to two envoys. While the challenges in the two countries are different, the fates of the two countries remain intertwined. Coordination is critical, as is support for both of their offices.

Second, we must have a sound strategy for supporting a viable peace agreement. I call upon Special Envoy Symington to take immediate steps to develop an interagency strategy, in consultation with our Ambassadors in the region, aimed at uniting the region to apply pressure to the parties to ad-

dress outstanding obstacles to the formation of a unity government. In the short term, the strategy should focus on developing benchmarks and milestones towards formation of a unity government, and steps—to include punitive measures—the United States will take to encourage regional partners to apply consistent pressure on the parties to the conflict to move towards peace. Longer term, it should lead towards supporting conditions that support a sustainable peace and credible elections. The strategy should also include actions to support grassroots reconciliation and restorative justice, as well as accountability for war crimes and human rights abuses.

Finally, the administration must conclude its review of assistance to South Sudan and be transparent to the South Sudanese, members of the diplomatic community, and the American people about exactly what the next steps will be relative to its findings and how those steps fit into a broader strategy. Whatever these steps are, they should be aimed towards cementing peace, and continuing strong support for development and humanitarian assistance to the people of South Sudan.

If past is prologue, South Sudan’s leaders may well once again fail their people. The stakes for the formation of a unity government—one that can implement a durable peace—are perilously high. If the current negotiations collapse, millions will suffer. We must do all we can to ensure that the South Sudanese are able to move forward with this agreement, flawed though it may well be, and we must be prepared to help it succeed.

TRIBUTE TO IYAD SHIHADDEH

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to a valued and long-standing member of my staff, Iyad Shihadeh. After nearly 9 years of serving the people of California in my San Francisco office, tomorrow will be Iyad’s last day.

Iyad first joined my team in 2011 as a staff assistant and quickly made an impression through his diligent efforts on behalf of the Californians calling or visiting our office. Iyad was quickly promoted to the position of constituent services representative, where he managed as many as 200 casework requests simultaneously between the Departments of State, Justice, and Homeland Security.

Iyad demonstrated an aptitude for problem solving on behalf of individuals and organizations needing help navigating the Federal bureaucracy. Additionally, Iyad took charge of the office’s intern program, guiding the dozens of students each year working in the San Francisco office. Many of our former State interns and staff are indebted to him for his thoughtful career advice as they made their first forays into the field of public service.

In 2017, Iyad was promoted again to be the director of constituent services,

in charge of a team of staff who receive, process, and advocate for the casework needs of Californians seeking assistance from Federal agencies. I have depended on Iyad's sound judgment, management capabilities, and cool head in this critical function.

As all Senators know, your casework director needs to be a special person. They represent you to constituents who are in need and often have nowhere else to turn. I have been particularly lucky to have Iyad in this role; he has performed with skill and with a deft personal touch.

I am proud of our casework successes under Iyad's management in recovering millions of dollars in benefits for those needing help with Social Security checks, student loans, tax refunds, veterans' benefits, and other payments from the Federal Government. He has worked on behalf of countless constituents seeking visas or other immigration benefits. When a constituent is in a foreign jail or has lost their passport overseas, Iyad has been on the case, immediately, professionally, and successfully.

I am particularly thankful for Iyad's help with Maria Mendoza, a nurse from Oakland who is back in the United States with her children after Iyad's work in securing an H1-B visa; also Maria Isabel Bueso, a young woman from Guatemala who has lived in the United States for most of her life in order to receive lifesaving medication, but who was threatened last year with removal. Iyad worked with the family and with Judiciary Committee staff, and now, Isabel has been given a stay from deportation.

In addition to his casework efforts, Iyad has provided guidance in my San Francisco office. His steady presence has been indispensable for three State directors and four chiefs of staff.

Before joining my team, Iyad graduated from Purdue University with a double major in history and political science in 2009. He received academic honors, graduating in the top 10 percent of his class. Following his lifelong passion of international issues, he dedicated himself to his studies and wrote a dissertation titled, "They Also Served: The Untold Story of the Egyptian Labour Corps in World War One." In 2010, he graduated from the London School of Economics, where he received a master of science in the history of empires. His efforts afforded him a deeper knowledge of economics and globalization, and once again, he centered his academic curiosities on foreign affairs by writing his thesis on "Money, Arms, and Superpowers: British Foreign Policy towards the War of Attrition."

While I am sad to see him go, I am thrilled for Iyad's family as he will join them in the day-to-day management of their restaurant in south San Francisco. His energy, ideas, and ability to connect with people will undoubtedly serve his family and community well for many years to come. I am deeply

grateful for the wisdom and dedication that Iyad Shihadeh has brought to our office and his dedication on behalf of the people of California. I thank Iyad and wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO BETH BURKE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am here today to recognize a loss for the Murray office and a major victory for Wisconsin and that is the return of Beth Burke, a longtime and deeply trusted aide of mine, to her home State after 8 years with my office.

Over her time with us, Beth saw me through office move after office move, countless hectic days of running to and from the Capitol all without missing a vote, I should say and more rebooked flights back to Washington State than sure she would like to remember.

All of that would be enough to keep a team of ordinary people busy, but it doesn't even scratch the surface of what Beth has meant to me, to our team, and to our country because, during those same years of Beth's service, she helped lead our team as we grew from scrappy and small to still scrappy, but spanning three different office buildings in the Senate, in addition to our two coast, as I negotiated a bipartisan budget agreement no one thought we could get done and through the negotiations between Chairman Alexander and me on reforming K-12 education to end No Child Left Behind.

She was up at all hours, all week, every week, doing everything she could to advance our efforts to fight for patients' healthcare, for women's reproductive rights and equality, and always, always for our servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

It is a bit of a truism that the loudest voice in the room is not always the one having the biggest impact. Now, Beth will be the first to admit that she has a loud voice. But she used it and her expertise at navigating every logistic and obstacle imaginable to ensure we were in the best possible position to succeed in whatever we set out to do. She is a true public servant with the biggest heart you can imagine, and I know families and communities in Washington State and nationwide are better for her time here.

I would also be remiss if I didn't note that Beth met her wonderful husband Dan, got married, and had her adorable, fierce baby girl Lillian all while she worked in our office.

It has been a true joy seeing her family grow, so before I close I want to thank Beth's family—Dan, Lillian, their dog Karl—the most important Burke and everyone who's excited to welcome her home to Wisconsin, for sharing Beth with us.

I know it is not always easy having a Senate staffer as a spouse or a family member or a close friend, especially one who works as hard and cares as much as Beth, so I want to recognize all your loved ones for their service as well.

Beth, thank you again from my State and my family to yours. We are so deeply grateful for you and so excited to hear about everything you have in store.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING MARIE GREENWOOD

• Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Marie Greenwood, who passed away late last year at the age of 106 years old. Marie, a teacher by trade, spent her life dedicated to the idea that each child—regardless of their race, gender, or class—deserves a quality education. Her intellect, compassion, and vigor propelled countless children through the Denver Public School system and towards lives of purpose. Marie's work as Denver's first tenured Black teacher and an integration pioneer increased educational equity in our schools and helped shape Denver into the great city that it is today.

An only child, Marie was born in Los Angeles in 1912 before she and her family relocated to Denver in 1925. As a Black family in segregated Denver, they faced no shortage of obstacles. Despite being a star student who time and again overcame the bigotry leveled against her, Marie was told by her high school guidance counselor not to apply to college because it would be a waste of her parents' money. Thank goodness Marie did not heed this wrongheaded advice. She went on to graduate third in her class and earned a scholarship to Colorado Teachers College. Marie had set out on a path that would eventually lead to touching the lives of generations of Colorado's students.

Marie was a trailblazer in civil rights and the ideal teacher. In 1938, she earned tenure in the Denver Public Schools, the first Black teacher to do so. Throughout the 1940s, Marie was involved in local activism that challenged discriminatory policies. In 1955, Marie made history again when she became the first African American in Denver to teach at a segregated school. In the 1960s, she served on a Denver Public Schools committee tasked to study racial inequities in district funding and staffing. All the while, she was a kind and determined teacher who ensured that her students always tried their hardest.

In retirement, she authored two books, one outlining her philosophy on teaching children facing difficulties and the other her autobiography. In 2001, her legacy was further solidified as the school district named a new elementary school in her honor. She will continue to be remembered by students who participate in the Greenwood Scholars program, which teaches the history of Denver through her life story.

As the former superintendent of Denver Public Schools, I can confidently

say that our students would be well-served if Marie was the lodestar for our teachers. Her grace and passion for the profession made a tremendous difference in the lives of our young people, and we are all in her debt. Thank you, Marie. May she rest in peace.●

TRIBUTE TO ASHLEY KEMMIS AND BRIANNA PAGE

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Ashley Kemmis and Brianna Page for their entrepreneurial spirit in Valley County.

Ashley and Brianna saw a need in the community for more options for women's clothing after Shopko closed in Glasgow in 2019.

They teamed up together to launch Thistle and Thread, an online women's clothing boutique. Since they launched their website one year ago, Ashley and Brianna's project flourished into a successful operation out of Eastern Montana.

Women across the country can purchase the boutique's clothing online and those in eastern Montana can visit their storefront in Glasgow.

It is my honor to recognize Ashley and Brianna for taking the initiative to successfully launch Thistle and Thread. Thistle and Thread is a now a proud part of the Glasgow community, and I am grateful for Ashley and Brianna's entrepreneurship.●

TRIBUTE TO JERRIANNE BOGGIS AND VALERIE CUNNINGHAM

● Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize JerriAnne Boggis of Milford and Valerie Cunningham of Portsmouth as February's Granite Staters of the Month for their work to bring to light New Hampshire's too often forgotten Black history and engage communities across our State in conversations about New Hampshire's full past.

JerriAnne has said that it took 25 years after emigrating from Jamaica to New Hampshire for her to discover that New Hampshire had a Black history. JerriAnne was surprised to learn that the town she lived in, Milford, was home to Harriet E. Wilson, one of the first African Americans in North America to publish a novel. To commemorate Harriet's incredible achievement, JerriAnne established a non-profit organization to erect a statue of Harriet, which also marked the first statue in New Hampshire to honor a person of color.

Valerie grew up in Portsmouth, where her parents were leaders of the local civil rights movement and encouraged their daughter to explore New Hampshire's Black history. Valerie followed her parents' encouragement and spent years documenting African and African-American history in New Hampshire. Valerie would later go on to create a physical embodiment of her decades of research by establishing the

Portsmouth Black Heritage Trail in 1995, with the intent of bringing public awareness to Portsmouth's Black history.

Today, the Portsmouth Black Heritage Trail has expanded to become the Black Heritage Trail of New Hampshire. The foundation that Valerie founded is now led by JerriAnne, the trail's executive director. JerriAnne is working to expand the organization's mission to other towns across New Hampshire with the hope of growing public awareness of the Black history that exists in every region of the State.

The Black Heritage Trail plays an important role in engaging Granite Staters about the complex topic of race in America. To help jumpstart these necessary conversations, the organization hosts community dialogues, called Tea Talks, focused on discussing the intersection of race with different facets of American life, including health, education, and the arts. It also hosts a variety of events throughout the year, including the Black New England Conference, held last year at Southern New Hampshire University.

The Black Heritage Trail of New Hampshire brings a long overdue focus on our State's Black history. African Americans in New Hampshire have made profound contributions to our State, and thanks in part to the work of JerriAnne and Valerie, these stories and achievements will be remembered in history. It is a great honor to recognize the work of these women and their dedication to creating a more informed, inclusive, and just New Hampshire.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF STEVENS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize and congratulate Stevens Institute of Technology in Hoboken, NJ on the 150th anniversary of its founding.

On February 15, 1870, Stevens Institute of Technology was founded as the first college of mechanical engineering in the United States, with a bequest from Edwin A. Stevens, a member of "America's first family of inventors." Over the past 150 years, the university has expanded to include comprehensive academic offerings in a wide array of engineering and science discipline, and has an accredited School of Business and a College of Arts and Letters.

From its earliest days, Stevens has honored its mission to inspire, nurture, and educate leaders in the technology-centric environment of the future, while equipping them with the tools to find innovative solutions to the most challenging problems of our time. Today Stevens is among the fastest growing universities in the Nation, attracting top students and faculty from New Jersey, the Nation, and across the globe.

Stevens is also one of the largest producers of science, technology, engineering and mathematics, STEM, de-

gree recipients in New Jersey and ranks first in the State and 15th in the Nation in the production of engineering graduate degrees. Students at Stevens benefit from the university's technology-centric education, which provides a unique and entrepreneurial approach to learning that encourages problem-solving and is a passport to success. Stevens has an outstanding 96 percent placement rate for its graduates, and its alumni have launched and led numerous companies and organizations.

Stevens faculty, student, and alumni have pioneered research and innovations in many diverse fields, including transportation, telecommunications, resiliency, sustainability, artificial intelligence, machine learning, healthcare, biomedicine, cybersecurity, maritime security, and systems engineering. It is no exaggeration to say that Stevens has changed and improved the way we live, work, and communicate, greatly benefiting society. Stevens has also contributed significantly to the community and local, State, and national economy.

It is my great honor to recognize Stevens for this significant milestone in the history of the university and to thank its leadership, faculty, students, and alumni for their profound and farreaching contributions to the communities of Hoboken, Hudson County, the State of New Jersey, and to the United States.●

REMEMBERING WESLEY AIKEN

● Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to take a few minutes to recognize the life of Ugiagtaq Wesley Aiken, who died January 6, 2020 at the age 93 years old, only 19 days shy of his 94th birthday.

With the passing of Native elder Wesley Aiken, Alaska has lost a highly respected Inupiat leader who dedicated his life to leadership in the Alaska Native community and ensuring that cultural and traditional knowledge will be passed down to younger generations.

Wesley Aiken was born in 1926 in Utqiagvik, to a completely subsistence lifestyle north of the Arctic Circle. He grew up in a small village, Isuk, which lays east of Utqiagvik, until the age of 12, moving for his education. As a teenager, he became a reindeer header for 3 years in order to help out his family. He was a man of many trades—he was a mechanic, laborer, member of the Alaska Territorial Guard, and later a member of the Alaska National Guard. He served as the land chief for Ukpeagvik Inupiat Corporation following its formation in 1973. He was a spiritual leader for the community and was always asked to pray. He would pray when the whale was caught, before big celebrations, the Nalukatak blanket toss, the Winter Games, and he prayed with the whaling captains. He loved the gatherings of the people and strived to see all the community's children participate. He was a hard worker

and would say, "If you have dreams to do something, you, yourself have to work hard to get to that goal."

Wesley grew up using dog teams in the wintertime to camp and hunt long before snow machines were prevalent and available in his region. His traditional knowledge of the subsistence lifestyle was extensive, and he enthusiastically shared with his community. He learned whaling from his grandfather and uncle and later became a whaling captain. He took it upon himself to teach the next generation whaling. His daughter's generation was sent off to boarding schools, and so many youth were not taught the traditional ways of hunting and needed to be re-taught when they returned. He taught many of his nephews traditional hunting methods and said it was his job to give back, just as his elders had taught him how to hunt whale and inland animals. He observed changes in sea ice and climate in his generation and shared with the world what he saw.

Wesley also served on the North Slope Borough's Inupiat History, Language and Culture Commission. He often stressed the importance of language, and his dream was an immersion camp in which only Inupiat was spoke. He reminded the youth about the hardships their ancestors experienced and that the whole community looked out for each other. And if you took care of animals and the land, they would take care of you.

In 2018, he served as the keynote speaker at the Elders and Youth Conference in Anchorage, during which he delivered a strong message on respect. He said it is all about respect. It is about respect for self and for one other, as well as a respect for the animals, which he said have spirits just like we do. In fact, when he took his daughter hunting, he taught her where to put a hole behind the neck to release the spirit of the caribou.

Wesley was also known for his Alaska Native rights activism. He participated in the 1961 Barrow Duck Sit-in, protesting the Federal Government's regulation of Native hunting rights, and this protest, among others, led to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. A respected leader, he also helped establish the Alaska Federal of Natives.

Elder Wesley's wisdom and kindness will be missed. He is survived and respected by his children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, friends, and his whole community. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United

States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN PROCLAMATION 9844 OF FEBRUARY 15, 2020, WITH RESPECT TO THE SOUTHERN BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES—PM 46

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the southern border of the United States declared in Proclamation 9844 of February 15, 2019, is to continue in effect beyond February 15, 2020.

The ongoing border security and humanitarian crisis at the southern border of the United States continues to threaten our national security, including the security of the American people. The executive branch has taken steps to address the crisis, but further action is needed to address the humanitarian crisis and to control unlawful migration and the flow of narcotics and criminals across the southern border. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Proclamation 9844 concerning the southern border of the United States.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 2020.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:16 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 and joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2546. An act to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 2546. An act to designate certain lands in the State of Colorado as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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-3992. A communication from the Chairman and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Bank's Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2021, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3993. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Advisory: Prudent Management of Agricultural Lending During Economic Cycles" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3994. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" (44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2020-0005) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3995. A communication from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the National Credit Union Administration's 2020 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3996. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-541, Revision 2, 'Add Exceptions to Surveillance Requirements for Valves and Dampers Locked in the Actuated Position'" (NUREG-1430, 1431, 1432, 1433, and 1434) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3997. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Safety Evaluation of Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler TSTF-568, Revision 2, Revise Applicability of BWR/4 TS 3.6.2.5 and TS 3.6.3.2" (NUREG-1433) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 11, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3998. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries off West

Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Electronic Monitoring Program" (RIN0648-BF52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3999. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Recreational Management Measures for the Summer Flounder Fishery; Fishing Year 2019" (RIN0648-BI92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4000. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Monkfish Fishery; 2018 Monkfish Specifications" (RIN0648-XG168) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4001. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Commercial Blacktip Sharks, Aggregated Large Coastal Sharks, and Hammerhead Sharks in the Gulf of Mexico Region; Retention Limit Adjustment" (RIN0648-XT005) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 12, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 910. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-216).

S. 2299. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to enhance the safety and reliability of pipeline transportation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-217).

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 123. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into a contract or other agreement with a third party to review appointees in the Veterans Health Administration who had a license terminated for cause by a State licensing board for care or services rendered at a non-Veterans Health Administration facility and to provide individuals treated by such an appointee with notice if it is determined that an episode of care or services to which they received was below the standard of care, and for other purposes.

S. 2336. A bill to improve the management of information technology projects and investments of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2594. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to modify certain requirements with respect to service and retirement for the purposes of veterans' preference for Federal hiring.

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3110. A bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a

study on disability and pension benefits provided to members of the National Guard and members of reserve components of the Armed Forces by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Charles Williams, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

*James E. McPherson, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Thomas A. Bussiere, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Joseph R. Harris II and ending with Col. Gent Welsh, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Billy M. Nabors, to be Major General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. AnnMarie K. Anthony and ending with Col. Brian E. Vaughn, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Col. Dann S. Carlson and ending with Col. Lisa K. Snyder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Steven J. deMilliano and ending with Brig. Gen. Russell L. Ponder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Andrew J. MacDonald, to be Major General.

Air Force nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Todd M. Audet and ending with Brig. Gen. Gregory T. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020. (minus 1 nominee: Brig. Gen. Jon S. Safstrom)

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Christopher E. Finerty, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Joseph B. Wilson, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Ronald F. Taylor, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Aaron R. Dean II, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nomination of Brig. Gen. Michael S. Martin, to be Major General.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Col. Douglas K. Clark and ending with Col. John F. Kelliher III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 9, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Jacqueline D. Van Ovost, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Joshua E. Erlandsen and ending with Tosha M. Vann, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Matthew G. Adkins and ending with Catherine M. Ware, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jenara L. Allen and ending with Sarah M. Wheeler, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Daniel J. Adams and ending with Zachary E. Wright, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jennifer R. Bein and ending with Angela K. Stanton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Wesley M. Abadie and ending with Scott A. Zakaluzny, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Lior Aljadeff and ending with Hyun J. Yoon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jason K. Adams and ending with Danielle N. Ziehl, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Victoria M. Aglewilson and ending with Deborah L. Willis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nominations beginning with Junelene M. Bungay and ending with Alexandra L. Mccrary-Dennis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Air Force nomination of Christopher J. Nastal, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Alexander Khutoryan, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Daniel S. Kim, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Marilyn L. Smith, to be Major.

Army nomination of Zachary J. Conly, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Audrey J. Dean, to be Major.

Army nomination of Michael W. Brancamp, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tracy J. Brown, to be Major.

Army nomination of Kenneth A. Wieder, to be Major.

Army nomination of Chong K. Yi, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with John C. Benson and ending with Sean M. Vieira, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Army nomination of Ross C. Puffer, to be Major.

Army nomination of Amanda G. Luschinski, to be Major.

Army nomination of June E. Osavio, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Yasmin J. Alter and ending with Debby L. Polozeck, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Army nominations beginning with Otha J. Holmes and ending with Jonathan W. Murphy, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Army nomination of Shaun P. Miller, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Krista H. Clarke, to be Major.

Army nomination of Peter K. Marlin, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Angela I. Iyanobor, to be Major.

Army nomination of John J. Landers, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of David P. Frommer, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Mario A. Ortega, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Keith A. Stevenson, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Joseph P. Ball and ending with Ramon F. Vasquez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Donald K. Brown and ending with Keith R. Wilkinson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Christina L. Hudson and ending with Brent J. Patterson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with James M. Shipman and ending with Philip S. Spencer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nomination of Christopher L. Kaiser, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Peter T. Graham and ending with Travis W. Storie, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Daniel E. Fuson and ending with Jesus T. Rodriguez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Navy nomination of Colin R. Young, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Catherine M. Dickin-son, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Donald A. Sinitiere, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Stephen W. Aldridge and ending with Gregory C. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 4, 2020.

Navy nomination of Paul J. Kaylor, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Andrew S. Jackson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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 Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3289. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to establish an Innovation Voucher Grant Pro-

gram; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3290. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to verify whether a health care provider is licensed in good standing before issuing the provider a unique health identifier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 3291. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to expand tax credit education and training for small businesses that engage in research and development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 3292. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to reduce Federal spending on crop insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3293. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish the Food and Nutrition Education in Schools Pilot Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 3294. A bill to require U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to facilitate naturalization services for noncitizen veterans who have been removed from the United States or are inadmissible; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 3295. A bill to amend the Act of August 18, 1941 (commonly known as the "Flood Control Act of 1941") to authorize the Secretary to provide reimbursement to non-Federal sponsors for emergency response repair and restoration work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. LANFORD):

S. 3296. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently allow a tax deduction at the time an investment in qualified property is made, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3297. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make certain information available on a public website relating to intermediate care facilities for individuals with intellectual disabilities certified for participation under the Medicaid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COTTON, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3298. A bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to permit the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to terminate the insured status of a depository institution that refuses to provide services to certain Federal contractors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 3299. A bill to repeal certain impediments to the administration of the firearms laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 3300. A bill to establish a Federal data protection agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 3301. A bill to promote the empowerment, development, and prosperity of women globally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KING:

S. 3302. A bill to improve global health security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3303. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to promote transportation career opportunities and improve diversity in the workforce; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3304. A bill to encourage and facilitate efforts by States and other stakeholders to conserve and sustain the western population of monarch butterflies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 3305. A bill to establish a grant program to provide legal assistance to eligible tenants at risk of or subject to eviction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. COONS, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3306. A bill to establish a microplastics pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. TESTER, Mr. JONES, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3307. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the implementation of curricula for training students, teachers, parents, and school personnel to understand, recognize, prevent, and respond to signs of human trafficking and exploitation in children and youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3308. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to standardize payment of hazardous duty incentive pay for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. KING):

S. 3309. A bill to provide for a Public Health Emergency Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. SASSE, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3310. A bill to permit visiting dignitaries and service members from Taiwan to display the flag of the Republic of China; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3311. A bill to direct the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information to take certain actions to enhance the representation of the United States and promote United States leadership in communications standards-setting bodies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3312. A bill to establish a crisis stabilization and community reentry grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3313. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to limit the exemption from the registration requirements of such Act for persons engaging in activities in furtherance of bona fide religious, scholastic, academic, or scientific pursuits or the fine arts to activities which do not promote the political agenda of a foreign government, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the disclosures of foreign gifts by institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3314. A bill to seek a diplomatic resolution to Iran's nuclear program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 3315. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that products derived from tar sands are crude oil for purposes of the Federal excise tax on petroleum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 3316. A bill to require a license for the reexport to an entity on the entity list of certain foreign-made items incorporating more than 10 percent of controlled United States-origin content; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 3317. A bill to improve the operation of the Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 3318. A bill to promote transparency in health care pricing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3319. A bill to reauthorize comprehensive research and statistical review and analysis of trafficking in persons and commercial sex acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 3320. A bill to designate as wilderness certain National Forest System land in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3321. A bill to authorize 4 additional judgeships and to convert a temporary judgeship for the district of Arizona; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 3322. A bill to prevent the unlawful use of financial instruments in the United States for online slot machines, lotteries, table games, and similar offerings, including games and applications that are deceptively marketed or designed to be attractive to children, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S.J. Res. 70. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to the voting threshold for impeachment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 498. A resolution condemning Stephen Miller for trafficking in bigotry, hatred, and divisive political rhetoric and for promoting policies that are inconsistent with the trust and confidence placed in him as a Senior Advisor to the President, and expressing the sense of the Senate that Stephen Miller should immediately resign from office; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 499. A resolution acknowledging the reprehensible policy of the United States regarding the forced relocation of the Potawatomi people from their homeland east of the Mississippi River to Kansas and Oklahoma and the devastating hardships the Potawatomi people endured during the march west, known as the "Potawatomi Trail of Death"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 500. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the "International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife", as designated by the World Health Organization; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. Res. 501. A resolution amending the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials to ensure adequate access to witnesses and documents in impeachment trials of a President or Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BURR, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 502. A resolution recognizing the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima during World War II and the raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 503. A resolution commending the University of West Florida Argonauts football team for its National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship victory; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 504. A resolution honoring the memories of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High

School on February 14, 2018; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. Res. 505. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States will continue to provide support to international partners to help prevent and stop the spread of coronavirus; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 206

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 296

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 296, a bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the members of the Women's Army Corps who were assigned to the 6888th Central Postal Directory Battalion, known as the "Six Triple Eight".

S. 634

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations and eligible workforce training organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Master Sergeant Rodrick "Roddie" Edmonds in recognition of his heroic actions during World War II.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 655

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 655, a bill to impose additional restrictions on tobacco flavors for use in e-cigarettes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 888

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 888, a bill to require a standard financial aid offer form, and for other purposes.

S. 997

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 997, a bill to recognize and honor the service of individuals who served in the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs.

S. 1355

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1355, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for AmeriCorps educational awards.

S. 1473

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 1473, a bill to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to set maximum contaminant levels for certain chemicals, and for other purposes.

S. 1843

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1843, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the disclosure of the total number of domestic and foreign employees of certain public companies, and for other purposes.

S. 1908

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1908, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 2085

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) 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. 2267

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2267, a bill for the relief of Cesar Carlos Silva Rodriguez.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2274, a bill to establish a voluntary program that strengthens the economy, public health, and environment of the United States by reducing emissions from wood heaters, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2627

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2627, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an above-the-line deduction for attorney fees and costs in connection with civil claim awards.

S. 2628

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2628, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove a limitation on an individual's eligibility for medical assistance under the State Medicaid plan while the individual is in custody pending disposition of charges.

S. 2711

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2711, a bill to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing-related misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 2765

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2765, a bill to improve Federal fiscal controls and the congressional budget process.

S. 2931

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2931, a bill to establish a process for obtaining a Federal certificate of rehabilitation, and for other purposes.

S. 2980

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 2980, a bill to require the promulgation of certain standards for perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2982

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2982, a bill to expand eligibility for certain housing programs for qualified volunteer first responders.

S. 3004

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3004, a bill to protect human rights and enhance opportunities for LGBTI people around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 3007

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3007, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require a provider of a report to the CyberTipline related to online sexual exploitation of children to preserve the contents of such report for 180 days, and for other purposes.

S. 3020

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3020, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with States or to award grants to States to promote health and wellness, prevent suicide, and improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 3098

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3098, a bill to redesignate the Jimmy Carter National Historic Site as the "Jimmy Carter National Historical Park".

S. 3139

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3139, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to more comprehensively address the interstate transportation of firearms or ammunition.

S. 3155

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3155, a bill to establish a rural postsecondary and economic development grant program.

S. 3167

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3167, a bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair.

S. 3217

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3217, a bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3242

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3242, a bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to protect privacy rights, and for other purposes.

S. 3246

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3246, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to direct the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a public auction of the C-band, and for other purposes.

S. 3273

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3273, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish a community college and career training grant program.

S. 3286

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 3286, a bill to restrict certain Federal grants for States that grant driver licenses to illegal immigrants and fail to share information about criminal aliens with the Federal Government.

S.J. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 6, a joint resolution removing the deadline for the ratification of the equal rights amendment.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. CON. RES. 36

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution supporting the Farmers Bill of Rights.

S. RES. 481

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 481, a resolution commemorating

the 75th anniversary of the liberation of the Auschwitz extermination camp in Nazi-occupied Poland.

AMENDMENT NO. 1305

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1305 proposed to S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 1311

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1311 intended to be proposed to S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 498—CONDEMNING STEPHEN MILLER FOR TRAFFICKING IN BIGOTRY, HATRED, AND DIVISIVE POLITICAL RHETORIC AND FOR PROMOTING POLICIES THAT ARE INCONSISTENT WITH THE TRUST AND CONFIDENCE PLACED IN HIM AS A SENIOR ADVISOR TO THE PRESIDENT, AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT STEPHEN MILLER SHOULD IMMEDIATELY RESIGN FROM OFFICE

Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 498

Whereas Public Law 115-58, a joint resolution signed into law on September 14, 2017—

(1) rejects white nationalists, white supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups; and

(2) states that in August 2017, white nationalists, white supremacists, Klansmen, and neo-Nazis gathered and demonstrated in Charlottesville, Virginia, chanting racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-immigrant slogans and causing violence, from which the Charlottesville community is still healing;

Whereas Stephen Miller is a Senior Advisor to President Trump and has long cultivated relationships and correspondence with individuals who adhere to white nationalist ideology;

Whereas recently published emails of Stephen Miller primarily address the subjects of race and immigration, exclusively focus on offenses committed by nonwhite individuals, and promote policies to severely limit or end immigration to the United States by nonwhite individuals;

Whereas, in such emails, Stephen Miller—

(1) directly and repeatedly suggests story ideas for the website Breitbart, encouraging Breitbart to incorporate white supremacist, racist, and eugenics ideologies in its news coverage;

(2) adheres to white supremacist ideologies in his opposition to Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (commonly known as “DACA”), a policy that protects from deportation young people, many of whom know no other home than the United States, and permits such individuals to make valuable contributions to their communities and the United States; and

(3) repeatedly recommends that Breitbart publish favorable articles relating to President Calvin Coolidge and the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190), a law based on eugenics ideology that established a national origin quota system to restrict immigration from areas other than Northern and Western Europe;

Whereas a former Breitbart editor has acknowledged that Stephen Miller’s suggestions have been used by Breitbart to “spin a narrative where immigrants of color were not only dangerous, violent individuals but also posed an existential threat to America”;

Whereas eugenics encompasses the racist belief that the human population can be improved by promoting groups considered genetically superior and eliminating or excluding groups considered genetically inferior, a belief that was strongly embraced by Adolf Hitler;

Whereas the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190) prohibited all immigration from Asia, severely restricted immigration from Africa, and used outdated census data to exclude many other individuals whom the proponents of the law considered inferior or undesirable, including Southern and Eastern Europeans;

Whereas the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190) was strongly supported by eugenicists and reflected the pervasiveness of anti-immigrant and nativist sentiment in the early twentieth century;

Whereas President Coolidge wrote, “Our country must cease to be regarded as a dumping ground [for new immigrants] . . . Biological laws tell us that certain divergent people will not mix or blend”;

Whereas, in his manifesto entitled “Mein Kampf”, Adolf Hitler described the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190) as a model for Nazi Germany to make his eugenics ideology a reality;

Whereas the national origin quotas and the eugenics ideology embodied in the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153, chapter 190) governed United States immigration policy until the passage of the Act entitled “An Act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes”, approved October 3, 1965 (commonly known as the “Immigration Act of 1965”) (79 Stat. 911), which replaced the national origin quota system with a preference system based on family ties and professional and skilled employment opportunities;

Whereas Stephen Miller is widely understood to direct immigration policy for the Trump Administration, including by supporting legislative and administrative proposals that would severely reduce immigration to the United States and disproportionately reduce immigration from Africa, Asia, and Latin America; and

Whereas Stephen Miller’s leadership position brings discredit upon the White House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate condemns Stephen Miller for—

(A) trafficking in bigotry, hatred, and divisive political rhetoric; and

(B) promoting policies that are inconsistent with the trust and confidence placed in him as a Senior Advisor to the President; and

(2) it is the sense of the Senate that Stephen Miller, Senior Advisor to the President,

should immediately resign from office, and if he does not resign, the President should remove him from office.

SENATE RESOLUTION 499—ACKNOWLEDGING THE REPREENSIBLE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES REGARDING THE FORCED RELOCATION OF THE POTAWATOMI PEOPLE FROM THEIR HOMELAND EAST OF THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER TO KANSAS AND OKLAHOMA AND THE DEVASTATING HARDSHIPS THE POTAWATOMI PEOPLE ENDURED DURING THE MARCH WEST, KNOWN AS THE "POTAWATOMI TRAIL OF DEATH"

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. RES. 499

Whereas the Potawatomi people, collectively known as the "Potawatomi Nation", are comprised of members of the many villages, communities, and bands that resided for millennia in their homeland in the southern Great Lakes region of the present day States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin;

Whereas the advanced farming techniques, extensive trade and commerce networks, and well-established transportation routes of the Potawatomi Nation had a significant influence on the early history of North America;

Whereas Potawatomi leaders entered into 44 treaties with the United States, including a series of treaties the Potawatomi people were pressured to sign between 1818 and 1828, under which the Potawatomi people ceded vast areas of the homeland of the Potawatomi people in exchange for annuities, small reservations in the States of Indiana and Illinois, and scattered individual allotments;

Whereas, in 1830, President Andrew Jackson signed the Act of May 28, 1830 (4 Stat. 411, chapter 148) (commonly known as the "Indian Removal Act"), into law, which authorized the President to provide land in the so-called Indian territory in the western United States "for the reception of such tribes or nations of Indians as may choose to exchange the lands where they now reside, and remove there. . .";

Whereas 3 treaties signed by Potawatomi leaders in October 1832 further reduced the remaining homeland of the Potawatomi people in the States of Indiana and Illinois to several small reservations and individual allotments, including a reservation at a village on the Yellow River in Twin Lakes, Indiana (referred to in this preamble as the "Twin Lakes Reservation"), under a Potawatomi leader named Menominee;

Whereas pressure from United States negotiators resulted in Potawatomi leaders signing a number of treaties between 1834 and 1837, known as the "Whiskey Treaties", which ceded the remaining Potawatomi land in the State of Indiana and included a commitment to move to reservations in the West within 2 years;

Whereas Menominee and a number of other Potawatomi leaders—

(1) refused to participate in the negotiations that produced the Treaty of August 5, 1836 (7 Stat. 505) (commonly known as the "Yellow River Treaty"), which purported to relinquish the rights of the Yellow River Band of the Potawatomi people (referred to

in this preamble as the "Yellow River Band") to the Twin Lakes Reservation; and (2) later submitted a petition to United States General John Tipton that challenged the validity of the Yellow River Treaty;

Whereas, after the 2-year period for the Yellow River Band to move west expired, White settlers who wanted to occupy the lands of the Twin Lakes Reservation petitioned Indiana Governor David Wallace for protection, and, in response, Governor Wallace authorized General Tipton to mobilize a militia of 100 volunteers to forcibly remove the Yellow River Band from the reservation;

Whereas, on August 30, 1838, General Tipton and a volunteer militia surprised the Yellow River Band at the Twin Lakes Reservation, and, over the next several days, the soldiers burned the crops and destroyed the village of the Yellow River Band to discourage anyone from trying to return;

Whereas on September 4, 1838, the forced relocation of 859 members of the Yellow River Band proceeded from Twin Lakes, Indiana, under the armed escort of the militia, including the Potawatomi leaders Menominee, Makkatahmoway, and Pepinawa, who were treated as prisoners of war and rode along in a wagon under armed guard;

Whereas, over the course of 61 days, through deprivation and often brutal heat along the march west, known as the "Trail of Death", that extended from Twin Lakes, Indiana, through the States of Illinois and Missouri to the eventual destination of the Yellow River Band some 660 miles away in Osawatimie, Kansas, some 42 Potawatomi individuals died, including 28 children; and

Whereas some of the Potawatomi Nation, including the Pokagon Band, the Nottawaseppi Huron Band, the Gun Lake Band, and the Hannahville Indian Community, evaded forced relocation and the devastating consequences of the Trail of Death by fleeing to other locations in the Great Lakes region, including to Canada, and elsewhere in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

The Senate—

(1) recognizes—

(A) the special legal and political relationship Indian Tribes have with the United States; and

(B) the solemn covenant that the Potawatomi people of the United States share with the land; and

(2) acknowledges the extreme hardship, violence, and maltreatment inflicted on the Potawatomi people by the United States through the cruel and ill-conceived policy of forcible removal of the Potawatomi people from their homeland east of the Mississippi River.

SEC. 2. DISCLAIMER.

Nothing in this resolution—

(1) authorizes or supports any claim against the United States; or

(2) serves as a settlement of any claim against the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 500—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE "INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE NURSE AND THE MIDWIFE", AS DESIGNATED BY THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 500

Whereas the World Health Organization has designated 2020 as the "International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife";

Whereas 2020—

(1) marks the 200th birthday of Florence Nightingale, the founder of modern nursing; and

(2) is an appropriate time to reflect on the high-quality health care that nurses and midwives provide in all settings across the United States;

Whereas, with approximately 4,000,000 registered nurses in the United States and 20,700,000 registered nurses worldwide, nurses and midwives—

(1) represent nearly 50 percent of the global health workforce; and

(2) comprise the largest component of the health care workforce in many countries;

Whereas investing in nurses and midwives provides great value to communities;

Whereas a report of the High-Level Commission on Health Employment and Economic Growth of the United Nations concluded that "investments in education and job creation in the health and social sectors result in a triple return of improved health outcomes, global health security, and inclusive economic growth";

Whereas nurses and midwives have contributed to major achievements in global health, including—

(1) the eradication of smallpox; and

(2) reductions in maternal and child mortality;

Whereas nurses and midwives are known to be patient advocates, acting to protect the lives of the individuals under their care;

Whereas nurses and midwives, in caring for patients and their families in all stages of life, serve as vital members of the health care workforce who improve patient outcomes and safety;

Whereas better integration of nurses and midwives into health care systems is reducing primary and maternity care provider shortages and improving maternal health outcomes;

Whereas nurses promote healthy lifestyles and educate communities on disease prevention and health promotion;

Whereas nurses and midwives are well-positioned to address and reduce health care disparities that exist in the United States, including with respect to maternal health;

Whereas many nurses are experienced researchers, and the work of nurses encompasses a wide scope of scientific inquiry relating to clinical science, health systems and outcomes, and nursing education;

Whereas nurses provide care that is sensitive to the cultures and customs of individuals across the United States; and

Whereas many nurses can inform and work closely with legislators to improve the—

(1) recruitment, education, practice, and retention of nurses; and

(2) health and safety of the patients for whom nurses care in all communities, including rural and underserved communities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of the "International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife", as designated by the World Health Organization;

(2) recognizes the significant contributions of nurses and midwives to the health care system in the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe the International Year of the Nurse and the Midwife with appropriate recognition, ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate the importance of nurses and midwives to patients.

SENATE RESOLUTION 501—AMENDING THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND PRACTICE IN THE SENATE WHEN SITTING ON IMPEACHMENT TRIALS TO ENSURE ADEQUATE ACCESS TO WITNESSES AND DOCUMENTS IN IMPEACHMENT TRIALS OF A PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 501

Resolved,

SECTION 1. WITNESSES AND DOCUMENTS IN IMPEACHMENT TRIALS OF A PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials are amended by adding at the end the following:

“XXVII. In an impeachment trial of the President or the Vice President, upon whom the powers and duties of the Office of President shall have devolved, each party may move to issue 1 or more subpoenas to obtain testimony from witnesses. If the Presiding Officer determines the testimony of a witness for whom a subpoena is sought is material and relevant to the impeachment trial and not redundant, the Presiding Officer, through the Secretary of the Senate, shall issue a subpoena for the taking of testimony of the witness. A Senator may raise a point of order that a subpoena for the taking of testimony of a witness should not be issued. If a point of order is raised, the Presiding Officer shall submit the point of order to a vote of the Senate without debate. A vote under this Rule shall be taken in accordance with the Standing Rules of the Senate.

“XXVIII. In an impeachment trial of the President or the Vice President, upon whom the powers and duties of the Office of President shall have devolved, each party may move to issue 1 or more subpoenas to obtain documents. If the Presiding Officer determines the documents for which a subpoena is sought are material and relevant to the impeachment trial and not redundant, the Presiding Officer, through the Secretary of the Senate, shall issue a subpoena requiring production of the documents. A Senator may raise a point of order that a subpoena requiring production of the documents should not be issued. If a point of order is raised, the Presiding Officer shall submit the point of order to a vote of the Senate without debate. A vote under this Rule shall be taken in accordance with the Standing Rules of the Senate.

“XXIX. It shall not be in order to consider a resolution or motion establishing procedures for an impeachment trial, or an amendment thereto, that would modify, supersede, waive, or be inconsistent with any portion of Rule VII, XXVII, or XXVIII.”

(b) EVIDENTIARY QUESTIONS.—Rule VII of the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials is amended—

(1) in the second sentence—

(A) by striking “may rule” and inserting “shall rule”; and

(B) by inserting “, except in the impeachment trial of the President of Vice President, upon whom the powers and duties of the Office of President shall have devolved,” before “he may at his option”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “In an impeachment trial of the President or the Vice President, upon whom the powers and

the duties of the office of President shall have devolved, the Presiding Officer shall rule on any assertion of privilege or immunity in connection with the production of testimony, documents, or other evidence.”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 502—RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMPHIBIOUS LANDING ON THE JAPANESE ISLAND OF IWO JIMA DURING WORLD WAR II AND THE RAISINGS OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES ON MOUNT SURIBACHI

Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BURR, Mrs. LOEFFLER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 502

Whereas, following the surprise attack by Japanese forces on December 7, 1941, at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, the United States formally declared war on the Imperial Government of Japan on December 8, 1941;

Whereas, during the 4 years that followed the attack, the United States and allied forces fought a prolonged counterattack against Japanese advances across the Pacific region;

Whereas the tactic of attacking, defeating, and controlling Japanese-held outposts through the use of amphibious assault landings against Japanese-held islands and territories (referred to in this preamble as “island hopping”) became crucial to successfully countering Japanese advances throughout the Pacific region;

Whereas the goal of island hopping was to secure airfields and supply bases—

(1) in order to launch aerial bombardment attacks against the mainland of Japan using the new Boeing B-29 Superfortress; and

(2) in preparation for, and in anticipation of, a United States invasion of Japan;

Whereas, by early 1945, the United States and allied forces bravely fought and advanced to the island of Iwo Jima, an 8-square-mile volcanic island with 3 strategic airfields, located between the Mariana Islands and Japan;

Whereas Iwo Jima was—

(1) a strategic island with airfields to support bombers of the United States with fighter escorts; and

(2) an essential base for emergency, refueling, and diversionary landings for B-29 bombers;

Whereas, under the command of Japanese Lieutenant General Tadamichi Kuribayashi, Iwo Jima was a heavily fortified island with nearly 11 miles of underground and networked tunnels, rooms, bunkers, artillery emplacements, ammunition dumps, and pillboxes supporting more than 21,000 Japanese soldiers;

Whereas, on February 19, 1945, under the leadership of United States Navy 5th Fleet Admiral Raymond A. Spruance, United States Marine Corps V Amphibious Corps Major General Harry Schmidt, 3rd Division Major General Graves B. Erskine, 4th Division Major General Clifton Cates, and 5th Division Major General Keller E. Rockey, the

United States launched an amphibious landing and assault on Iwo Jima that culminated with the engagement of more than 70,000 members of the United States Marine Corps, buttressed by thousands of members of the United States Navy and the United States Army serving as assault, garrison, and support forces (referred to in this preamble as the “Battle of Iwo Jima”);

Whereas the members of the United States Marine Corps who fought in the Battle of Iwo Jima overcame numerous disadvantages in the 36-day battle that included treacherous terrain, unfavorable weather conditions, and heavy enemy fire from an embedded, determined, and fierce Japanese fighting force in places immortalized by members of the United States Marine Corps, including the “Meat Grinder” and “Bloody Gorge”;

Whereas, on February 23, 1945, only 5 days into the Battle of Iwo Jima, members of the United States Marine Corps ascended the highest point on the island, Mount Suribachi, and raised the flag of the United States 2 times, the second of which resulted in the iconic, Pulitzer Prize-winning image that—

(1) was captured on film by photographer Joe Rosenthal;

(2) has become a recognized symbol of determination, perseverance, and struggle; and

(3) has been memorialized as the United States Marine Corps War Memorial in Arlington, Virginia;

Whereas the Battle of Iwo Jima, one of the bloodiest battles in the history of the United States Marine Corps, resulted in more than 26,000 casualties of the United States, more than 6,800 of whom were killed;

Whereas most of the more than 20,000 estimated Japanese soldiers who fought in the Battle of Iwo Jima were killed, with only 1,083 Japanese soldiers surviving at the conclusion of the campaign;

Whereas the Battle of Iwo Jima led to 22 members of the United States Marine Corps and 5 members of the United States Navy receiving the Medal of Honor, representing—

(1) the most members of the United States Marine Corps ever to receive the highest military decoration in the United States for a single battle; and

(2) more than ¼ of all members of the United States Marine Corps to receive the decoration during World War II;

Whereas the secured airfields on Iwo Jima became emergency landing locations for 2,400 B-29 Bombers, saving the lives of an estimated 24,000 flight crewmen;

Whereas, 160 days after the end and victory of the pivotal Battle of Iwo Jima, the United States received the unconditional surrender of Japan on September 2, 1945;

Whereas the world owes a debt of gratitude to the members of the United States Marine Corps who selflessly led the fight for the strategic island of Iwo Jima in the middle of the Pacific theater; and

Whereas, on March 28, 2020, the 75th anniversary of the Battle of Iwo Jima will be marked by commemorative events on the island of Iwo Jima organized by the people of the United States and Japan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 75th anniversary of the amphibious landing on the Japanese island of Iwo Jima that began on February 19, 1945 and ended on March 26, 1945;

(2) commemorates the iconic and historic raisings of the flag of the United States on Mount Suribachi that occurred on February 23, 1945;

(3) honors the marines, sailors, soldiers, army air crew, and coast guardsmen who fought bravely on Iwo Jima, including the thousands of Japanese soldiers who defended the island;

(4) remembers and venerates the service members who gave their last full measure of devotion on the battlefield;

(5) recognizes the Allied victory in the Battle of Iwo Jima, which—

(A) was led by the United States Marine Corps; and

(B) made the defeat of the Empire of Japan in World War II possible;

(6) affirms the immortal words of Admiral Chester Nimitz, who stated that “uncommon valor was a common virtue” among the service members of the United States who fought on Iwo Jima;

(7) reaffirms the bonds of friendship between the United States and Japan;

(8) encourages the people of the United States to honor the veterans of the Battle of Iwo Jima with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities; and

(9) honors the service and sacrifice of the men and women who serve the United States today, carrying on the proud tradition of the individuals who came before them.

SENATE RESOLUTION 503—COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA ARGONAUTS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR ITS NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION II NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 503

Whereas, on December 21, 2019, the University of West Florida Argonauts football team (referred to in this preamble as the “Argonauts”) defeated the Minnesota State University Mavericks by a score of 48 to 40 in the National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship game in McKinney, Texas;

Whereas the Argonauts returned to the national championship game in 2019 for the second time in the last 3 years;

Whereas the Argonauts won the first national football championship for the University of West Florida a mere 4 years after the football program was established at the university in 2015;

Whereas the Argonauts finished the 2019 football season with a 13–2 record; and

Whereas head coach Pete Shinnick and each player on the Argonauts’ team roster should be congratulated for a successful football season: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the University of West Florida Argonauts football team for its National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship victory in football;

(2) recognizes the hard work, determination, and excellence exhibited by the players, coaches, support staff, and student body of the University of West Florida; and

(3) congratulates—

(A) the University of West Florida and the city of Pensacola, Florida;

(B) the fans of the University of West Florida Argonauts football team; and

(C) the alumni of the University of West Florida throughout the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 504—HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL ON FEBRUARY 14, 2018

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 504

Whereas, on February 14, 2018, a mass shooting that took the lives of 17 teachers and students took place at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida;

Whereas the people of the United States continue to pray for the individuals who were affected by this tragedy;

Whereas President Donald Trump stated, “no child, no teacher, should ever be in danger in an American school. No parent should ever have to fear for their sons and daughters when they kiss them goodbye in the morning.”;

Whereas the Parkland community has shown strength, compassion, and unity in the past 2 years; and

Whereas February 14, 2020, marks 2 years since the horrific attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the memories of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018, and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims;

(2) honors the survivors of the attack and pledges continued support for their recovery;

(3) recognizes the strength and resilience of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School community; and

(4) expresses gratitude to the emergency medical and health care professionals of the Parkland community for their efforts in responding to the attack and caring for the victims and survivors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 505—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES WILL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE SUPPORT TO INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS TO HELP PREVENT AND STOP THE SPREAD OF CORONAVIRUS

Mr. CASSIDY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 505

Whereas an outbreak of the coronavirus, known as “COVID-19”, was first detected in Wuhan, China, and was reported by China to the World Health Organization on December 31, 2019;

Whereas the characteristics of the coronavirus, such as the way the virus is transmitted and the ability of the virus to rapidly spread, have raised concerns among experts that the virus may have the potential to become a pandemic;

Whereas the World Health Organization declared that the outbreak of the coronavirus constitutes a public health emergency of international concern;

Whereas the medical facilities in China have been overwhelmed;

Whereas the coronavirus has infected tens of thousands of people in China and hundreds more people worldwide;

Whereas the coronavirus has infected more than a dozen citizens of the United States;

Whereas the United States Government has pledged the support of the United States in combating the coronavirus;

Whereas experts in the United States Government, including public health experts from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, should join the World Health Organization in efforts to stop the spread of the coronavirus in China; and

Whereas ending the spread of the coronavirus is in the best interest of people at home in the United States and abroad: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) the United States will continue to provide support to international partners to help prevent and stop the spread of the coronavirus; and

(B) the United States stands in solidarity with the people of China and other countries around the world who are suffering from the coronavirus; and

(2) the Senate encourages the United States Government to continue to work together with the World Health Organization and other countries on the goal of preventing the coronavirus from taking more lives.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1324. Mr. KAINÉ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1325. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League.

SA 1326. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1324. Mr. KAINÉ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 68, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 2, amend subsection (b) to read as follows:

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to prevent the United States from defending itself, including its territories, citizens, troops, personnel, military bases, and diplomatic facilities from attack, including acting to prevent an imminent attack; or

(2) to restrict force protection measures used by United States aircraft, ships, or personnel.

SA 1325. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League; as follows:

Insert after the second whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas Super Bowl LIV was the culmination of the 100th season of the NFL, a season in which the league has promoted stars both past and present, served the community, and looked toward the next 100 years of football;

SA 1326. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 490, congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I have 3 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, February 13, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMEMORATING UTAH WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I rise to mark the 150th anniversary of the first ballot cast by a woman in the United States under an equal suffrage law. I am proud that this remarkable milestone occurred in my home State of Utah.

The fight for the right to vote for all Americans, regardless of gender, race, or class, was achieved through efforts, large and small, and through great sacrifice.

Suffrage is the freedom to vote, to reaffirm the solemn duty of the citizen in a representative democracy. When I vote, I remember the sacrifice of men and women in uniform—of those who have won and preserved freedom for us in the past and of those who preserve it for us today. My vote is a recognition of that sacrifice. It is right and fitting that every American, male and female, has that same privilege.

Our great State of Utah was settled by pioneers like Brigham Young, who led his people to a new land in search of liberty and freedom from oppression. While the pioneers and settlers of Utah secured freedom of territory, religion, and thought, the voices of women were still not heard when it often mattered most—during the democratic selection of their government leaders.

Seraph Young, like her granduncle Brigham Young before her, endeavored to chart a different course. In the early morning of February 14, 1870, she became the first woman to vote in the United States of America. On that election day in Salt Lake City, 24 other women joined Seraph Young in casting their ballots. Then, in the next election, 2,000 more women followed their lead and exercised their equal suffrage rights. The voices of the few set in motion a monumental shift in our Nation's history.

Twenty-four years before the 19th Amendment to grant equal suffrage for women was ratified, Utah once again made history by electing the Nation's first female State senator, Martha Hughes Cannon. Cannon did not hesitate to pursue her own path. After receiving her undergraduate degree in chemistry, she went on to earn degrees in oration, medicine, and pharmacy at a time when few women pursued advanced education. As a physician, church leader, suffragist, and mother, she defeated her own husband at the ballot box to become the first female State senator in U.S. history.

Soon, we will honor the tremendous contributions Martha Hughes Cannon and all women suffragists have made as we welcome her as a new addition to Statuary Hall in the U.S. Capitol.

The symbols we choose to represent us and our State matter a great deal, and the bronze rendering of Cannon will serve as an enduring tribute to the efforts of all suffragists.

To all the women who have led and who continue to lead by example, we thank you.

RECOGNIZING THE LEADING ROLE OF UTAHNS IN THE FIGHT FOR WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE AND CELEBRATING THE SESQUICENTENNIAL OF THE FIRST VOTES BY WOMEN UNDER THE EQUAL SUFFRAGE LAW OF UTAH ON FEBRUARY 14, 1870

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 475 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 475) recognizing the leading role of Utahns in the fight for women's suffrage and celebrating the sesquicentennial of the first votes by women under the equal suffrage law of Utah on February 14, 1870.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 475) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of January 16, 2020, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

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

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

PROTECTING PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILDREN

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, earlier this week the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing to discuss the level of care babies who are born alive should receive. You heard me correctly. We had a hearing in the Senate Judiciary Committee to discuss the level of medical care a baby that is born alive should receive.

As heartbreaking as it is to even ask that question—as if there were more than one option—this is a real debate and something that needs to be paid attention to.

There are actually some folks who think it is appropriate for doctors to provide something less than the highest standard of care to babies who survive abortions, and there are those who believe babies who survive abortions should receive the same level of medical assistance as any other baby. That is certainly where I stand. I believe that all life is precious and that every baby deserves a fighting chance.

I can't imagine that there is a divergence of view on this topic. Of course, public opinion polling, for what that is worth, shows that the vast majority of Americans agree. Last year, a poll found that more than three-quarters of Americans support providing medical support for babies who survive abortions. It is hard for me to believe that there would be 25 percent on the other side of that, but, suffice it to say, the vast majority of people agree with the proposition that the same medical standard of care should apply.

Unfortunately, there are people who make up that 25 percent in government who are in high-ranking positions and who wield a great deal of influence on this question. Take, for example, Virginia's Governor Ralph Northam. About this time last year, he made

comments which were deeply disturbing about how to care—or rather, not care—for certain newborn babies.

He was caught during an interview. I would like to think he misspoke, but he certainly didn't claim that. This was actually his view. He said that after the baby was delivered, it would be kept comfortable. The baby "would be resuscitated if that's what the mother and the family desired, and then a discussion would ensue between the physicians and the mother."

What would be the subject of that discussion, whether the baby would live or die? Presumably so. Instead of providing prompt care to save the baby, Governor Northam—who is, by the way, a pediatrician, of all things—believes that you should sit down and decide whether to let the child live or die. That is not healthcare. That is infanticide.

In response to Governor Northam's comments—which, apparently, he spoke not just for himself but for a significant segment, maybe the 25 percent in that poll I mentioned earlier—our colleague from Nebraska, Senator SASSE, introduced a bill called the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This legislation is very straightforward. It would require doctors who treat babies who survive an abortion with the same lifesaving care that other infants receive. It sounds like common sense, right? Well, common sense apparently is not all that common in some quarters.

You might think that surely there are already protections that exist for that newborn baby. That has to be the law already, right? Sadly not. There are no Federal laws requiring healthcare providers to care for these babies just as they would any other infant in their care.

Sadly, many of our Democratic colleagues in the Senate are just fine with that. When the Senate voted on this legislation last year, 44 Democrats voted against it—against it. But for those of us who are aligned more with the 75 percent of Americans who believe all babies deserve that care, we are not fine with that.

This legislation would build on the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, which actually passed the Senate unanimously at the time. That bill clarified that any infant born alive at any stage of development is a person—again, a statement of the obvious—regardless of the manner in which they were born.

Now it is time to clarify that each person will receive appropriate medical care, no matter what their circumstances and how they happened to be delivered and born.

One of our witnesses in today's and Tuesday's hearings was Dr. Robin Pierucci, a neonatologist at Bronson Methodist Hospital. Dr. Pierucci discussed the medical standard of care for babies born alive and concluded that "we are always obligated to care, whether or not we have the ability to heal."

I agree with her. There should only be one side to this question—the side that advocates for equal medical care for newborns, the side that believes that all infants deserve a fighting chance, the side that believes that life is precious and must be protected.

When I attended this hearing, it reminded me of an article that was written back in 2004 by one of my favorite writers, Peggy Noonan. She was talking about a Presidential candidate, General Wesley Clark, running that year for the Democratic nomination for President. She quotes an interview that General Clark had with the publisher of the Manchester Union-Leader, Joseph McQuaid. Here is how the conversation went.

General Clark says: I don't think you should get the law involved in abortion.

McQuaid said: At all?

Clark said: Nope.

McQuaid said: Late-term abortion? No limits?

Clark said: Nope.

McQuaid said: Anything up to delivery?

Clark said: Nope, nope.

McQuaid: Anything up to the head coming out of the womb?

Clark said: I say it is up to the woman and her doctor, her conscience. You don't put the law in there.

Back when the Supreme Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, it made clear that at some point, once the fetus is viable, you are dealing with more than just the interest of the mother. I know the whole debate over abortion is divisive in this country, but at some point you have to realize you are not just talking about one person but two people, and each of those individuals has rights, and the State certainly has an interest in protecting a vulnerable child.

In my State of Texas—and I dare say in Florida and in every other State in the country—we have child protection laws in place which say if you witness child abuse or neglect, you have a legal duty to report it. Again, the law says, if you see a child that is being abused or neglected, you have a duty to report it, and if you don't do it, you are guilty of a crime.

How in the world we could reconcile these ideas that it is somehow OK to deliver a child, even though it is a botched abortion, and not have a legal, much less a moral, duty to care for that child is irreconcilable.

I think it is really important for the Senate to stand on the side of life. This is not an abortion issue. This is a matter of equal protection under the law and whether we are going to fulfill our duty to protect the most vulnerable among us—the children, who might otherwise be abused or, certainly, neglected.

I am proud to cosponsor this legislation and to stand up firmly on the side of our most vulnerable citizens.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

USAID BRANDING MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 369, H.R. 2744.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2744) to authorize the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to prescribe the manner in which programs of the agency are identified overseas, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "USAID Branding Modernization Act".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION FOR BRANDING.

(a) *IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (referred to in this section as "USAID"), in coordination with the Secretary of State, as appropriate, and with due consideration for the safety and security of implementing partners and beneficiaries, is authorized to prescribe, as appropriate, the use of logos or other insignia of the USAID Identity, or the use of additional or substitute markings, including the United States flag, to appropriately identify, including as required by section 641 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2401), overseas programs administered by USAID.*

(b) *AUDIT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of USAID shall submit to Congress an audit of compliance with relevant branding and marking requirements of USAID by implementing partners funded by USAID, including any requirements prescribed pursuant to the authorization under subsection (a).*

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 2744), as amended, was passed.

WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR., DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HEADQUARTERS ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the

immediate consideration of Calendar No. 419, S. 3239.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3239) to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, as the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 3239) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3239

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Department of Transportation Headquarters Act".

SEC. 2. WILLIAM T. COLEMAN, JR., FEDERAL BUILDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The headquarters building of the Department of Transportation located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue, SE, in Washington, DC, shall be known and designated as the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "William T. Coleman, Jr., Federal Building".

CONGRATULATING THE KANSAS CITY CHIEFS ON THEIR VICTORY IN SUPER BOWL LIV

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 490.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 490) congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; that the Blunt amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; that the Blunt amendment to the title be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 490) was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1325) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

Insert after the second whereas clause of the preamble the following:

Whereas Super Bowl LIV was the culmination of the 100th season of the NFL, a season in which the league has promoted stars both past and present, served the community, and looked toward the next 100 years of football;

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1326) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution congratulating the Kansas City Chiefs on their victory in Super Bowl LIV in the successful 100th season of the National Football League."

(The resolution, with its preamble, as amended, is printed in the Record of February 25, 2020.)

COMMENDING THE UNIVERSITY OF WEST FLORIDA ARGONAUTS FOOTBALL TEAM FOR ITS NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION DIVISION II NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP VICTORY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 503, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 503) commending the University of West Florida Argonauts football team for its National Collegiate Athletic Association Division II national championship victory.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 503) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL ON FEBRUARY 14, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 504, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 504) honoring the memories of the victims of the senseless at-

tack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 504) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2020, THROUGH MONDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2020

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following dates and times, and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Monday, February 17, at 1:45 p.m., and Thursday, February 20, at 2:30 p.m. I further ask that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, February 20, it will next convene at 3 p.m. on Monday, February 24; further, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Molloy nomination; and finally, I ask that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, February 24.

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

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, Senator BALDWIN will be recognized on Monday, February 24, following the prayer and pledge, to deliver Washington's Farewell Address.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 2020, AT 1:45 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:42 p.m., adjourned until Monday, February 17, 2020, at 1:45 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

ADAM L. BRAVERMAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE ROGER T. BENITEZ, RETIRED.

JOHN W. HOLCOMB, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE DEAN D. PREGERSON, RETIRED.

KNUT SVEINBJORN JOHNSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE JOHN A. HOUSTON, RETIRED.

STEVE KIM, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE BEVERLY REID O'CONNELL, DECEASED.

SANDY NUNES LEAL, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE CHRISTINA A. SNYDER, RETIRED.

R. SHIREEN MATTHEWS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE BARRY TED MOSKOWITZ, RETIRED.

MICHELLE M. PETTIT, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MICHAEL M. ANELLO, RETIRED.

RICK LLOYD RICHMOND, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MANUEL L. REAL, RETIRED.

TODD WALLACE ROBINSON, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MARILYN L. HUFF, RETIRED.

JEREMY B. ROSEN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE MARGARET M. MORROW, RETIRED.

JENNIFER P. TOGLIATTI, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA, VICE JAMES C. MAHAN, RETIRED.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. EDWARD M. DALY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GARY M. BRITO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RANDY B. CRITES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SAMUEL J. PAPARO, JR.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

KEVIN L. RAWSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

NIREN ANGLE
OCLLA M. FLETCHER
RUTH A. GERMAN
RYAN P. HAWKS
PATRICK M. JOHANNES
PATRICK L. KELLER
JEFFREY S. LAROCHELLE
WILLIAM M. LUCAS
CHARLES C. MARTINEAU
CRAIG ALLAN SOLTIS
OLIVER J. WISCO
BRET JAMES WOOD
MARISSA V. YLAGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

SANDRA L. CASTLE OH
TUCKER A. DRURY
PATRICK M. ELLISON
GREGORY A. ERICKSON
MICHAEL D. LANDES
JOEL ADLAI REYES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TRACEY G. ATHERTON
SUSAN C. BEYLOTTE
CAROLYN ANN DALE
PATRICIA A. HAYDEN

MEDORI S. HILL
NICOLE SUZANNE HURLEY
CHRISTINE C. JONES
VICTOR D. LAVIGNE
LISA M. LEHOCKY
JANENE M. LUFF
DAVID J. NOWAK
STEPHEN V. SECRAW
MABLE H. SMITH
SCOTT A. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RAFAEL V. ANDINO
PATRICK D. BARGER
CURT AUSTIN CAPPS
THEODORE STANISLAUS LISZESKI
JAMES M. MCCLAIN
FRANK R. PASCARELLI
LEROY A. RICHARDSON
MICHELLE E. VAN SICKLE
RICHARD E. YENKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ALEXANDER L. MILLMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KIMBERLY A. ADAMS
MICHAEL T. BAKER
KAY A. BEIGH
JENNIFER MARIE BERRY
JOHN C. BISSELL
JOHNSTEPHEN A. BOCCIERI
THOMAS P. BORREGO
MICHELE A. BOYKO
JOEL PATRICK BRANOSKY
DANE M. BRASHEAR
PAUL RAYMOND BRENNER
MORGENSTARR K. D. BRIENZA
KRISTIN M. BROCKSHUS
DAVID M. BROWN
CHAD N. BURDICK
MARK W. BURNS
GEORGE T. CAMPOSANO
FRANCISCO CHASANOVA
RICK A. CADAWICK
CHRISTOPHER L. CHANDLER
JACLYN A. CHATWICK
CONNIE L. CLAY
KELLY MARIE COLACICCO
ERIAN R. COLLINS
ERIN CHRISTINE COOK
SHANNA R. CORBETT
DANIEL W. COUNTS
SILAS V. DARDEN III
JEFFREY A. DERR
SHAWN D. DICKMAN
BHAN W. DIEHL
DIXIE A. DUKE
KELVIN D. DUMAS
JEROD I. DWYER
DARRIS S. EDGE
ANITA M. EDMONDS
JAMES L. EHRRIG
COLLEEN M. EWASKO
ANDREW P. FETH
JENNIFER A. FIEDERER
RYAN M. FREEMAN
KYLE H. GOLDSTEIN
JONATHAN S. GRATTON
ROBERT A. GRIFFITH
LOUIS E. GUERRINI
RODNEY A. HAMMOND
DAVID B. HARDEN
BENJAMIN R. HARRISON
ELIZABETH JANE HARTZ
MATTHEW K. HEINTZELMAN
ANGELA J. HENDERSON
CLINT A. HENDERSON
SEAN COLLEEN HEUP
TODD S. HILL
ETHAN P. HINKINS
SEAN P. HOLAHAN
MARION L. HORMES
KYLE W. HOSMAN
CARL ALEXANDER ISE
JAMMIE LYNN HIMSL JAMIESON
CARL VIRGIL JONES III
CHRISTOPHER J. JORDAN
TARA LOUISE KEENE
DON M. KELLEY
BRANDON M. KELLY
DENISE A. KERR
BRADLEY G. KING
LAURA E. KOHAKE
JOHN A. LESHO
STEVEN J. LEUTNER
RODNEY D. LYTKINS
ROBERT F. LYTLE
WILLIAM T. MACLIN
ISOBELLE LALIMARMO MAHONEY
RODNEY ERIC MCCRAINE
WILLIAM T. MCELHINNEY III
KEITH A. MECHEAM
MARK L. MEIER
ERICA J. MEYER
GREGORY S. MEYER

ROBERT N. MISHEV
RYAN RODRIGUEZ MONTANEZ
LOUIS E. MORGAN
MICHAEL A. MUNDY
JAMES M. NELSON
JOHN M. NEMECEK
TODD J. NERLIN
MATTHEW J. NICOLETTA
JAIME J. NORDIN
KEVIN M. PETERSON
AUGUST L. PFLUGER
CASEY N. POMBERT
KALLECE A. QUINN
PATRICK B. RAGAN
ADAM G. RESSLER
KERYA REYES
JAMES A. RIGSBEE
WILLIAM J. ROFF, JR.
PAULA G. ROSS
STUART M. RUBIO
EDWARD J. SCHIERBERL
MARK A. SCHULMAN
REBECCA SUE SCHULTZ
BEN P. SMALLWOOD
ROBERT J. SMOLICH
BETH A. STARGARDT
TREVOR T. STHULTZ
RODERICK R. STOUT
WILLIAM C. TATUM
JERADE W. TIPTON
ALAN M. TORNAV
JOSEPH W. TRINGE
JOSHUA L. TYLER
SEAN J. VANHOLTZ
VIANESA R. K. VARGAS
MARK A. VILLACIS
ELIAS I. VOCES III
ALAN H. WAGNER
BRETT A. WARING
KATRINE M. WATERMAN
BERNARD L. WILLIS II
MARY F. WILSON
WENDY A. WOODARD
JAMEY L. WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER T. PROTT
YVONNDE M. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARK ALAN BOWDITCH
STUART A. KING
DANIEL R. SWEENEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CURTIS J. HAYES
LAWRENCE VU NGUYEN
ROBERT B. SEMTNER
MARK R. SHEILS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DAVID P. BENNETT
CHRISTOPHER A. MONSEY
TRACY M. SILER
MICHAEL N. SPARGO
ANDREW K. STAMPER
JON B. STANLEY
ROBERT L. STULZMAN
JOHN C. WIGGLESWORTH
TIWANA LATISE WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MARK S. BREIDENBAUGH
MICHAEL T. CARTWRIGHT
MARIO G. CORA-HERNANDEZ
KELLY A. RHODEN
SIERRA H. SUHAJDA
BARBARA ANN WUJCIAK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHARLES J. HOWELL

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ALEXANDER D. DOWDS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

PHILLIP W. MAZINGO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BENJAMIN J. POWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JULIO RIVERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

PAUL HOLOYE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

AARON S. BROWN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

CARLSON D. CHOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DEMETRIUS D. HOWARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant colonel

LESLEY C. CALIX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

DOUGLAS T. FRANK
ROBERT C. HORVATH
WILLIAM P. KELLY
GRANT C. MARKS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

FREEMAN W. DAVENPORT IV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

To be captain

JOHN P. BARRIENTOS
JOSEPH E. FALS
RYAN S. JACKSON
MATTHEW J. KISER
JOSEPH E. KLOPPER
DANIEL R. PROCHAZKA
ROBERT W. ROSE
STIG SANNESS
JEREMY A. SHAMBLEE
BRANDON E. TODD
MATTHEW T. VENTIMIGLIA

To be commander

KASEY W. CARTER
ROGER L. YOUNG

To be lieutenant commander

MATTHEW C. ABARE
JUAN E. ACOSTA
OSEI ASANTE
MICHAEL D. ASHLEY
MARK A. BAKER
KRISTOPHER W. BENNETT
BRIAN J. BIELINSKI
ROBERT L. BLAKE
STEPHEN E. BOGDANOWICZ
RYAN L. CONWAY
SEAN A. CRUZ
EMILY A. CURRAN
RYAN P. DONOHUE
JOHN S. DOWD
PAUL A. GALE
CARMEN M. GENTRY
DAVID R. GRZYWACZ
JAMES D. HALSELL
ANDREW M. HARRELL
JOSHUA M. HEANEY
JOSEPH F. HENKEL
CHRISTOPHER J. HOREL

STEVEN D. HUCKS
TREN'T E. JAMES
LICHEN J. KENTZ
SCOTT T. KILISZEWSKI
JOSHUA J. KROLL
CONRAD J. KUSEL
KEVIN T. LAMOTT
PATRICK K. LEAR
PHILIP S. LEE
WILLIAM M. LOVE

BRIAN C. LUCAS
BRYAN P. MCDONOUGH
MATHEW D. MCINTYRE
NICHOLAS G. MEHALIC
KYLE W. OLEARY
CHRISTOPHER C. REILLY
JOSHUA J. SALE
ALEXANDER K. SAMANIEGO
RYAN F. SCHAEDEL
MICHAEL J. SCHRUMP
KEVIN M. SCHWENK
ROBERT D. SEADER
CURTIS L. SHELTON III
MICHAEL G. SJOHOLMSIERCHIO
PERRY J. SOLOMON
FOSTER P. STENSON
AARON C. STOCKARD
ADAM C. TOEPP
VICTOR M. TRISCAS
JUSTIN W. VAGTS
JEANNE L. VANGILDER
EARL WATSON III
KEVIN J. WEEKS
RYAN T. WISZ
MICHAEL A. WREN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KATHERINE L. JAUDON

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10 U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be captain

JENNIFER J. CONKLIN
DIANE M. CROFF
KIMBERLY K. GUEDRY
KARL A. HANSEN
JAMES J. JOHNSON
BECKY K. JONES
MAUREN R. KALLGREN
BRUCE G. MACK
NATALIE M. MURPHY
GENNARO A. RUOCCO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E):

To be commander

RYAN G. ANGELO
STEVEN B. ARNWINE
BRIAN D. BACHTEL
ARMELL V. BALMACEDA
CHRISTIAN J. BARGER
ALEXANDER S. BARKER
TIMOTHY J. BERNADETT
MICAH W. BONNER
KURT F. BRANDSTAETTER
ADAM T. CERNOVICH
BRIAN M. CHAPMAN
ALEXANDRA K. CHERRY
LEAH M. COLE
JUDSON A. COLEMAN
JAMES O. CONNER
NEAL A. CORBIN II
BROOKS C. CRAWFORD
BEN W. CROWELL
CHRISTOPHER K. CUMBERLAND
LEO T. DANAHAR
KELLY A. DEUTERMANN
RYAN P. DEVLIN
TODD R. DEVRIES
JESSE M. DIAZ
ADAM J. DISQUE
MICHAEL J. DOUGHERTY
TIFFANY A. DUFFY
BROCK S. ECKEL
STEVEN R. ELLIOTT
KRISTOPHER R. ENSLEY
MICHAEL G. FAULKNER
JOEL S. FERGUSON
ARI D. FITZWATER
CHRISTOPHER A. FLOYD
LAUREN U. FULLAM
ANGEL M. GALINANES
GAVIN V. GARCIA
JUSTIN H. GORDON
ANNA A. GRAFCHIKOVA
JOSEPH F. GRAHAM
DOUGLAS D. GRAUL II
SIMON C. GREENE
ANDREW T. GREENWOOD
JEREMY M. GREENWOOD
BENEDICT S. GULLO III
MATTHEW A. GULLY
KRISTEN A. HAHN

PETER K. HAHN
ANDREW T. HAWTHORNE
CORYDON F. HEARD
JAMES L. HELLER
ROBERTO R. HERRERA
DANA E. HIATT
SCOTT M. HIGBEE
GREGORY E. HIGGINS
MICHAEL A. HJERSTEDT
MATTHEW M. HOBIE
KENNETH E. HOGUE
GORDON A. HOOD
JUSTIN C. HUNT
THOMAS J. HUNTLEY
WILLIAM J. JACOBS
BEAU J. JAMES
JEFFREY G. JANARO
JEANITA A. JEFFERSON
ROXANNE B. JENSEN
LEE H. JONES II
RYAN P. KELLEY
KALEN M. KENNY
JEREMY A. KIME
JAMIE L. KOPPI
HEIDI L. KOSKI
AARON J. KOWALCZK
FRANK R. KULESA
MARK E. LABERT
JILLIAN M. LAMB
MARC J. LANORE
BRIAN S. LIED
TONYA M. LIM
ASHLEY F. LOVEJOY
RHIANNA N. MACON
JODY J. MAISANO
MARY E. MARTIN
THOMAS P. MARTIN
ROGER M. MASSON
CHARLES R. MATHIS
MARC R. MCDONNELL
MICHAEL S. MCGRALL
GREGORY A. MCLAMB
CHRISTIAN T. MEDICK
JEANINE M. MENZE
GARRETT R. MEYER
MICHAEL J. MEYER
JAMES R. MILLER, JR.
LAURA S. MILLER
PAUL J. MILLER
JODI J. MIN
DANIEL P. MOCHEN
JOSEPH W. MORGANS
ELLEN M. MOTOI
SEAN M. MURRAY
STEVEN MYERS
JUSTIN P. NADOLNY
MICHAEL J. NORDHAUSEN
ESTEVAN OLIVERA
CORRINA OTT
JAMES H. PAFFORD
ERIC C. PARE
MICHAEL A. PATTERSON
KRYSTYN E. PECORA
PIERO A. PECORA
SEAN M. PETERSON
WALTER S. PIERCE
DAVID C. PIZZURRO
CHRISTIAN T. POLYAK
JONATHAN H. POTTERTON
DAWN N. PREBULA
MATTHEW J. PRESS
THOMAS E. PRZYBYLA
NICHOLAS O. RAMIREZ
LISA M. RODMAN
JOHNA N. ROSSETTI
BEN P. RUSSELL
KELLY A. SAWYER
DANA E. SCHULMAN
MAEGAN R. SCHWARTZ
BROOK I. SERBU
COURTNEY A. SERGENT
BONNIE M. SHANER
LISA M. SHARKEY
JOHN M. SINGLETARY
MATTHEW B. SMITH
BAXTER B. SMOAK
MATTHEW M. SPOLARICH
LAURA M. SPRINGER
JANNA M. STATON
KELLEY L. STEVENS
DONALD S. STIKER
JUSTIN W. STROCK
CHRISTINA D. SULLIVAN
DANIEL B. SWEIGART
BRYAN J. SWINTEK
MARIO B. TEIXEIRA
MAILE I. TESLER
PAUL D. TESSITORE
BRYAN D. TILEY
TIMOTHY S. TILGHMAN
KELLY J. TONGOL
JUSTIN O. VANDENHEUVEL
JEREMY A. WEISS
EUSTACIA Y. WEIST
KYLE A. WEIST
JENNIFER L. WESCOTT
BRIAN R. WHISLER
DUSTIN R. WILLIAMS
JOSHUA D. WINE
WARREN N. WRIGHT
KISMET R. WUNDER
ADAM K. YOUNG
JEFFREY S. ZAMARIN