

is pregnant—the idea that we could follow our dreams, standing on his strong and weary shoulders. Mine led me here. I will never stop being grateful to my dad for that.

So allow me to wish my father a happy birthday today and to say that I look forward to seeing him and my mom Selma, who turned 90 just on D-Day, as well as my wife and two daughters this weekend for Father's Day, and I wish all Americans the same joy in celebrating Father's Day this weekend.

I yield the floor.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 5515, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5515) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Inhofe/McCain modified amendment No. 2282, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Toomey) amendment No. 2700 (to amendment No. 2282), to require congressional review of certain regulations issued by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States.

Reed/Warren amendment No. 2756 (to amendment No. 2700), to require the authorization of appropriation of amounts for the development of new or modified nuclear weapons.

Lee amendment No. 2366 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2282), to clarify that an authorization to use military force, a declaration of war, or any similar authority does not authorize the detention without charge or trial of a citizen or lawful permanent resident of the United States.

Reed amendment No. 2842 (to amendment No. 2366), to require the authorization of appropriation of amounts for the development of new or modified nuclear weapons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first, let me make sure we get into the RECORD as accurately as I am saying right now, to Abe Schumer, that his little boy's most predictable adversary wishes him today a happy birthday.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you. I thank the Senator.

Mr. INHOFE. That was very touching. Thank you very much, I say to my friend, Senator SCHUMER.

Mr. President, I want to start today by giving an update as to where we are in the process for the NDAA.

At 10:30 a.m., which is coming up shortly, we are going to have a cloture vote on TOOMEY's amendment that applies the REINS Act to the CFIUS rule-making process. We all know what that

is. We all know there is opposition. If that vote fails, we will immediately roll into a cloture vote on the substitute amendment. That is our amendment, which we will be considering as the bill. Then, we hope to invoke cloture on the underlying bill this afternoon before we head out of town. If we are able to do that, we will have the final passage vote on Monday when we return.

We are also working diligently as we speak to clear an additional managers' package. One of the things we were talking about, and I have been somewhat critical of some of my fellow Members, is the fact that we have been operating under rules—and we have gone through this in years past; it is almost predictable that one individual will try to use this bill as a must-pass bill. Everyone knows it is going to pass; it has passed for the last 57 years. So, logically, it is where you put an amendment that is very difficult to pass. I don't blame them for that. I would do the same thing. Nonetheless, I wouldn't do it if it caused all other amendments to not be considered.

I am hoping we will be able to have a managers' package. I have reason to believe and I am optimistic about that, and it would be a great thing to have. I don't know how many of these amendments would ultimately be in the managers' package, but we are talking about a lot of amendments, and we have already cleared many amendments.

Anyone who criticizes the process that we are going through right now may not be aware of how many amendments we have considered in our work on this in committee. We are talking about some 300 amendments, and since that time, countless amendments have been agreed to on both sides. That is where we are today.

It will be a great victory for all of us in this Chamber if we can get the managers' amendments agreed to, and hopefully that will be true.

I can't neglect that today is the Army's 243rd birthday. I actually attended a birthday party for the U.S. Army quite a while before a lot of you were even born, when I was in Fort Lee, VA, in the U.S. Army. We would have been celebrating the 180th birthday at that time. Back when we were celebrating the 180th birthday, I never dreamed I would be around to celebrate the 243rd birthday of the U.S. Army.

The Army is actually older than this country is. In 1775, brave Americans joined the cause to fight for the life and liberty we hold so dear now. It is the same motivation that still inspires the service of the men and women who join the Army and, indeed, all of the service branches today.

It is for those men and women that we are here today. That is what this is all about—the NDAA that we are considering today. It has provisions for individuals; it has specific provisions for the men and women on the ground in harm's way, including the largest pay

raise in 10 years. It means more opportunities for qualified servicemembers to receive promotions throughout their careers. I think it is a recognition that in the time in which this is taking place, there is a new emphasis on defending America.

I don't say this critically, but the last administration had a policy which said that we can't put any more money in sequestration for the military unless we do the same for nondefense spending. A lot of people agreed with that. I don't agree with that.

We are now at the point where we have broken parity, so I say to individuals who are making career decisions: Help is on its way; this is a good time to do it. Part of that is because of the modernization of the personnel system in this legislation.

It also authorizes \$40 million for supplemental impact aid support. With an expansion of some military activities, individuals who are involved are exempt from the taxes that support our schools. That is a problem we have. Every State has a problem, but it is probably more severe in Oklahoma than elsewhere. I would like to let individuals in my State of Oklahoma, at five different installations, know that help is on its way, and we are going to try to do a better job with the supplemental impact aid than we have done in the past.

This bill increases funding for the personnel, improving the quality of life for the forces and their families. Most importantly, it increases end strength. It is not as much as I would like to see, but it does grow the force, so servicemembers can have sufficient time to be with their families and train before redeploying.

That is what we are doing right now. It is going to take a lot of additional funding. We are authorizing that funding, and we are going to be rebuilding.

I have to remind people in the outside world who are not here in Washington that we do have a problem. The assumption that America has the best of everything at one time was true, but it is not true. I always document that because it is a pretty strong statement.

Right now, if we look at our artillery in terms of rapid fire and range, both Russia and China have better range and rapid fire than we have in the United States. We know we have done nothing with our nuclear arsenal for the last 10 years. At the same time, our triad system has been static, and Russia and China have improved theirs. They are ahead of us in that area.

There is a new type of defense system that actually has a defense mechanism that goes five times the speed of sound. It is still in the experimental stage, but both China and Russia are ahead of us. The bill we are considering now, ironically on the birthday of the U.S. Army, is going to correct that. It is going to take a little while, but it is ultimately going to correct that.

We have 20 or more minutes before we cast the two very significant votes

that I just mentioned. This is everyone's opportunity to be heard. I am hoping, and I really believe, that individuals who have been somewhat of an obstacle in the past are cooperating at a new level, and I am very excited about that. I hope we will be able to stay on the schedule I just articulated a few minutes ago.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, we have two votes coming up. The first vote is the one I strongly support. With this amendment, Senator TOOMEY is looking to do something that has been very successful; that is, to give a little more opportunity for us to oversee some of the overregulations that are out there.

I was very pleased to have the first CRA that was mine, which I authored, to be enacted into law. We have now had 16 CRAs, Congressional Review Act. It is interesting because we went 20 years without having any of them that were taken, and now we have been successful in doing that. It is a stronger position for those of us in the Senate to be able to get some things done. We can safeguard the importance of deregulation, especially for the future, by passing this amendment today.

Senator TOOMEY's amendment will give congressional oversight over the CFIUS rulemaking process, which I think everyone in here knows needs to be done and will be done. It will not slow down the implementation process and still grants CFIUS the necessary flexibility to enact in the name of national security.

After that, we are going to have the vote that is going to allow us to move to a package, and I am hoping we will be able to do it because there has been a lot of talk about not being able to get an open amendment process. We have not had one, and that is unfortunate. If we can get this package of amendments put together—there are going to be quite a few of them—all of them will be cleared on both sides. It is going to be one that people are going to be very anxious to get done. It is going to give voice to many of the Members, probably some 40 Members who otherwise would not have the opportunity to have their amendment agreed to or at least heard. I think we will have that opportunity. It is very important we do it now. Hopefully, that package of amendments is going to be one that will be favorably approved.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 1 minute.

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2700

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I appreciate this broad support we have seen for plugging the holes in our ability to evaluate foreign investment with regard to national security risks in the United States. We know China, for example, has been quite explicit about what it is trying to do to surpass the United States economically and militarily, and it has been very aggressive and very strategic in the way it has tried to acquire intellectual property and know-how through foreign investment in the United States. That is why this legislation is so important.

I admire the Senator from Pennsylvania as one of the most principled conservatives in this body and in Congress, but he and I differ over whether the REINS Act, which would require up-or-down votes on implementing regulations, should be a part of the implementation of this national security legislation. I never dreamed we would do that in a national security context as opposed to doing it in economic and environmental legislation. Reluctantly, I oppose the amendment of the Senator from Pennsylvania and encourage all of our colleagues to do the same.

I conclude by saying, I share his concerns when it comes to using national security as a pretext on economic legislation and trade issues, and I look forward to continuing to work with him and all of my other colleagues outside of the national security context to make sure we support free and fair trade—trade that protects U.S. interests. With the overstepping of the regulatory bounds by the executive branch on occasion, I am all for rolling that back when we can but not in a national security context like this.

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

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

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the body for 1 minute.

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

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I make the case that this amendment we are about to vote on is the simple question of whether we think we ought to be accountable, that we ought to take responsibility for the legislative authority we delegate.

Rulemaking is a legislative function. In this bill—the CFIUS reform bill that is in the NDAA—and on many other occasions, we delegate a portion of that authority—we delegate the rulemaking—to the executive branch, which is fine. Yet we have a responsibility to make sure it gets it right, this administration and future administrations.

This amendment has a mechanism that requires a simple up-or-down vote—it can't be filibustered; it can't be delayed; it is a simple majority vote—to affirm that the rulemaking will actually achieve the legislative attempt. A “no” vote is really a vote to shirk our own responsibility, our constitutional responsibility, since all legislative authority is vested in the Congress of the United States.

I urge a “yes” vote.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2700 to amendment No. 2282, as modified, to H.R. 5515, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pat Toomey, Ted Cruz, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Marco Rubio, Mitch McConnell, Ben Sasse, James M. Inhofe, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, John Thune, Steve Daines, Ron Johnson.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2700, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, for the Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. TOOMEY, to amendment No. 2282, as modified, to H.R. 5515, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 35, nays 62, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 123 Leg.]

YEAS—35

|           |            |          |
|-----------|------------|----------|
| Alexander | Grassley   | Paul     |
| Barrasso  | Hatch      | Perdue   |
| Blunt     | Heller     | Rounds   |
| Capito    | Hyde-Smith | Sasse    |
| Cassidy   | Inhofe     | Scott    |
| Corker    | Isakson    | Sullivan |
| Crapo     | Johnson    | Thune    |
| Cruz      | Kennedy    | Tillis   |
| Enzi      | Lankford   | Toomey   |
| Ernst     | Lee        | Wicker   |
| Flake     | McConnell  | Young    |
| Gardner   | Moran      |          |

NAYS—62

|              |            |            |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Baldwin      | Gillibrand | Nelson     |
| Bennet       | Graham     | Peters     |
| Blumenthal   | Harris     | Reed       |
| Booker       | Hassan     | Risch      |
| Boozman      | Heinrich   | Roberts    |
| Brown        | Heitkamp   | Rubio      |
| Burr         | Hirono     | Sanders    |
| Cantwell     | Hoeben     | Schatz     |
| Cardin       | Jones      | Schumer    |
| Carper       | Kaine      | Shaheen    |
| Casey        | King       | Shelby     |
| Collins      | Klobuchar  | Smith      |
| Coons        | Leahy      | Stabenow   |
| Cornyn       | Manchin    | Tester     |
| Cortez Masto | Markey     | Udall      |
| Cotton       | McCaskill  | Van Hollen |
| Daines       | Menendez   | Warner     |
| Donnelly     | Merkley    | Warren     |
| Durbin       | Murkowski  | Whitehouse |
| Feinstein    | Murphy     | Wyden      |
| Fischer      | Murray     |            |

NOT VOTING—3

|           |        |         |
|-----------|--------|---------|
| Duckworth | McCain | Portman |
|-----------|--------|---------|

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 35, the nays are 62.

The motion is rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2282, as modified, to H.R. 5515, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Deb Fischer, Mike Rounds, Roger F. Wicker, Ted Cruz, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James Lankford, Marco Rubio, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, John Thune.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2282, as modified, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, to H.R. 5515, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of

Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 14, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 124 Leg.]

YEAS—83

|              |            |            |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Alexander    | Graham     | Perdue     |
| Baldwin      | Grassley   | Peters     |
| Barrasso     | Hassan     | Portman    |
| Bennet       | Hatch      | Reed       |
| Blumenthal   | Heinrich   | Risch      |
| Blunt        | Heitkamp   | Roberts    |
| Booker       | Heller     | Rounds     |
| Boozman      | Hirono     | Rubio      |
| Brown        | Hoeben     | Sasse      |
| Burr         | Hyde-Smith | Schatz     |
| Cantwell     | Inhofe     | Schumer    |
| Capito       | Isakson    | Scott      |
| Carper       | Jones      | Shaheen    |
| Casey        | Kaine      | Shelby     |
| Cassidy      | Kennedy    | Smith      |
| Collins      | King       | Stabenow   |
| Coons        | Klobuchar  | Sullivan   |
| Cornyn       | Lankford   | Tester     |
| Cortez Masto | Leahy      | Thune      |
| Cotton       | Manchin    | Tillis     |
| Cruz         | McCaskill  | Toomey     |
| Daines       | McConnell  | Udall      |
| Donnelly     | Menendez   | Van Hollen |
| Enzi         | Moran      | Warner     |
| Ernst        | Murkowski  | Whitehouse |
| Fischer      | Murphy     | Wicker     |
| Flake        | Murray     | Young      |
| Gardner      | Nelson     |            |

NAYS—14

|            |         |         |
|------------|---------|---------|
| Cardin     | Harris  | Paul    |
| Corker     | Johnson | Sanders |
| Durbin     | Lee     | Warren  |
| Feinstein  | Markey  | Wyden   |
| Gillibrand | Merkley |         |

NOT VOTING—3

|       |           |        |
|-------|-----------|--------|
| Crapo | Duckworth | McCain |
|-------|-----------|--------|

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 83, the nays are 14.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 2366

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I make a point of order that amendment No. 2366 is not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 2700

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I make a point of order that amendment No. 2700 is not germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken. The amendment falls.

AMENDMENT NO. 2276 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2282, AS MODIFIED

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2276 on behalf of Senator BOOZMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for Mr. BOOZMAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2276 to amendment No. 2282, as modified.

Mr. INHOFE. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a report on the permanent stationing of the United States forces in the Republic of Poland)

Strike section 1254 and insert the following:

SEC. 1254. REPORT ON PERMANENT STATIONING OF UNITED STATES FORCES IN THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2019, the Secretary of Defense, in coordination with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the feasibility and advisability of permanently stationing United States forces in the Republic of Poland.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the types of permanently stationed United States forces in Poland required to deter aggression by the Russian Federation and execute Department of Defense contingency plans, including combat enabler units in capability areas such as—

(A) combat engineering;  
(B) logistics and sustainment;  
(C) warfighting headquarters elements;  
(D) long-range fires;  
(E) air and missile defense;  
(F) intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance; and  
(G) electronic warfare.

(2) An assessment of the feasibility and advisability of permanently stationing a United States Army brigade combat team in the Republic of Poland that includes the following:

(A) An assessment whether a permanently stationed United States Army brigade combat team in Poland would enhance deterrence against Russian aggression in Eastern Europe.

(B) An assessment of the actions the Russian Federation may take in response to a United States decision to permanently station a brigade combat team in Poland.

(C) An assessment of the international political considerations of permanently stationing such a brigade combat team in Poland, including within the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

(D) An assessment whether a such a brigade combat team in Poland would support implementation of the National Defense Strategy.

(E) A description and assessment of the manner in which such a brigade combat team in Poland would affect the ability of the Joint Force to execute Department of Defense contingency plans in Europe.

(F) A description and assessment of the manner in which such a brigade combat team in Poland would affect the ability of the Joint Force to respond to a crisis inside the territory of a North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally that occurs prior to the invocation of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty by the North Atlantic Council.

(G) An identification and assessment of—  
(i) potential locations in Poland for stationing such a brigade combat team;

(ii) the logistics requirements, including force enablers, equipment, supplies, storage, and maintenance, that would be required to support such a brigade combat team in Poland;

(iii) infrastructure investments by the United States and Poland, including new construction or upgrades of existing sites, that would be required to support such a brigade combat team in Poland;

(iv) any new agreements, or changes to existing agreements, between the United States and Poland that would be required for such a brigade combat team in Poland;

(v) any changes to the posture or capabilities of the Joint Force in Europe that would be required to support such a brigade combat team in Poland; and

(vi) the timeline required to achieve the permanent stationing of such a brigade combat team in Poland.

(H) An assessment of the willingness and ability of the Government of Poland to provide host nation support for such a brigade combat team.

(I) An assessment whether future growth in United States Army end strength may be used to source additional forces for such a brigade combat team in Poland.

(c) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 2885 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2276

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2885 to amendment No. 2276.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. REED] proposes an amendment numbered 2885 to amendment No. 2276.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the amendment)

At the end, add the following:

**SEC. 1254A. INEFFECTIVENESS OF SECTION 937.**

Section 937, relating to a Strategic Defense Fellows Program for the Department of Defense, shall have no force or effect.

**SEC. 1254B. JOHN S. MCCAIN STRATEGIC DEFENSE FELLOWS PROGRAM.**

(a) FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish within the Department of Defense a civilian fellowship program designed to provide leadership development and the commencement of a career track toward senior leadership in the Department.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The fellowship program shall be known as the “John S. McCain Strategic Defense Fellows Program” (in this section referred to as the “fellows program”).

(b) ELIGIBILITY.—An individual is eligible for participation in the fellows program if the individual—

(1) is a citizen of the United States or a lawful permanent resident of the United States in the year in which the individual applies for participation in the fellows program; and

(2) either—

(A) possesses a graduate degree from an accredited institution of higher education in

the United States that was awarded not later than two years before the date of the acceptance of the individual into the fellows program; or

(B) will be awarded a graduate degree from an accredited institution of higher education in the United States not later than six months after the date of the acceptance of the individual into the fellows program.

(c) APPLICATION.—

(1) APPLICATION REQUIRED.—Each individual seeking to participate in the fellows program shall submit to the Secretary an application therefor at such time and in such manner as the Secretary shall specify.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each application of an individual under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) Transcripts of educational achievement at the undergraduate and graduate level.

(B) A resume.

(C) Proof of citizenship or lawful permanent residence.

(D) An endorsement from the applicant's graduate institution of higher education.

(E) An academic writing sample.

(F) Letters of recommendation addressing the applicant's character, academic ability, and any extracurricular activities.

(G) A personal statement by the applicant explaining career areas of interest and motivations for service in the Department.

(H) Such other information as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(d) SELECTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each year, the Secretary shall select participants in the fellows program from among applicants for the fellows program for such year who qualify for participation in the fellows program based on character, commitment to public service, academic achievement, extracurricular activities, and such other qualifications for participation in the fellows program as the Secretary considers appropriate.

(2) NUMBER.—The number of individuals selected to participate in the fellows program in any year may not exceed the numbers as follows:

(A) Ten individuals from each geographic region of the United States as follows:

(i) The Northeast.

(ii) The Southeast.

(iii) The Midwest.

(iv) The Southwest.

(v) The West.

(B) Ten additional individuals.

(3) BACKGROUND INVESTIGATION.—An individual selected to participate in the fellows program may not participate in the program unless the individual successfully undergoes a background investigation applicable to the position to which the individual will be assigned under the fellows program and otherwise meets such requirements applicable to assignment to a sensitive position within the Department that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(e) ASSIGNMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each individual who participates in the fellows program shall be assigned to a position in the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

(2) POSITION REQUIREMENTS.—Each Under Secretary of Defense and each Director of a Defense Agency who reports directly to the Secretary shall submit to the Secretary each year the qualifications and skills to be demonstrated by participants in the fellows program to qualify for assignment under this subsection for service in a position of the office of such Under Secretary or Director.

(3) ASSIGNMENT TO POSITIONS.—The Secretary shall each year assign participants in the fellows program to positions in the offices of the Under Secretaries and Directors described in paragraph (2). In making such

assignments, the Secretary shall seek to best match the qualifications and skills of participants in the fellows program with the requirements of positions available for assignment. Each participant so assigned shall serve as a special assistant to the Under Secretary or Director to whom assigned.

(4) TERM.—The term of each assignment under the fellows program shall be one year.

(5) PAY AND BENEFITS.—An individual assigned to a position under the fellows program shall be compensated at the rate of compensation for employees at level GS-10 of the General Schedule, and shall be treated as an employee of the United States during the term of assignment, including for purposes of eligibility for health care benefits and retirement benefits available to employees of the United States.

(6) EDUCATION LOAN REPAYMENT.—To the extent that funds are provided in advance in appropriations Acts, the Secretary may repay any loan of a participant in the fellows program if the loan is described by subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 16301(a)(1) of title 10, United States Code. Any repayment of loans under this paragraph shall be on a first-come, first-served basis.

(f) CAREER DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that participants in the fellows program—

(A) receive opportunities and support appropriate for the commencement of a career track within the Department leading toward a future position of senior leadership within the Department, including ongoing mentorship support through appropriate personnel from entities within the Department such as the Defense Business Board and the Defense Innovation Board; and

(B) are provided appropriate opportunities for employment and advancement within the Department upon successful completion of the fellows program.

(2) RESERVATION OF POSITIONS.—In carrying out paragraph (1)(B), the Secretary shall reserve for participants who successfully complete the fellows program not fewer than 30 positions in the excepted service within the Department that are suitable for the commencement of a career track toward senior leadership within the Department. Any position so reserved shall not be subject to or covered by any reduction in headquarters personnel required under any other provision of law.

(3) NONCOMPETITIVE APPOINTMENT.—Upon the successful completion of the assignment of a participant in the fellows program in a position pursuant to subsection (e), the Secretary may, without regard to the provisions of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, appoint the participant to a position reserved pursuant to paragraph (2) if the Secretary determines that such appointment will contribute to the development of highly qualified future senior leaders for the Department.

(4) PUBLICATION OF SELECTION.—The Secretary shall publish on an Internet website of the Department available to the public the names of the individuals selected to participate in the fellows program.

(g) OUTREACH.—The Secretary shall undertake appropriate outreach to inform potential participants in the fellows program of the nature and benefits of participation in the fellows program.

(h) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall carry out this section in accordance with such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe for purposes of this section.

(i) FUNDING.—Of the amounts authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance, Defense-wide, \$10,000,000 may

be available to carry out the fellows program in such fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

AMENDMENT NO. 2273

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I call up the Rounds amendment No. 2273 to the underlying bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. INHOFE], for Mr. ROUNDS, proposes an amendment numbered 2273 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2282, as modified.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To require a report on participation in the Transition Assistance Program)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. REPORT ON PARTICIPATION IN THE TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than February 28, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on participation in the Transition Assistance Program under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, by members of the Armed Forces.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Information on the participation of members of the Armed Forces in the Transition Assistance Program during 2018, including the following:

(A) The number of members who were eligible for participation in the Program during 2018, in aggregate and by component of the Armed Forces.

(B) The number of members who participated in the Program during 2018, in aggregate and by component of the Armed Forces, for each service as follows:

(i) Preseparation counseling provided by the Department of Defense.

(ii) Briefings provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(iii) Employment workshops provided by the Department of Labor.

(C) The number of members who did not participate in the Program during 2018 due to a waiver of the participation requirement under section 114(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, for each service set forth in subparagraph (B).

(2) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, considers appropriate to increase participation of members of the Armed Forces in each service set forth in paragraph (1)(B).

(3) Assessments of the Transition Assistance Program by members of the Armed Forces who participated in the Program during 2018, including the following:

(A) A summary of the data obtained by the Department of Defense through assessments of the Program by participants in the Program during 2018, including data obtained through the assessments as follows:

(i) The Transition Goals Plans Success (GPS) Participant Assessment.

(ii) Status of Forces Surveys (SOFs).

(B) A summary of the conclusions derived by the Secretary of Defense from the data described in subparagraph (A).

(4) Such recommendations for improvements to the Transition Assistance Program as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate in light of the data described by paragraph (3)(A) and the conclusions described by paragraph (3)(B), including recommendations for such legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out such improvements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

**TRUMP-KIM SUMMIT**

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am glad we are making such great progress on the Defense authorization bill. I know some additional work needs to be done. I wanted to come to the floor and comment briefly on the historic meeting that occurred this last week with North Korean officials in Singapore.

President Trump, Secretary of State Pompeo, National Security Advisor Bolton, and the rest of the American delegation are to be congratulated for having this meeting. It was a historic first step, and I applaud President Trump for taking it. But I reiterate: It was a first step.

To me, it reminds me of boxers entering the ring and touching gloves before the fight begins. It is a warmup for something longer and much more difficult. We need to remain clear-eyed about who we are dealing with and not assume that there isn't hard work to be done.

As one commentator recently put it, North Korean duplicity is normal. We need to remind ourselves of our own history of negotiating with North Korea and our counterpart's record of saying one thing and simply doing another.

The joint agreement signed by President Trump and Kim Jong Un set broad goals whereby the United States made unspecified "security guarantees" and Kim Jong Un recommitted to work toward the complete denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. This agreement set the stage for future engagements between our Secretary of State and his North Korean counterpart.

By saying it is a first step—or, like two boxers, touching gloves before the fight begins—I don't want to suggest in any way that this was unimportant. I think it is dramatically important because I can't think of any other place in the world where a misstep or a miscalculation could lead to so much bloodshed, heartache, and conflict. While we know that the military option must always be the last option, diplomacy is always welcome and is facilitated by a strong military and preparedness. But now the followup negotiations will be led by Secretary Pompeo, and I have every confidence that he will ably lead those.

He has said that the United States hopes to achieve "major disarmament" of North Korea's nuclear arsenal during the next 2½ years but added emphatically that we will resume joint military exercises with South Korea if the talks stall.

I think this represents the right approach. Aim for the best, while remain-

ing vigilant and preparing for all possible obstacles and outcomes.

President Trump has said that sanctions against North Korea will remain in effect until we are sure that nuclear weapons are no longer a factor. I applaud this stance of maximum pressure. We shouldn't take our foot off the gas at this point because that is what brought us to this historic meeting in the first place.

I believe the United States should remain committed to the permanent, verifiable, and irreversible dismantling of North Korea's weapons of mass destruction, and I wish Secretary Pompeo luck as he continues followup discussions in South Korea to help accomplish the goal that we seek.

As Speaker RYAN said last week, President Trump has now "disrupted the status quo." I like the way he expressed that. President Trump—if nothing—is good at disrupting the status quo, but here, when it comes to North Korea, it is enormously positive when the status quo includes a brutal dictatorship that commits flagrant human rights violations, has a state-controlled economy, is starving its own people in order to build nuclear weapons, and has shown contempt for international norms and global diplomacy. I would say that the careful and cautious kind of "disruption" is exactly the right thing to do.

Our colleagues across the aisle seem to agree, and I am grateful for that. Not everything needs to be a partisan issue here in Washington, DC. In a statement, the junior Senator from Vermont called the summit earlier this week "a positive step in de-escalating tensions." I saw that former Director of National Intelligence James Clapper made similar positive remarks. We will have to wait and see how this story unfolds, but the President is to be commended, first for ensuring that the summit took place at all and, then, for providing us with hope for a path forward.

**FARM BILL**

Mr. President, another item of business today is the farm bill, which I hope we will take up promptly here in the Senate. Fortunately, it passed the Senate Agriculture Committee yesterday by a vote of 20-to-1. Thanks to Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW, this bipartisan compromise is a fair and equitable bill that does not favor one region of the country over another. I have found in my time in the Senate that agricultural issues and the farm bill don't pit Democrats against Republicans so much as it pits one region of the country against another, which makes it even more challenging—kind of like a Rubik's Cube to figure out. But the near unanimous vote is a testament to the collaboration and bipartisanship of the leaders of the committee. They deserve the respect and appreciation of us all, especially those of us who hail from States where agriculture has such a dominant presence, like my State

and like the State of the Presiding Officer.

The farm bill is always a significant piece of legislation because it helps to ensure that Americans, and many other people who depend upon our food supply, enjoy access to the safest, most affordable, and most reliable food supply in the world. We have to remember that in many non-Western countries, you can't just walk up to a store and know that what you want will be there on the shelf or that it will be affordable or that it will be safe to even eat. The farm bill helps to ensure that we continue to enjoy each of those things, knowing that we can walk into a store, that we will find what we want, that it will be affordable, and that it will be safe to eat.

This year's farm bill will be hugely impactful for farmers and ranchers in my State of Texas. Among its most noteworthy provisions are protecting seed cotton eligibility for the farm bill safety net. In the supplemental funding bill we passed last February, we worked hard to include this language, returning cotton to the safety net. This helped cotton growers compete on a level playing field after years of depressed prices.

So I want to thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW, as well as the rest of the committee, for ensuring that this policy continues and that cotton farmers have the long-term predictability they deserve under the farm bill.

This year's bill also retains and strengthens the Price Loss Coverage Program to help provide Texas producers with predictability throughout unstable weather and natural disasters. That comes as great news this year, especially, when we are all well aware that much of the Texas Panhandle, as well as much of the rest of my State, remains under severe, or even exceptional, drought conditions.

Additionally, the bill promotes animal health and reauthorizes disease research programs, including a crucial one that will help the U.S. Department of Agriculture research and contain the spread of cattle fever tick. This is a parasite-carrying insect with the potential to wipe out cattle herds and cause devastating financial losses.

The research programs that we are promoting will help farmers and ranchers all across the country. I know the senior Senator from Minnesota, for example, has been concerned about avian influenza in her State, and I am glad that we were able to work together to ensure that these important research programs, with all of their implications, are authorized in the bill.

On top of that, the farm bill will strengthen crop insurance and other crop management tools and enhance incentive programs that help the agriculture community conserve soil and water.

Finally, the bill encourages the U.S. Department of Agriculture research partnerships, including those at Texas

A&M, Texas Tech, and Prairie View A&M, to promote more productive and profitable farming, and it will assist Texas farmers and ranchers in placing and selling their products in foreign markets.

I know Senator MCCONNELL intends to take the farm bill up on the floor as soon as possible, and I look forward to supporting its swift passage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment in order to call up amendment No. 2304.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, this amendment very simply directs the Postmaster General to issue a Forever Stamp to honor Gold Star families who have lost a family member in combat. It is about as simple and straightforward as an amendment to this immensely complex and costly measure could be.

We are now in the second decade of wars in Iraq and Afghanistan at humongous costs to our Nation: In treasure, some \$5 trillion, and in lives, close to 7,000 Americans have perished.

On this Flag Day, and at the beginning of the Father's Day weekend, I ask that this body approve an amendment that very simply would issue and direct the Postmaster to issue a Forever Stamp commemorating the sacrifice and loss of our Gold Star families.

All of us in this body have attended funerals. We have seen firsthand the losses suffered by brave Americans, their families, their loved ones, their friends, their dads, and their moms. All of us ought to be joining in paying tribute to those families by directing the Postmaster General to issue a Forever Stamp, which will be valid for whatever time it is used.

There is precedent for this kind of stamp. In fact, I was reminded of it by a friend and constituent, Joe Kaliko of Greenwich, CT, who was inspired by his childhood stamp collection to suggest a stamp for Gold Star families, permanently recognizing and commemorating these national heroes. The stamp was issued in 1947 for Gold Star mothers. It expired about a year thereafter. Since then, this Nation has never issued such a stamp again, but there is no better time than now to recognize this service and sacrifice.

This amendment is a very simple way to pay tribute to Americans who have lost loved ones in wars that we have permitted and authorized to go forward. Indeed, this defense bill has more than \$700 billion, and a good part of it will be in support of continued American service and sacrifice in Iraq and Afghanistan.

So my question to colleagues is: Who knows better about whether this stamp ought to be issued, the Postmaster General or ourselves? Their objection is that somehow there is bad precedent here in Congress authorizing a Forever Stamp. We ought to be proud of that precedent because this cause is different. Especially as we pass a measure that will support continued war efforts in defense of our Nation, protecting our national security, we ought to be especially mindful of the need to remember and pay tribute to families who have sacrificed loved ones in the service of our country.

I know that every one of my colleagues joins me in this feeling. I hope that every one of my colleagues will join me in making that feeling known to the Postmaster General. This amendment is one way of doing it.

To all of us whose sons or daughters have served—as two of mine have—during this period of war, we must be haunted by the idea that we could be one of those Gold Star families. No doubt, some of my colleagues have been touched directly and immediately—I would say almost all of us—by friends, neighbors, or relatives who have suffered these losses. Let us remember them in this special way, as the Nation did after World War II. Let us remember the moms and the dads on Father's Day, on Flag Day, and on every day.

I want to speak more generally about the National Defense Authorization Act because it is a vital and profoundly significant step toward sustaining our national defense and security.

In an era of unprecedented threats to our great Nation, the dangers have never been greater. The need for this defense—particularly in areas and domains where we are at a disadvantage, like cyber—is critically important.

The United States is the strongest and greatest Nation in the history of the world. Militarily, we have no peer. But other nations are rapidly advancing in many of the spaces and domains where our advantage was secure. In undersea warfare, in space and cyber and robotic combat, we must invest.

We need to invest not only in the hardware but also in the people—in the men and women who fight, who put their lives on the line, who wear the uniform and, equally, in the men and women who make the arms and equipment and weapons platforms they take into combat. They should never have a fair fight. The defense industrial base requires skill and training so they can make the submarines, helicopters, and Joint Strike Fighters, which we do in Connecticut and in States around this country.

The men and women who make that stuff are equally important to our national defense, and their skill training and jobs are vital to our national security. I think we need to recognize that education and training are vital parts of our defense, even though they may not be included in this bill.



I was proud to author a provision which will ensure that survivors of military sexual trauma, assault, and harassment are eligible for “liberal consideration” during discharge upgrade petition.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I have worked to improve discharge upgrade provisions to ensure that servicemember petitions are treated fairly and expeditiously. This policy change was a crucial next step in reforming that discharge petition upgrade process.

Another provision I have led will require a zero tolerance policy toward domestic violence in the military, a long overdue provision which will ensure that offenders in the armed services are held accountable and referred to the FBI.

In defending our Nation against Russian cyber attacks, a provision in this year’s NDAA will authorize USCYBERCOM to detect, deter, and defend against Russian information and weapons cyber warfare campaigns that target American Government officials. We should be doing vastly more against cyber attacks from Russia and other adversaries around the world, rather than coddling or cozying up to them, as this administration seems to want to do repeatedly. We should be recognizing they are attacking us, literally, daily in the cyber domain.

This legislation will invest in that defense industrial base, which is so vital in Connecticut and elsewhere. I am proud that Connecticut plays such a vital role in our defense industry. Five percent of our country’s defense contract spending is done in Connecticut, and every dollar is critical to our national security, involving the production of submarines, electric boats, and F-35 engines at Pratt & Whitney, and helicopters at Sikorsky, notably the heavy lift CH-53. Submarines, fighters, and helicopters are proudly produced in this arsenal of democracy.

Groton, CT, is the submarine capital of the world. This bill will support submarines and this important naval installation. The NDAA includes nearly \$3.8 billion for the Columbia-class program and \$4.4 billion for two Virginia-class submarines. I fought to include an additional \$250 million in funding above the President’s request for over \$3 billion in advance procurement of attack submarines to achieve the Navy’s goals of 66 attack submarines for the 355-ship Navy the Nation needs. These submarines are not a luxury or convenience. They are the stealthiest, most versatile, strongest weapons platform we have, capable of delivering surveillance and special operators and cruise missiles and other vital means of war.

I have also championed more than \$10.4 billion in funding for 75 F-35 Joint Strike Fighters across the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps Services for the only fifth-generation fighter in production. I am so glad the administra-

tion is now supporting the F-35, after the President expressed doubts at the beginning of this administration. The bill also includes \$1 billion for F-35 modernization and spares.

The 2019 NDAA includes very robust funding for helicopter production. Sikorsky helicopters, made in Stratford, CT, have served our Nation for decades. It will support collaboration involving the University of Connecticut and the Navy, \$25 million above the President’s request in research and development funding for warship partnerships.

As we consider these floor amendments, I want to emphasize one amendment that I have filed concerning the current immigration crisis; specifically, the predicament of unaccompanied minors.

In May, Attorney General Jeff Sessions declared that the Justice Department would prosecute every person who illegally enters the country and separate children from their parents. Previously, families apprehended at the border were released as they waited for civil deportation hearings, but this new, cruel policy will tear apart countless families. It has already separated literally thousands of children of immigrant families from their moms and, yes, on this Father’s Day, from their dads.

These heartless family-separation policies are made even more inhumane with the announcement that the Trump administration plans to house these immigrant children, who have been separated from their parents, on military bases. The only reason the Trump administration is even considering detaining children on military installations is because the number they are tearing away from their moms and dads exceeds the facilities they have available right now. The Department of Health and Human Services has already visited four military installations—both in Texas and Arkansas—to assess whether they can be used to shelter children.

Just this week, we also heard that the Trump administration is looking to construct “tent cities”—yes, “tent cities”—along the southern border to house unaccompanied migrant children.

This practice ought to make us ashamed and embarrassed as Americans. It is appalling. I am ashamed that the United States is not only actively destroying families and indefinitely detaining children but also using military bases to do this. Turning military installations into detention camps is a disservice to our brave military men and women. Using our military installations to in effect imprison children separated from their parents mocks their purpose and disrespects our brave men and women in uniform who rightly use them in the defense of our Nation.

My amendment in the NDAA would explicitly prohibit the Department of Defense from using any funding authorized in this defense spending pack-

age to revise or rebuild or renovate military bases to house these undocumented, unaccompanied minors.

I urge my colleagues to speak out about this disgusting and dangerous policy—not only the separation of children from their moms and dads but also the use of our cherished military bases for that purpose.

I am also proud to have worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up to the threat posed by two Chinese telecommunications companies—Huawei and ZTE. This bipartisan opposition to their continued business is a testament to our ability to work across the aisle in defense of our Nation.

Our military and intelligence leaders have repeatedly warned that ZTE and Huawei threaten the security of our networks due to their close ties to the Chinese Government. They have also violated our sanctions, broken our law, and provided equipment and services to rogue regimes, such as Iran and North Korea.

President Trump and Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross may be willing to overlook ZTE’s track record, but Congress will not do so. Our amendment, which has been included in the managers’ package, will prohibit ZTE and Huawei technologies and equipment from entering the networks of the U.S. Government and its contractors for the safety and security of all of us.

It is not just an intellectual point; it is a practical security measure. These two companies are instruments of Chinese influence, and they are peddling that influence throughout the world. We will ensure through this provision that these two telecommunications companies beholden to the Chinese Government are not a part of our communications system in this great Nation.

I am proud to support this NDAA.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, the Constitution charges Congress with the authority and the responsibility to raise and support armies and provide and maintain a navy. It is a responsibility this body takes very seriously. That is why for over 50 years the National Defense Authorization Act has been signed into law each and every year. It is the only piece of legislation with this long history of consistently being passed by Congress and signed into law by the President. This history is a reflection of the importance of the policies and funding authorizations within the bill.

I am particularly proud of what this bill includes to support Michigan’s important contributions to our national defense. For example, the 127th Wing at Selfridge Air National Guard Base flies the A-10 and in 2015 deployed in the fight against ISIS. As a result of their outstanding performance, the 127th Wing won the Spaatz Trophy as the top flying unit in the Air National Guard,

as well as the Meritorious Unit Award following their deployment.

The A-10 is without question a great airplane, but it is also getting old. The A-10 fleet will require wing replacements in order to continue to fly those important missions. That is why I worked to include an authorization for an additional \$65 million for A-10 wing replacement, bringing the bill's total investment in new A-10 wings to over \$144 million. These funds will help pay for new wings for a full squadron's worth of A-10 aircraft, which are vital for close air support and combat search and rescue missions. Our troops on the ground know that when they hear the iconic roar of an A-10, help is on the way. A-10 pilots and maintainers are proud of their mission, as they should be. This bill works to ensure that these aircraft will keep flying.

The legislation also includes an additional \$70 million for the next-generation combat vehicle prototype. The Detroit Arsenal in Warren will be the home of the Army's cross-functional team for the next-generation combat vehicle, reporting to the Army Futures Command.

This important work on developing the future of the Army's ground vehicles will continue to occur in Southeast Michigan, taking advantage of many of the automotive manufacturers and suppliers that are shaping the future of mobility.

Just as the commercial automotive industry is developing connected and autonomous vehicles that will change the future of transportation forever, the next-generation combat vehicle and other concepts developed by the Army's Tank Automotive Research, Development and Engineer Center, TARDEC, will change the future of warfare.

All self-driving vehicles, whether they are developed for the military or for the auto industry, rely on artificial intelligence and machine learning. Artificial intelligence powers autonomous systems but can also reform the business practices of the Pentagon. AI can help with personnel management and purchasing practices and find insights and efficiencies that are difficult to find unless you can manipulate and analyze the Department's massive amounts of data.

Artificial intelligence will have an enormous impact on our economy, and that is why it is essential that the United States make significant investments in AI development and that we lead the world in developing this capability. We know that our competitors are taking AI very seriously. China has developed a national strategy to develop its AI capabilities, and Vladimir Putin has said that whoever leads in AI will rule the world. The United States must lead the way on artificial intelligence to best shape the future economy and our country, to strengthen our national security, and to address the moral and ethical questions that arise with any new technology.

Without question, the United States needs our own coordinated strategy on AI. That is why I wrote a provision in the bill that designates a senior official for artificial intelligence at the Department of Defense and cuts redtape, letting that person utilize all of the flexibilities Congress has provided to the Pentagon.

It is also important that we take steps to protect American ingenuity and innovation generally. That is why I also authored a provision in the bill that will allow the Department of Defense to require that companies and researchers receiving defense contracts not share new technologies and capabilities developed with any foreign entity, and if they do, they will lose the rights to that intellectual property. This will help ensure that investments made by DARPA and the DOD labs are not shared with our competitors.

Additionally, this bill also includes reform to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, known as CFIUS. CFIUS works to ensure that investments in U.S. companies made by foreign investors do not threaten national security by providing other countries with access to the crown jewels of U.S. technology.

In closing, Madam President, I wish to point out that this bill is named for Chairman JOHN MCCAIN. We all know his presence is missed on the Armed Services Committee, as well as throughout the entire Senate. I wish him a speedy recovery. I am keeping him and his family in my prayers.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 2276

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the amendment the senior Senator from Arkansas has offered to the H.R. 5515, the Fiscal Year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act, NDAA. Senator BOOZMAN's amendment is a thoughtful one. It proposes to solicit information from the Department of Defense to help us carefully think through our response to the changed strategic situation in Europe. Russia's military aggression and Military incursions in Georgia, Ukraine, and elsewhere have made it abundantly clear that we are no longer in the security environment that provided the context for the commitments we made in the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act.

The United States and Poland have a long record of highly effective cooperation in military matters. Poland has made important contributions to operations in Iraq, Syria and Afghanistan, and an American-led NATO battle group in Poland is playing an important role in reinforcing NATO's eastern flank today.

Still, a decision to permanently deploy U.S. forces to the territory of even such a stalwart ally should not be taken lightly. This amendment wisely requests that the Department of Defense provide its assessment of a number of factors that we will need to weigh when deciding whether to take

such a step, including the reactions we should anticipate from other allies, possible responses by Russia, and more practical considerations including cost and timing.

Poland needs no reminder about the external threats it faces. After all, it borders Ukraine. However, Poland faces an enemy within: democratic backsliding, which plays into Vladimir Putin's hands as he aims to undermine democratic values across Europe.

Since 2015, the Polish Government has challenged constitutionalism, eroded checks and balances, and indulged in historical revisionism. The breadth and depth of the government's actions led the European Commission to conclude in December that Poland's "executive and legislative branches have been systematically enabled to politically interfere in the composition, powers, administration and functioning of the judicial branch."

I discussed these concerns in a meeting with Polish Deputy Foreign Minister Marek Magierowski in February, including a controversial law, introduced on the eve of International Holocaust Remembrance Day, which may actually impede research, scholarship, and journalism about the Holocaust. The Department of State rightly observed that this law might have repercussions for "Poland's strategic interests and relationships—including with the United States and Israel. The resulting divisions that may arise among our allies benefit only our rivals."

Independence of the judiciary will take another hit on July 3, when a new law will go into effect forcing the early retirement of up to 40 percent of Poland's 120-member supreme court, the reintroduction of the Soviet-era feature of "lay judges," and make final judgments subject to "extraordinary appeals." These developments—very concerning both for Poland and the region—should be part of the administration's dialogue with Warsaw on comprehensive transatlantic security.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to highlight an issue concerning the industrial base that supports the strategic TRIAD. Currently the Air Force is developing the Ground Based Strategic Deterrent or GBSD. This will be the Nation's new land-based intercontinental ballistic missile and will replace the venerable Minuteman Three. Nearly 50 years ago, when Minuteman was built, there were five companies capable of producing large solid rocket motors. The industrial base that produces large solid rocket motors for the Nation's strategic TRIAD has shrunk to two, and if the GBSD program is not handled carefully, it could soon shrink to one. With each new missile likely to have three large solid rocket motors, it is important to maintain multiple companies that can produce them.

This problem was clearly identified in April 2018 when the Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment released the Department of Defense's Annual Industrial Capabilities Report. I would encourage my



colleagues to go read the entire report for themselves. The report can be found at <http://www.businessdefense.gov/Portals/51/Documents/Resources/2017%20AIC%20RTC%2005-17-2018%20-%20Public%20Release.pdf?ver=2018-05-17-224631-340>.

The report is quite lengthy; however, I would like to read one paragraph from page 85, which accurately synthesizes the lack of oversight of the large solid rocket motor industrial base: "Maintaining a healthy and competitive solid rocket motor industrial base is also of concern to the Department. Solid rocket motors for tactical missiles are produced in a nearly even split between the two domestic suppliers, Orbital ATK and Aerojet Rocketdyne. However, in the very near future all the large solid rocket motors for strategic missiles and space launch will be produced by Orbital ATK."

Aerojet Rocketdyne has managed to maintain their large solid rocket motor capability for now with production of the boosters for the United Launch Alliance (ULA) Atlas V space launch vehicle, and small development investments from the GBSD program. But ULA has chosen Orbital ATK's boosters to replace Aerojet Rocketdyne's on Atlas and future launch vehicles, leaving Aerojet Rocketdyne with no large solid rocket motor production. Aerojet Rocketdyne has chosen to close their Sacramento large solid rocket motor production facility.

While they have plans to reconstitute this capability at their Camden facility, they may not do so if they are not part of the winning team for GBSD, producing at least one solid rocket motor stage. This potentially leaves the United States with a single large solid rocket motor supplier, which can lead to cost increases due to lack of competition, decreases in internal research and development efforts, and risk of security of supply if a catastrophic accident should occur."

I am very concerned about what the Under Secretary has revealed in this report. I believe that the Nation must avoid a monopoly provider situation for the very reasons stated in the report. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I believe that we have a duty to be proper stewards of the defense industrial base, both for our current warfighters and for those who will follow. This is an issue that I will continue to monitor, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwith-

standing rule XXII, all postcloture time expire at 1:45 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. For the information of Senators, this sets up a series of votes this afternoon. We should expect three to four votes during this series.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

STEPHEN MICHAEL GLEASON CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL BILL

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I come to the floor to honor Washington State's finest, Spokane native and Washington State University Cougar Steve Gleason. I know my Senate colleagues will be here later this afternoon to do the same. My colleagues from Louisiana and Washington have introduced legislation to award Steve the Congressional Gold Medal, Congress's highest honor. I look forward to seeing this legislation pass later today by unanimous consent.

Many Washingtonians remember Steve as a standout student athlete whose dedication in the classroom earned him repeated academic honors and whose dominance on the football field and baseball diamond set records and dazzled fans. Everybody back home is pulling for Steve.

Instead of Steve going to the Seahawks, he signed with the New Orleans Saints. He quickly became a fan favorite for his work ethic and the joy he brought to the game.

In his first game back under the Superdome after Hurricane Katrina, he blocked a punt that was returned for a touchdown. It is a play I know Saints' fans around the country still remember fondly.

It is not Steve's athletic feats at Washington State University or in the Superdome that make him worth recognition, it is his perseverance, determination, his unbreakable spirit in the face of ALS, and his dogged advocacy for people who have been impacted by this disease.

That is why Steve is such an inspiration to the people of Spokane, throughout the State of Washington, and across the United States. Through his public advocacy and collaboration with Congress, Steve helped pass the Steve Gleason Act, which ensures that people with ALS and other degenerative diseases can access speech-generating devices, whether at home or in a health facility.

His leadership with the Gleason Initiative Foundation brought together the largest ALS research project in the world, and his work has helped us improve the lives of countless individuals who have been impacted by this disease.

We could not be more proud of him, and that is why we are here today, to make sure this legislation gives that appropriate recognition. Steve Gleason said: "Our potential is not contained in our physical bodies, but rather in our mind and in our spirit."

I so appreciate all he has done to help fight this disease. He has been such a leader in communicating the needs of those with ALS and showing the progress we all can make. I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc: amendments Nos. 2289, 2295, 2300, 2322, 2365, 2440, 2441, 2464, 2486, 2509, 2544, 2550, 2579, 2587, 2589, 2598, 2600, 2611, 2617, 2623, 2633, 2634, 2653, 2654, 2686, 2691, 2695, 2721, 2723, 2729, 2737, 2742, 2755, 2758, 2768, 2794, 2799, 2800, 2810, 2815, 2818, 2830, 2862, 2863, and 2887. I further ask consent that these amendments be considered en bloc; that it be in order for the Lee amendment No. 2366 to be called up, and that there be up to an hour of debate on the amendments to run concurrently, and that following the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the en bloc amendments and the Lee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. Madam President, reserving the right to object, and I will object.

My colleague from Utah, who is a very smart man on the Judiciary Committee, like I am—I don't know if I am smart, but we are on the same committee—we are actually making progress here.

Just briefly, Senator CRUZ has had an amendment that says if someone is suspected of being part of an enemy force, they will have a hearing to strip their citizenship, which avoids the problem Senator LEE and I have. He is trying to combine that with his amendment.

Unfortunately, there is no ability to hold them as an enemy combatant during that process—and maybe we can work that out later—so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I appreciate the efforts made by my friend and distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Carolina. I wish to speak concerning the purpose for my making this request. I do so with great respect for this body, for its customs, its traditions, its rules, and for each of its Members.

At the same time, it is imperative that we point out what is happening. We have a bill—one of the most consequential pieces of legislation we vote on each year—the National Defense Authorization Act. We have been effectively shut out of a meaningful amendment process, one that has historically marked this body as one of its distinguishing characteristics; one that has historically helped this body to refer to itself as the world's greatest deliberative legislative body.

We have tested that in recent months and years as Members have started objecting with increasing frequency to

anyone getting a vote on any amendment they don't like, that they object to. The amendment at issue is based on a bipartisan piece of legislation called the Due Process Guarantee Act. I am the lead sponsor, along with my lead cosponsor, the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN.

The purpose of this amendment is simple. It is to make sure the U.S. Government has no authority and claims no authority to indefinitely detain U.S. citizens apprehended on U.S. soil. Most people listening to this—anyone listening to it—would think, why on Earth would we need legislation stating something so obvious? The fact is, we shouldn't.

It is the inexorable command of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Amendments, not to mention other statutory and constitutional protections, that the indefinite detention without charge, without trial, without access to a jury, without access to counsel—these kinds of things are anathema to our way of life, to our constitutional system of laws.

Why then do we need this amendment? Well, about 7 years ago, toward the end of 2011, when Congress was considering, then ultimately passed, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012, Congress included in that legislation a provision, section 2021 of that bill, that purported to give the U.S. Government that authority in certain circumstances.

In other words, there were circumstances based on the accusations against you, as an American citizen, that you could be apprehended on U.S. soil and held indefinitely without charge or trial. This violates everything we know about our system of government. It violates everything we know about the laws of any decent nation—any nation that recognizes the fundamental, essentially eternal dignity of the human soul. This is not something we do in the United States.

I raised objections to it at the time. I tried to fix it at the time. It didn't happen. The following year, late in 2012, when we were addressing the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, toward the end of 2012, I introduced an amendment that is substantially identical to the one I am trying to seek a vote on today. It passed by a bipartisan supermajority vote. There were 67 Members who voted for this. That is more than a majority; more than the three-fifths it needed to close debate. In fact, it is equal to the sum required when you are proposing a constitutional amendment out of this body or trying to override a Presidential veto. That is what we had.

For reasons that escape me, that provision was removed in the Conference Committee when the Conference Committee was trying to recognize competing House and Senate versions of the bill. In the subsequent 6 years, I tried repeatedly to get a vote on this amendment again, recognizing that it passed overwhelmingly and that it was

inexplicably removed from the bill during the Conference Committee. Promise after promise has been made to help me get a vote on that amendment, which ever since hasn't panned out.

We have an opportunity to consider it here. Yesterday, something interesting happened. Yesterday, there was a motion to table this amendment. In other words, there were some Members of this body who didn't want to consider it at all so they made a motion to table. When you table something in the Senate, you are setting it aside, setting it on the table, saying: We are not going to address that. Do you know what happened? There were 68 people who voted against that motion to table. In other words, 68 people voted that we should have a vote on this amendment. That is more than a majority, more than the three-fifths or 60 needed to close debate. That is more than the threshold required to propose a constitutional amendment or override a Presidential veto.

Why then are we not discussing this? Why are we not voting on it so we have a number of amendments? You may have heard me reciting a series of about three dozen four-digit numbers, each referring to a separate amendment being proposed for a so-called managers' package.

If we are going to further amend this bill, we need to consider those with a vote, and we need a vote on my amendment. Yesterday, 68 Members of this body agreed that we should be considering this.

Ask any American you know—your friends, your neighbors, I don't care what State they live in, what party they identify with, where they go to church or synagogue, whether they are believers in God, regardless of their background, their socioeconomic status, what they do for a living—you ask people from almost any background, and I can almost guarantee you they are going to call this a no-brainer.

Why would we not want to remove a pernicious provision from a piece of Federal law that passed a few years ago, purporting to authorize the Federal Government to indefinitely detain U.S. citizens, without charge or trial or jury or counsel, based merely on the nature of the allegations against them? This is wrong, and the wrongness of that provision, which could be corrected by my amendment, is compounded still by the refusal of this body, by the refusal of 1 Member of this body, 1 Member out of 100, to allow us to get a vote on this. We must vote on this.

If we are going to lay claim to any type of status as the world's greatest deliberative legislative body, we have to start voting on amendments again. We have steadily, sadly, tragically relinquished that right by acquiescence.

As of today, I say no more. It has to stop. Let us vote on this. We will continue to push this. The laws of the United States and the principles that govern the behavior of decent people

everywhere dictate we should correct this error in the law.

I implore my colleagues, I implore my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina, let us vote on this amendment.

Thank you.

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

FLAG DAY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, Last year, just a few miles down the road in Virginia, a disabled World War II veteran, Richard Cohen, woke up to his burned American flag on his doorstep. Let me say that again. Richard Cohen, who was wounded by German machine-gun fire while defending our freedom in World War II, woke up to his American flag desecrated on his doorstep.

Unfortunately, this is just one of many astonishing stories of our American flag being ruined. In fact, since 2014, there have been 50 known offensive acts of American flag burning. That is 50 times that our symbol of freedom—that thousands of Americans have paid the ultimate sacrifice for—was destroyed.

That is why I am here today, Flag Day, to speak about my constitutional amendment that would prohibit the burning of the American flag. The colors of the flag—red, white, and blue—symbolize valor, purity, and perseverance. The American flag represents our Nation's history and the character of our Nation's Founding Fathers.

Beginning with those Founding Fathers, the American flag represents the patriotism and dedication of men and women who fought to defend our Nation's freedom when our country was founded more than 200 years ago today. Thousands of brave and selfless men and women have given their lives in sacrifice and service to our country and in defense of our flag.

That is why I have introduced this constitutional amendment to provide Congress with the authority to prohibit burning of the American flag. Our flag should be protected in honor of the countless American servicemembers who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to defend it.

It is no wonder, by overwhelming majorities, our veterans and organizations like the American Legion support this because they have been on the frontlines defending our freedom.

Our veterans are the best example of why America is still the greatest country on Earth and why our freedoms and our liberties are worth defending.

In the words of that World War II veteran Richard Cohen, "I served under that flag and I bled for it, really, and it was a personal affront."

The American flag has been a symbol of hope, a symbol of freedom for centuries, and it ought to be respected. On this day, Flag Day, may God continue to bless our troops, our veterans, and this great United States of America.

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

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

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, there is a reason we have passed the National Defense Authorization Act every year for the past 57 years, and that is because it is vital for the men and women who take responsibility for defending our country. Passing the Defense authorization bill is one of the most important things we do in this Chamber, and I look forward to passing the bill that we have before us out of the Senate and getting it through conference and signed into law very soon.

I want to start by briefly thanking the bill managers for including a number of my amendments, but one I will mention that they have added to the managers' package is an amendment that requires the Air Force and the National Nuclear Security Administration to submit a joint progress report every 6 months on their efforts to develop a new nuclear cruise missile capability. This will help ensure that their efforts are synchronized and that we stay on schedule. The nuclear cruise missile is an important part of our deterrent, and I am grateful for the committee's willingness to work with me on this amendment and include it in the managers' package.

This year's legislation certainly contains its share of noteworthy provisions. I will not be able to mention them all, but I do want to talk about some of them here today. For example, it authorizes a 2.6-percent pay raise for members of the armed services, which is the highest pay raise we have been able to include in more than a decade. It is something they very much deserve.

Thanks to the good work of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the bill also takes important steps to modernize the personnel system to provide greater career flexibility and make sure we can meet the needs of the professionals who serve across our magnificent Armed Forces.

In addition to personnel matters, I am pleased to note that the legislation supports our Nation's strategic priorities as reflected in the National Security Strategy, the National Defense Strategy, and the Nuclear Posture Review. Those documents rightly point out that we face emerging challenges from Russia and China. While we hope to avoid confrontation with these nations, there is no question we are in competition with them, and this year's NDAA helps align our forces to make sure we maintain our competitive advantage.

This legislation also authorizes significant numbers of fighter aircraft and additional numbers of submarines and surface ships. The reason we are able to do that is that we, in the budget agreement this year, provided more funding

authority for our military, which, again, is something we very much needed to do.

This legislation also fully authorizes the nuclear modernization program aimed at sustaining and modernizing all three legs of the nuclear triad, as well as extending the service lives of our nuclear warheads. Modernizing our nuclear forces is extremely important for our national security, as well as to my home State. In my State, the Minot Air Force Base is home to two of the three legs of the triad—bombers and ICBMs. These men and women of the Minot Air Force Base are on the frontlines of vital missions, and updating our nuclear force will help ensure they continue to fulfill this vital role in coming decades. In just the past few months, I have visited that base, and we have had ongoing deployments to the Korean Peninsula, based TDY out of Guam, as well as to the Middle East, taking an important role in what is going on in Iraq and Syria.

I also want to highlight in this legislation the Air Force's plan to replace the engines on the venerable B-52 aircraft, something I have worked on quite a bit. We expect that aircraft, which has been a workhorse for us for many years, to remain a key element of not only our nuclear deterrent but also an important component of our conventional bomber force for decades to come. New engines will help keep it flying and ensure that it will continue to fulfill those vital roles.

The legislation also provides for significant investment in emerging technologies that will position our forces to remain the most capable military on Earth, including investments in hypersonic weapons and directed energy weapons.

Another base in my State, the Grand Forks Air Force Base, has the Global Hawk mission. This legislation makes sure we continue support for the Global Hawk, which is an unmanned aircraft that provides an incredibly important role in ISR—intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—which is a very important part of our global reach.

This legislation also authorizes the annual military construction program, with an Army readiness center in Fargo, ND, and a helicopter operations facility at the Minot Air Force Base representing two examples of military construction projects made possible through this legislation. Again, these are things I have worked hard on, as well as other support for our National Guard in my State and across the country.

This bill includes language that provides higher allowances for Guard members on lengthy or numerous deployments. It also addresses Federal delays in recognizing promotions for National Guard and Reserve members, who play such an important role in our Armed Forces.

There are too many provisions to go through all of them, obviously, but the point is we need to pass this legislation

for our men and women in uniform. We have the finest armed services in the world, and they deserve our careful and deliberate attention to ensure they have the benefits they deserve, the tools they need, and the support that we owe them.

Again, I look forward to completing work on this legislation, and then, as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee—and I am on the Defense Appropriations Committee as well—I will work hard to make sure we have the appropriate funding to go with the authorization we provide in this legislation to make absolutely sure we support our incredible men and women in uniform. We owe them so much, and it is an honor and privilege to work on their behalf.

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

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I want to take a second to thank Senator INHOFE and Senator REED and their staffs for all of their hard work on getting us to this point on the Defense authorization bill, which is so very important.

Through the European Deterrence Initiative, we have made important progress in preparing U.S. forces and allies to address Russian threats to American interests and the international order that protects them.

I was just in Poland visiting U.S. forces with Senators INHOFE, CAPITO, and ENZI. We saw firsthand the work they are doing to preposition equipment and to establish the necessary footprint to sustain operations.

The NDAA contains a provision that would require the Secretary of Defense to conduct an assessment of the feasibility and advisability of permanently stationing a U.S. Army brigade combat team in Poland. This amendment would require a report to accompany the assessment, detailing the requirements for combat enablers to deter aggression by Russia and to execute the Department of Defense's contingency plans. Combat enablers are the essential noncombat force that helps to maintain our defense posture around the globe.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment as the Senate continues to play its oversight role to ensure that we defend our interests and our allies in Europe against Russian aggression.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2273 WITHDRAWN

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw amendment No. 2273.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2273) was withdrawn.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the votes following the first vote in this series be 10 minutes in length.

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

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2885

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Reed amendment would name a fellowship program on behalf of Senator JOHN MCCAIN. I can't think of anything more fitting, in addition to the naming of this bill, than naming this fellowship program on behalf of Senator MCCAIN.

I hope all of my colleagues will join me in voting unanimously for Senator MCCAIN's fellowship program.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 2885, offered by the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 97, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 125 Leg.]

YEAS—97

|            |              |            |
|------------|--------------|------------|
| Alexander  | Coons        | Graham     |
| Baldwin    | Corker       | Grassley   |
| Barrasso   | Cornyn       | Harris     |
| Bennet     | Cortez Masto | Hassan     |
| Blumenthal | Cotton       | Hatch      |
| Blunt      | Crapo        | Heinrich   |
| Booker     | Cruz         | Heitkamp   |
| Boozman    | Daines       | Heller     |
| Brown      | Donnelly     | Hirono     |
| Burr       | Durbin       | Hoeven     |
| Cantwell   | Enzi         | Hyde-Smith |
| Capito     | Ernst        | Inhofe     |
| Cardin     | Feinstein    | Isakson    |
| Carper     | Fischer      | Johnson    |
| Casey      | Flake        | Jones      |
| Cassidy    | Gardner      | Kaine      |
| Collins    | Gillibrand   | Kennedy    |

|           |         |            |
|-----------|---------|------------|
| King      | Perdue  | Stabenow   |
| Klobuchar | Peters  | Sullivan   |
| Lankford  | Portman | Tester     |
| Leahy     | Reed    | Thune      |
| Lee       | Risch   | Tillis     |
| Manchin   | Roberts | Toomey     |
| Markley   | Rounds  | Udall      |
| McCaskill | Rubio   | Van Hollen |
| McConnell | Sanders | Warner     |
| Menendez  | Sasse   | Warren     |
| Merkley   | Schatz  | Whitehouse |
| Murkowski | Schumer | Wicker     |
| Murphy    | Scott   | Wyden      |
| Murray    | Shaheen | Young      |
| Nelson    | Shelby  |            |
| Paul      | Smith   |            |

NOT VOTING—3

|           |        |       |
|-----------|--------|-------|
| Duckworth | McCain | Moran |
|-----------|--------|-------|

The amendment (No. 2885) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2276

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 2276, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, for the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. BOOZMAN.

The amendment (No. 2276) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2282, AS MODIFIED, AS AMENDED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to amendment No. 2282, offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, as modified and amended.

The amendment (No. 2282), as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 442, H.R. 5515, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Deb Fischer, Mike Rounds, Roger F. Wicker, Ted Cruz, Cindy Hyde-Smith, James Lankford, Marco Rubio, James M. Inhofe, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, James E. Risch, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, John Thune.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on H.R. 5515, an act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 81, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Leg.]

YEAS—81

|              |            |            |
|--------------|------------|------------|
| Alexander    | Fischer    | Perdue     |
| Baldwin      | Gardner    | Peters     |
| Barrasso     | Graham     | Portman    |
| Bennet       | Grassley   | Reed       |
| Blumenthal   | Hassan     | Risch      |
| Blunt        | Hatch      | Roberts    |
| Booker       | Heinrich   | Rounds     |
| Boozman      | Heitkamp   | Rubio      |
| Brown        | Heller     | Sasse      |
| Burr         | Hirono     | Schatz     |
| Cantwell     | Hoeven     | Schumer    |
| Capito       | Hyde-Smith | Scott      |
| Cardin       | Inhofe     | Shaheen    |
| Carper       | Isakson    | Shelby     |
| Casey        | Jones      | Smith      |
| Cassidy      | Kaine      | Stabenow   |
| Collins      | King       | Sullivan   |
| Coons        | Klobuchar  | Tester     |
| Cornyn       | Lankford   | Thune      |
| Cortez Masto | Leahy      | Tillis     |
| Cotton       | McCaskill  | Toomey     |
| Crapo        | McConnell  | Udall      |
| Cruz         | Menendez   | Van Hollen |
| Daines       | Murkowski  | Warner     |
| Donnelly     | Murphy     | Whitehouse |
| Enzi         | Murray     | Wicker     |
| Ernst        | Nelson     | Young      |

NAYS—15

|            |         |         |
|------------|---------|---------|
| Corker     | Harris  | Merkley |
| Durbin     | Johnson | Paul    |
| Feinstein  | Kennedy | Sanders |
| Flake      | Lee     | Warren  |
| Gillibrand | Markley | Wyden   |

NOT VOTING—4

|           |        |
|-----------|--------|
| Duckworth | McCain |
| Manchin   | Moran  |

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 81, the nays are 15.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Louisiana.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

STEPHEN MICHAEL GLEASON CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I join Senator CASSIDY and many of our colleagues in recognizing one of Washington State's favorite sons—Spokane's own Steve Gleason.

I have to say, as a fellow Cougar, sponsoring this legislation to recognize Steve's legacy of excellence—from