



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 2019

No. 109

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord, the center of our joy, we come to You, drawn by Your unconditional love. Lord, give us reverential awe as You open our eyes to see Your power and majesty.

Help our lawmakers become aware of Your presence, giving them Your peace and illuminating their paths. May they rejoice because You are their refuge. Lord, bless their families, surrounding them with the shield of Your favor. Draw our Senators close to You and to one another in humility and service.

And, Lord, we thank You for the faithfulness of the 2019 U.S. Senate summer pages as they prepare to leave us. We pray that You would bless and keep them. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 90 seconds as in morning business.

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

ALZHEIMER'S AND BRAIN AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, June is Alzheimer's and Brain Awareness Month.

It is important to recognize the impact Alzheimer's has on families in

Iowa and across the country and to recognize the cost to taxpayers because of the care it takes in the last years of their lives. This disease robs Americans of their memories and impacts their ability to speak, pay attention, and exercise judgment.

The best way for Congress to help with Alzheimer's disease is to ensure adequate research funding to find treatments. As Congress considers appropriations for next year, we should continue to fund research and work toward curing this disease.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on another point, the Supreme Court made a decision this week that I very much disagree with. I am an advocate for the Freedom of Information Act and for the public's business being public, and this Supreme Court decision inhibited that.

In a self-governed society, the people ought to know what their government is up to. Transparency laws, like the Freedom of Information Act, help to provide access to information in the face of an opaque and obstinate government. Unfortunately, a recent Supreme Court ruling and new regulations at the EPA and the Department of the Interior are undermining access to there being public information.

In other words, the public's business ought to be public. So I am working on legislation to address these developments and to promote access to government records. Americans deserve an accountable government, and transparency leads to accountability.

TRIBUTE TO NICK NURSE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, on a little lighter note, I am proud to say that the NBA season concluded with a University of Northern Iowa graduate's being able to call himself a champion.

The Toronto Raptors' head coach, Nick Nurse, graduated from my alma

mater. He played for the University of Northern Iowa Panthers from 1985 to 1989. Nick went on to coach numerous teams, including for Grand View University in Des Moines. Nick knows how to reignite hometown pride. He led the first and only boys' Class 3-A championship for Kuemper Catholic High School in Carroll, IA. He is a class act. Congratulations to Nick.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, 8 weeks ago, the administration sent Congress an urgent request for humanitarian money for the border. For 8 weeks, we have seen evidence nearly every day that the conditions have been getting worse. Yet, during all of this time, our Democratic House colleagues have been unable to produce a clean measure to provide this humanitarian funding with its having any chance of becoming law.

The proposal they finally passed this week was way to the left of the mainstream. The President made it clear it would earn a veto, not a signature. Even so, in an abundance of fairness, the Senate voted on Speaker PELOSI's effort—poison pill riders and all. It earned just 37 votes. The House proposal earned 37 votes here. Fortunately, we do have a chance to make

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4587

law this week on a hugely bipartisan basis.

The Senate advanced a clean, simple humanitarian funding bill yesterday by a huge margin. Thanks to Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, this bipartisan package sailed through the Appropriations Committee 30 to 1, and it passed the full Senate yesterday—now listen to this—84 to 8. We sent that clean bill over to the House by a vote of 84 to 8. The Shelby-Leahy legislation has unified the Appropriations Committee, and it has unified the Senate. The administration would sign it into law.

So all that our House colleagues need to do to help the men, women, and children on the border this week is to pass this unifying bipartisan bill and send it to the President. For weeks, we have heard our House Democratic colleagues speaking a lot about the poor conditions, the overstretched facilities, the insufficient supplies. Our bill gives them the chance today to actually do something about it.

Now, I understand that instead of moving forward with this bipartisan bill, the Speaker is signaling she may choose to drag out the process even more and might persist in some variety of the leftwing demands that caused the House bill to fail dramatically in the Senate yesterday. I understand that some of the further changes the House Democrats are discussing may be unobjectionable things the Trump administration may be able to help to secure for them administratively.

Yet it is crystal clear that some of these new demands would drag this bipartisan bill way back to the left and jeopardize the Shelby-Leahy consensus product that unified the Senate and that is so close to becoming law—this close.

For example, I understand that the House Democrats may ask the Speaker to insist on—listen to this—cutting the supplemental funding for Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Department of Defense. In the middle of this historic surge on the border, they want to claw back some of this badly needed money from the men and women who are down there on the frontlines. It looks like these cuts would represent pay cuts to ICE staff, including pay that people have already earned, and cuts to the money for investigating child trafficking.

Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY have already reached a bipartisan agreement. Both sides have already compromised. We are standing at the 5-yard line. Yet, apparently, some in the House want to dig back into that “abolish ICE” playbook and throw a far-left partisan wrench into the whole thing.

Let me be perfectly clear. I am glad the Speaker and the administration are discussing some of these outstanding issues, but if the House Democrats send the Senate back some partisan effort to disrupt our bipartisan progress, we will simply move to table it. The U.S.

Senate is not going to pass a border funding bill that will cut the money for ICE and the Department of Defense. It is not going to happen. We already have our compromise. The Shelby-Leahy Senate bill is the only game in town. It is time to quit playing games. It is time to make it law.

I urge my colleagues across the Capitol to take up the clean, bipartisan bill that the Senate passed 84 to 8 and, without any more unnecessary delays, send it on to President Trump for his signature.

TOBACCO-FREE YOUTH ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, just last month, I introduced legislation, along with my colleague from Virginia, Senator KAINE, to address a serious and growing public health issue. As Senator KAINE and I laid out in May, the growing popularity and accessibility of tobacco products like e-cigarettes and vapor products are endangering America's youth.

The CDC estimates that in 2018 youth e-cigarette use in America increased by 1.5 million. So we introduced legislation that would accomplish something very important—raising the minimum age for purchasing tobacco and vapor products to 21 nationwide. We want to put a huge dent in these pathways to childhood addiction and help get these products out of high schools altogether.

Now, as a Virginian and a Kentuckian, neither Senator KAINE nor I lack an appreciation for the history of tobacco in America. For generations, this hugely important cash crop helped to build our States and, indeed, the whole Nation's early prosperity. Yet new doors are open today to Kentucky's growers and producers, and parents back home are rightly worried that e-cigarettes and vapor products pose new threats to the young people at a critical stage in their developments.

So I was proud to take the lead on this, and I am proud my colleague from Virginia has joined me in leading this effort to give this cause the strong bipartisan momentum it richly deserves. Our measure cleared an important milestone yesterday. The HELP Committee approved our Tobacco-Free Youth Act and advanced it here, to the floor, along with other legislation.

I thank Chairman ALEXANDER, Ranking Member MURRAY, and all of our colleagues on the committee for including our legislation in this package and advancing it. I look forward to continuing to work with them, with Senator KAINE, and with all of our colleagues as we work to get this important proposal signed into law.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter entirely, later today, the Senate will vote to fulfill a solemn

responsibility. For the 59th consecutive year, we will pass the National Defense Authorization Act. I hope and expect we will do it by a wide, bipartisan margin.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of this legislation to the ongoing missions of our Nation's men and women in uniform. The NDAA is simultaneously a target to guide the modernization of our all-volunteer force; a supply line to restore readiness and keep U.S. personnel equipped with the most cutting-edge, lethal capabilities; a promise of critical support services to military families; and a declaration to both our allies and adversaries of America's strategic resolve.

This year's bill authorizes the investments that will support all these bills and a major pay raise for military personnel to boot.

I am especially proud that it supports the ongoing missions of Kentucky's installations and the many military families who call my State home.

The NDAA is a product of a robust, bipartisan process that has consumed our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee for weeks. Nearly 300 amendments were adopted during markup. So today, once again, I would like to thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their leadership throughout this process. They produced legislation that each Member of this body should be proud of. Particularly in these troubled times, this is exactly—exactly—the message the Senate needs to send. I look forward to passing it today.

Passing the NDAA itself is not the only important message the Senate will send this week on national security. On Friday morning, we will vote on a badly ill-conceived amendment that would literally make our Nation less secure and make American servicemembers less safe. I respect my colleagues, but this amendment from Senator UDALL and others is a half-baked and dangerous measure—about as half-baked and dangerous as we have seen on the floor in quite some time. It should be soundly rejected.

We know that our Democratic colleagues have political differences with President Trump—I think the whole country has gotten that message pretty loud and clear—but they have chosen a terrible time and a completely irresponsible manner to express themselves. Rather than work with the President, who shares the goal of avoiding war with Iran, they have gratuitously chosen to make him the enemy.

Let me repeat that. Rather than work with the President to deter our actual enemies, they have chosen to make him the enemy.

At the very moment that Iran has been stepping up its aggression throughout the Middle East, these Senators are proposing radical new restrictions on the administration's ability to defend U.S. interests and our partners.

The Udall amendment would require the administration to secure explicit authorization from Congress before our forces would be able to respond to all kinds of potential Iranian attacks. That would include attacks on American civilians.

Let me say that again. Some of our colleagues want us to go out of our way and create a brandnew obstacle that would block the President from swiftly responding if Iran attacks American civilians, our U.S. diplomatic facilities, or Israel, or the military forces of an ally or partner, or if Iran closes the Strait of Hormuz. In all of these scenarios, the Udall amendment would hamstring the executive branch from reacting quickly. In modern warfare, time is of the essence. The War Powers Resolution explicitly recognizes the reality that administrations may need to respond quickly and with flexibility.

This amendment could even constrain our military from acting to prevent an imminent attack. As written, it appears to suggest they must absorb the attack, take the attack first before defending themselves. And even then, for how long would they be allowed to conduct retaliatory strikes? Completely absurd. Totally dangerous.

Let's take an example. Iran attacks Israel. No timely response from the United States, especially if Congress happens to be on recess. Iran attacks American citizens. The President's hands would be tied. This is never how the American Presidency has worked, for a very good reason.

So I would ask my colleagues to stop obsessing about Donald Trump for a moment and think about a scenario involving a future or past President. Hypothetically, then, would it be appropriate for Congress to tie a President's hands with legislation preventing military action to defend NATO allies from a Russian attack without explicit congressional approval? If conflict came in August and the United States and its NATO allies didn't act decisively, frontline states could be gobbled up before Congress could even convene to consider an AUMF.

The Udall amendment would represent a huge departure from the basic flexibility that Presidents in both parties have always had to take immediate military steps, short of a full-scale war, to respond to immediate crises.

This ploy is being advertised as some kind of courageous reassertion by Congress of our constitutional authority, but it is nothing of the sort. It is a departure from our constitutional traditions and norms.

Nobody is talking about a full-scale war with Iran—not the President; not the administration. Heaven forbid, if that situation were to arrive, consultation with Congress and widespread public support would, of course, be necessary. The Udall amendment is something completely different. It defines self-defense in a laughably narrow way and then in all other situations pro-

poses that President Trump should be stripped of the basic powers of his office unless Democrats in Congress write him a permission slip. I don't think so.

This would be a terrible idea at any moment, let alone as Iran is escalating its violence and searching for any sign of American weakness.

So I would ask my colleagues: Do not embolden Iran. Do not weaken our deterrence. Do not undermine our diplomacy. Do not tie the hands of our military commanders. Reject this dangerous mistake when we vote on the Udall amendment tomorrow.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1790, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1790) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 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:

McConnell (for Inhofe) modified amendment No. 764, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Romney) amendment No. 861 (to amendment No. 764), to provide that funds authorized by the Act are available for the defense of the Armed Forces and United States citizens against attack by foreign hostile forces.

McConnell amendment No. 862 (to amendment No. 861), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 863 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 764), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 864 (to amendment No. 863), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Armed Services, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 865, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 866 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 865), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 867 (to amendment No. 866), of a perfecting nature.

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

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for noon today be at 11:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

S. 1790

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as the leader and I announced yesterday, we have an agreement in place to vote on passage of the Defense authorization bill today and then on an amendment to the bill tomorrow, led by Senators UDALL, KAIN, MERKLEY, MURPHY, PAUL, and LEE, to accommodate all Senators who wish to vote. That is why we are doing it tomorrow. If the Udall amendment is passed, it would be adopted to the Defense authorization bill even though the vote occurs afterward.

I want to thank the leader for understanding our position that the Senate ought to vote on this important amendment, which in essence would prohibit funds for hostilities with Iran without an affirmative authorization from Congress. Congress gets to approve or disapprove wars, period. It is crucial for the Senate and Congress as a whole to examine potential conflicts and to exercise our authority in matters of war and peace.

Let's start with the facts. Ever since President Trump withdrew from the Iran nuclear deal, our two countries have been on a path toward conflict. For the past month, we have been locked in a cycle of escalating tensions with Iran. Iran attacked a tanker in the Gulf region and shot down a U.S. surveillance drone. The U.S. Government has responded to both provocations, and the President reportedly considered and then pulled back on a military strike.

The American people are worried—and rightly so—that even if the President isn't eager for war, he may bumble us into one. Small provocations in the Middle East can often spin out of control. Our country has learned that the hard way. When the President is surrounded by hawkish advisers like John Bolton and Secretary Pompeo, the danger is even more acute.

So while the majority leader says that "no one is talking about war," that is only true until the folks do start talking about war, and by then, the chance to clarify that this President requires congressional authorization before engaging in major hostilities may have passed us by.

And this not talking about war? Well, the President said he was 10 minutes away from major provocation, if the reports are correct. It would have been on Iranian soil, three missile bases. And the President at one point said, in effect: We will smash Iran, blow it to smithereens—or something to that effect. People are talking about war. This President is.

Even though it is plainly written in the Constitution that the legislature alone, not the Executive, has the power to declare war, the Trump administration is already signaling that it doesn't need Congress. The President and his team are playing up links between al-Qaida and Iran, potentially setting the stage for them to claim legal authority under the sweeping 2001 authorization of military force to strike Iran without congressional approval.

The President himself, asked if he believes he has the authority to initiate military action against Iran without first going to Congress, replied, "I do." He continued, "I do like keeping Congress abreast, but I don't have to do it legally."

So when it comes to a potential war with Iran, Mr. President Trump, yes, you do. You do. You do.

The Founding Fathers—our greatest wisdom in this country—worried about housing war powers in the executive branch for precisely this reason.

As James Madison wrote to Jefferson, who was not there when they were writing the Constitution—he was plenipotentiary to France—here is what Madison wrote to Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the Legislature.

That is Madison, who put more into this Constitution than anyone else.

Let me read it again. It is clear as a bell. Madison wrote to Jefferson:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly, with studied care, vested the question of war to the Legislature. there were ever a President who fits that description, it is Donald Trump.

The Framers worried about an overreaching Executive waging unilateral war. My colleagues know well that we haven't had an overreaching Executive like the one we have now for quite some time, if ever. So if it comes to it, we should expect the President to challenge Congress's war powers. He has basically already told us that he would.

So my colleagues should vote to strengthen our ability to oversee this President's strategy with Iran. That is what the bipartisan Udall amendment would do—nothing more. There has been some fearmongering about how the amendment might tie the hands of our military. It would not. It is explicitly written that in no way should it be construed to prevent the U.S. military from responding to an act of aggression or from acting in self-defense.

It is high time that Congress reestablish itself as this Nation's decider of war and peace. We have been content too long to let the Executive take all of the initiatives and responsibility for military action abroad. The American people are weary of the endless conflicts in the Middle East and the loss of American lives and American treasure.

The Udall amendment would mark the beginning of Congress reasserting its constitutional powers. I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes tomorrow.

G20 ECONOMIC SUMMIT

Mr. President, President Trump has arrived at the G20 economic summit in Japan before traveling for a state visit in South Korea. Already, the President has managed to insult our long-standing allies, including Germany and Japan, the host nation.

Rather than undermining our alliances, here are two important things the President should do at the G20:

First, Russia and Vladimir Putin. When President Trump sits down with the Russian President, he must send an unmistakable warning that the United States will not tolerate foreign interference in our elections in 2020. President Trump has no excuse. The Mueller report, FBI Director Wray, virtually our entire intelligence community concluded that Russia was guilty of interfering in our elections and that 2020 would be the next big show.

President Trump has a responsibility to defend the United States. By directly challenging Putin, he will send a signal not merely to Putin but to all of our adversaries that interfering with our election is unacceptable and that they will pay a price—a strong price—for trying.

Second, China and President Xi. Now that trade negotiations between our countries seemed to have stalled, there is a chance to put them back on track. For that to happen, the President must remain strong. He cannot go soft now and accept a bad deal that falls short of reforming China's rapacious economic policies—cyber espionage, forced technology transfers, state-sponsorship, and, worst of all, denial of market access.

President Trump, you know it. We have talked about it. You have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to reform China's economic relations with the world and put American businesses and American workers on a level playing field. Stay tough. Don't give in. Make sure Huawei cannot come to the United States and we cannot supply it. Enough with the criticism for our allies. Aim it at our adversaries, China and Russia, and you will have a much better chance of making the G20 a success for American interests.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

S. 1790

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, tomorrow morning the Senate will vote on whether to disarm our troops as they face a growing campaign of Iranian aggression in the Middle East. Tomorrow morning the Senate will vote on whether to empower the Ayatollahs as they continue to rampage across the Middle East, attacking U.S. aircraft, attacking ships in the high seas, threatening our troops in Iraq, Syria,

Afghanistan, Bahrain, Qatar, and elsewhere. That is because we will be voting tomorrow morning on an amendment that says, very simply: "No funds may be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran, against the Armed Forces of Iran, or in the territory of Iran, except pursuant to an Act or a joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing such hostilities."

That amendment is simple—I would say simple-minded—but it is simply an act of appeasement against the Ayatollahs who are currently conducting attacks against the United States and our interests on a regular and growing basis.

Let's just take a case in point. The earlier version of this amendment included no exception—no exception whatsoever—for our troops to defend themselves against an attack by Iran. You might say that is a careless omission. I would, however, say that even the fact that it was changed after I pointed out that omission just goes to show you that the root of this amendment is Trump derangement syndrome.

It does have an exception now. Let's look at that: "Nothing can be construed to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend"—to defend—"against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces."

What does that mean? What does it mean to defend against an attack? I don't know. I am not sure. If an F-15 pilot is shot upon in international airspace, I guess he can deploy countermeasures—chaff—to disrupt the missile. Can he shoot back? Can he shoot back at the Iranian missile battery that shot at him?

Let's say our troops who are garrisoned in places like Iraq and Syria have incoming mortar fire by an Iranian proxy militia. I guess they can duck and cover in a concrete bunker. I guess that is defense. Can they use counterbattery fire to shoot back at that mortar firing position? I don't know. I don't know. Can they? Beats me.

We have thousands of troops stationed at Al Udeid Air Base, the main airbase from which we conducted operations against the Islamic State. Let's say they have a missile coming in. I guess they can use a patriot missile defense system to shoot that missile down. Can they fire back at the missile battery that shot that missile, which has many more to fire? I don't know. Can they? It seems like offense to me. Maybe it is defense.

Let's take a page from history. In 1988, Ronald Reagan authorized one of the largest naval engagements since World War II in response to the exact kinds of attacks against commercial shipping and the U.S. Navy on the high seas that we have seen from Iran in the last 2 weeks. However, that operation didn't commence for 4 days; it was 4 days after a U.S. Navy frigate hit one of the Iranian mines before we struck

back. Is that in defense against an Iranian attack? It doesn't seem that it would be, to me. I don't know.

What we are debating here is how many lawyers can dance on a head of a pin when our soldiers are in harm's way. They need to know that when they are shot upon, they can fire back, and they can eliminate that threat without any politician in Washington or any lawyer at the Department of Defense looking over their shoulders and second-guessing them. That is not what they get from this amendment, though.

Consider also the consequences. Many of the speakers today will say this is about deescalating tension in the Middle East—deescalating. Who is escalating it? Who is the one firing on American aircraft? Not Donald Trump. Who is interfering with the freedom of navigation on the high seas? It is not Donald Trump; it is the Ayatollahs. They are the ones who have manufactured this crisis because they know that the United States is on the strategic offensive and that we have the initiative against Iran for the first time in 40 years.

This amendment, though, would only embolden them to continue the campaign of the last 2 months of gradually marching up the escalatory ladder. It started with threats. Then it was an attack on foreign vessels at port. Then it was an attack on foreign vessels on the high seas. Then it was an attack on an unmanned American aircraft. Next it might be an attack on a manned American aircraft or a U.S. ship. And the message we are going to send is this: Well, the Congress thinks that the Commander in Chief and, for that matter, battalion commanders on the ground don't have the authority and the flexibility they need to take the appropriate response, as opposed to cowering inside bunkers and using some defensive measures.

Let's also think about the language of this amendment. A lot of people are going to come here and say that this is about our constitutional authority, and we need to reclaim our authority, and we have given up too much authority to the executive branch. In a lot of instances I would agree with that. But this amendment is only about Iran. It is not about China; it is not about Russia—even though this President has forced our Democratic friends to finally discover their inner cold warrior.

This is only about Iran in the context of Iran shooting down an American aircraft just a week ago. What better message can you send that this is not about our constitutional authority? This is about trying to tie the hands of a Commander in Chief whom they dislike at a time when a foreign nation is targeting our aircraft and our service members.

This amendment would be a loud and clear message to the Ayatollahs that we will not strike back, that they can escalate even further, and that there will not be swift reprisal. If there is, it

will generate intense controversy in our country. It will only embolden them further to march up that escalatory ladder and threaten American lives. It is a hall pass for Iranian escalation, really.

Look, there is no amendment, no bill, no paper resolution that can change the iron laws of geopolitics. Strength deters and weakness provokes. Wars are not won by paper resolutions. They are won by iron resolution. But this amendment embodies irresolution, weakness, timidity, diffidence.

This Congress on a good day can rename a post office, and that is only after months and months of debate about the post office. Are you telling me—are you telling me that if Iran shoots down an American aircraft or continues attacks on partners like the United Arab Emirates, then this Congress in a matter of minutes and hours is going to pass a resolution authorizing the use of force to respond to that kind of provocation? Please.

There is a reason we have one Commander in Chief, not 535 commanders in chief—or, I say again, 535 battalion commanders, the level at which some of these decisions ought to be made.

Think about the kind of debates we have, the know-nothings we have seen here in Washington over the last couple of weeks who would say: Oh, it wasn't Iran that made the attack. OK, it was Iran, but maybe it wasn't authorized by the senior leadership of Iran. OK, it was authorized, but it didn't really do that much damage. It is kind of like the old line of: It is not my dog. He didn't bite you. You kicked him first. That is what that debate would devolve into while our troops are at risk.

This is a terrible amendment. It will do nothing but put more American lives at risk and imperil our interests and our partners throughout the region.

I know that the minority leader said earlier that he is worried about the President stumbling into war. He said it last week on TV too. Nations don't bumble into war.

He and others have raised the prospect of endless wars, the wars we have been fighting in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are long, and we have made lots of twists and turns on the way. But let's not forget that many of the Democrats in this Chamber voted to authorize those wars. We didn't bumble into those. They were considered, deliberate decisions.

President Trump said just a couple days ago that he is not talking about that kind of operation. He is talking about the exact kind of thing that Ronald Reagan did in response to Iranian aggression on the high seas. That didn't start a war. Ronald Reagan didn't start a war when he retaliated against Libya for acts of terrorism against our troops in 1986. Donald Trump didn't start a war when he struck Syria in 2017 and 2018 for gassing its own people. If you want a

Democratic example, Bill Clinton didn't start a war when he struck Iraq in 1993 and 1998.

This amendment purports to tie the hands of the Commander in Chief relative only to a single nation, which just so happens to be the nation that just shot down an American aircraft. The only result that will come of this amendment passing will be to embolden the Ayatollahs and make more likely that which its proponents wish to avoid.

I urge all of my colleagues to see the reality of this amendment and to vote no tomorrow morning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise to speak in favor of the Udall amendment, a bipartisan amendment. I am a proud Virginian. The Commonwealth of Virginia is more connected to the Nation's military service by our map, by the installations in Virginia, and by personnel than any other State, and I am the proud father of a U.S. marine. I love serving with my colleagues on the Foreign Relations and Armed Services Committees.

Tomorrow we are going to vote on a question that cannot be more fundamental: Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without coming to Congress for authorization? That is the question. Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without coming to Congress for authorization? This is a matter of the utmost importance for this body, for the American public, and for our troops. Americans, especially those who have family serving in the military—and many of those families have seen their loved ones deployed multiple times since 2001—want to know what each Senator thinks about this important question.

The Udall amendment to the NDAA, which has bipartisan sponsorship, is very simple. It states that no funds will be expended in a war with Iran or on Iranian soil, except in self-defense, unless Congress takes the affirmative step of specifically authorizing those hostilities.

My colleague from Arkansas talked about lawyers dancing on the head of a pin, as he tried to suggest that "self-defense" was not a clearly defined term. I think most of my colleagues who read the language will believe it is incredibly clear; the President has the power to defend the Nation from an imminent attack or ongoing attack without asking anyone for permission. That is specifically stated in our resolution. There is no confusion about it. There is no attempt to limit a President's power to defend the Nation, but if the President decides that we need to go on an offensive war against a sovereign country, this amendment would suggest he could not do so unless he came to Congress.

Those voting for this amendment will say clearly that no war should be started unless Congress votes for it. Those

opposing the amendment will say clearly that it is OK for the President to go to war against Iran whenever and for whatever reason on his own.

Those who vote against this amendment, in my view, are essentially giving the President a green light to wage war anywhere, against anyone, on his own. That is not a power we should give to this President or any President. I believe, in my 6½ years in the Senate, there has only been one vote as serious as the vote we will cast tomorrow morning.

Why do I believe war should not be started without a vote of Congress? The Democratic leader outlined the clear constitutional history in this regard. It is Congress that declares war. The history and context of that provision in article I is very plain. At that time in the world, in 1787, war was for the Executive. It was for the King, the Emperor, the Monarch, the Sultan, the Pope, but the drafters of the American Constitution wanted to dramatically change history in this Nation and say that war for the United States of America should be a matter not for the Executive to declare but, instead, for the peoples' elected legislative body to declare.

Once declared, the President, as Commander in Chief, needs to be that commander. I agree with my colleague from Arkansas. You don't need 535 commanders, but it is not up to the President to initiate or declare war, constitutionally; it is clearly up to Congress.

The reason we should vote for this isn't just because of the constitutional provision. It is the value that underlies the constitutional provision. Why did the Framers put the question of war as a matter for the legislature? A congressional debate and vote is what is necessary for the American public and Congress to fully understand the stakes, to explain to the public and educate them why war is necessary—and especially, and most importantly, the debate and the vote by the legislative body is the evidence of support for the mission that American troops deserve if they are going to be sent into harm's way where they could be killed or injured or see their friends killed or injured.

I believe it is the height of public immorality. There could be nothing more immoral in the public space than to order our troops into harm's way, where they would risk injury and death if Congress is unwilling to consider and debate and vote on whether a war is in the national interest.

You have to go risk your life, you have to go be with others and potentially be injured or killed, but we don't want to have to vote on it. Could anything be more immoral than that? What this provision does is say that if we are going to be at war with Iran and, by example, with any nation, Congress should have the guts and backbone to come and cast a vote before we order our troops into harm's way.

Why is this debate important right now? We are in the middle of discussing the National Defense Authorizing Act, but I also want to point out two very important things, one an event and one a statement that may have occurred in the last week, since many of us took the floor last Wednesday.

On Thursday, a week ago today, President Trump ordered and then called off a missile strike against Iranian territory that would have been the start of a shooting war with Iran. It was a missile strike in the sovereign nation of Iran. Our military and all reasonable people understood that would have been responded to. So we were within 10 minutes. President Trump says he called off the strike on Iran with 10 minutes to spare.

We were within 10 minutes a week ago of being in a war.

The second thing that happened is, a few days ago, the President gave an exclusive interview to *The Hill* saying: "I do not need congressional approval to strike Iran."

Congress is irrelevant. I don't need to come to Congress.

The quote that the Democratic leader mentioned a few minutes earlier was that the President said: It is good to keep them abreast of the situation, but I am not legally required to do so.

How insulting for the President, who pledged at his inauguration to defend and support the Constitution, to not recognize that the article I branch—and we are the article I branch for a reason—must not be just consulted with but be on board with any wars expressed by their vote.

This President is holding the article I branch in contempt. Will we grovel and accept that monumental disrespect or will we insist that the President must follow the law?

For the record, I believe a war with Iran would be a colossal mistake. Its cause would be laid significantly at our feet by the United States and the Trump administration tearing up a diplomatic deal, tearing it up over the objections or over the recommendations of the then-Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, National Security Advisor, Joint Chiefs of Staff, tearing it up over the recommendations of our allies, tearing it up over the recommendations of the International Atomic Energy Agency. We tore up a diplomatic deal and raised the risk of an unnecessary war; that would be catastrophic.

After 18 years of two wars in the Middle East, where we still have troops deployed, we should not be fomenting, encouraging, blundering toward rushing into a third war in the Middle East. It would suck lives and resources away from more pressing priorities of our citizens. Boggling ourselves down in another war against a smaller, weaker, faraway nation would divert our attention from acting firmly to counter our chief competitor, China.

Furthermore, another war in the Middle East would represent another

broken promise by this President. Just as he said that Mexico would pay for a border wall, just as he promised not to cut the Medicaid Program before supporting an effort to eliminate the Affordable Care Act and slash Medicaid, the President criticized the Iraq war as a candidate and said he would end wars in the Middle East, not expand or multiply them.

I will give my colleague from Arkansas credit for having the courage of his convictions to come and state what he has stated on the floor. There are some in this body and the administration who have argued that a war with Iran would be a good thing or a necessary thing. Some have even suggested it would be an easy win. Let them come to the floor of the Senate and make that argument in full view of the American public and let Congress debate and vote and then be held accountable for decisions we make about war.

As I conclude, I thank the majority leader for scheduling this vote, and I especially thank the Democratic leader for firmly insisting it must be held. Tomorrow we will all speak to a fundamental question about war but also about this institution: Can President Trump take us to war with Iran without even coming to Congress?

I hope my colleagues will stand for the Constitution. We must provide assurance to our citizens, and we especially must provide assurance to our troops, that war is not based on the whim of this President or the whim of any President, but it must be based instead on a clear vote, following public debate by the peoples' elected legislature.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Madam President, I very much appreciate being joined on the floor by Senator KAINE and Senator MERKLEY. I appreciate Senator KAINE's very wise words. I think all of us are here standing up to hold the President accountable. We believe he should follow and obey the Constitution.

I rise to call upon this body to do its duty, to assume its constitutional responsibility, and to make it clear that the President cannot wage war against Iran without congressional authorization. Whether you are in favor of giving the President that authorization or whether, like me, you are opposed, everyone in this Chamber should vote in favor of our bipartisan amendment because a vote in favor is a vote to fulfill our sworn oath to uphold the Constitution. I appreciate that at long last the Senate will finally have this debate; that we will finally take this vote because these matters of war and peace are among the most consequential responsibilities that fall to Congress. These are the hard votes, and we must step up to take them.

I am proud to partner with Senators KAINE, PAUL, MERKLEY, DURBIN, MURPHY, and LEE in this effort and to call

upon Congress to meet its constitutional responsibilities. After years of abdicating our responsibilities on matters of war, this entire body must stand up and show that we will not roll over for an unauthorized, unconstitutional war. We must pass this amendment.

This dangerous course with Iran began last May when the President unilaterally withdrew from the Iran nuclear agreement. This hard-fought diplomatic achievement denied Iran the nuclear material required to even begin work on a nuclear weapon. Since this administration turned away from diplomacy and resorted to a maximum pressure campaign to box in Iran, the risk of war has steadily risen.

Just last week, we were 10 minutes away from a strike on Iran, 10 minutes from a nightmare of escalation in the Gulf. This week, the President threatened Iran. I am quoting his words here—these are pretty strong words—he said to Iran: I threaten them with “great and overwhelming force,” and he used the word “obliteration.” That is not diplomacy; that is a drumbeat toward war without congressional approval.

Tensions are the highest they have been in many years, and the risk of a costly miscalculation grows day by day. Just days ago, the President falsely claimed he does not need congressional approval to launch strikes against Iran. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution could not be clearer: It is Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to “declare war.” This is not a close call; the Founders placed this responsibility squarely on our shoulders. The consequences of going to war are profound, so this decision rests with the people’s representatives, not one person—not even one President. It is time that Congress confront the administration’s rejection of diplomacy.

Our amendment prohibits funding for military action against Iran without congressional authorization. It does not prohibit war altogether; it prohibits an unconstitutional war, a war that has not been authorized by Congress.

We must be accountable to the American people and to our men and women in uniform whose lives would be on the line. Our soldiers are brave enough to face the danger of war. If my friends in this Chamber believe they should, we should be brave enough to be held accountable for that decision.

Some have claimed that this amendment would prohibit the President from defending the United States against attack. That is wrong. It is completely false. This amendment and the War Powers Act incorporated as part of it allow the United States to act in self-defense. I am going to quote from our amendment. The amendment clearly states that it shall not be interpreted “to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or

its Armed Forces.” It is explicit. The United States may defend itself against an attack by Iran. The claim that the military’s hands would be tied in the event of an emergency has no basis and cannot be used as an excuse to vote against the amendment.

I am heartened, as Senator Kaine was and as I am sure Senator Merkley will also say, that Senator McConnell and the Republican leadership will finally allow debate and a vote on this amendment. This is what the American people want and deserve.

Over the years, Democratic and Republican Presidents alike have steadily encroached upon Congress’s war powers, and Congress has tacitly allowed that encroachment.

I stood up to President Obama when he threatened to attack Syria without authorization, and so did many of my colleagues. I am standing up again now because the administration’s reckless actions have brought us to the precipice of war.

Mr. Bolton and Secretary Pompeo’s failed strategy has led directly to these heightened tensions, to the brink of war, with no benefits to show for their tactics.

The administration has reimposed and tightened sanctions on Iran three times—sanctions we agreed not to impose if Iran agreed not to develop nuclear capabilities.

Secretary Pompeo placed a dozen conditions on negotiations and then withdrew them.

Just this week, at the same time that Advisor Bolton claims we will talk with Iran anytime, the President sanctions the lead diplomat in Iran and tweets out his threat of obliteration, shutting the door on any diplomatic overtures.

This ping-pong diplomacy, manufactured crisis, and go-it-alone posture further diminish our world’s standing and credibility. None of the signatories to the Iran nuclear agreement, including our closest allies, backs us in what we are doing.

This reckless diplomacy is dangerously reminiscent of the run-up to war with Iraq. But any war with Iran, with its military capability, proxy forces, and a population of 80 million living in a geographically perilous region, would be more disastrous and more costly than Iraq. Yet we continue to march up to the brink.

According to the President’s tweet last week, he stopped a strike against Iran that he had already ordered because he learned at the last minute that 150 lives were at stake. I know I am not alone in being deeply alarmed at this decisionmaking—national security decisionmaking process. I know Members on both sides of the aisle share my concerns.

We must assert our constitutional authority. We must tell the President and affirm to the American people that we will assume our constitutional responsibility. And we must do so now before, through miscalculation, mis-

take, or misjudgment, our Nation finds itself in yet another endless war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, our Founders recognize that no decision carries more consequences than the decision of whether to go to war. They were well familiar with the carnage of human lives and blood, injuries, and treasure that our initial war, the War of Independence, brought.

As we stand here several hundred years later, we recognize the wars in between; that more than 400,000 Americans died in World War II, that more than 50,000 Americans died in the Vietnam war, and that more than 4,000 Americans died in the war in Iraq. Those are just some indications of the enormous impacts and consequences of a decision to go to war.

It was an issue that the Founders struggled with in a republic: Where should this immense power rest? Should it rest with one individual—the President—or are the consequences too great to have the judgment of a single person carry the decision to its completion?

After intense debate, after many arguments, the Founders became very clear that this power should never rest in the hands of a single person; that it should not just be one body but two bodies—the House and the Senate—that should weigh in on the issue of war. The consequences being so profound, they could not leave it to the idiosyncrasies or the biases or the misjudgment of a single individual.

It was in fact one of the defining arguments about the difference between a King and a President. A King could make that decision, with often horrific consequences for the people of the kingdom, but not in the United States of America. This is why it is so deeply embedded in our Constitution. In Article I, section 8, under the enumerated powers of Congress, are simply the words “to declare war.” That power is vested in Congress, not the President.

The Founders weighed in time and again about this. Turning to James Madison, the father of the Constitution, he commented:

The constitution supposes, what the History of all Governments demonstrates, that the Executive is the branch of power most interested in war, and most prone to it. It has accordingly with studied care vested the question of war to the Legislature.

He went on:

The power to declare war, including the power of judging the causes of war, is fully and exclusively vested in the legislature.

Madison continues:

The executive has no right, in any case, to decide the question, whether there is or not cause for declaring war.

He was the father of our Constitution. That led to this document that vests the power to declare war with Congress, not the President.

George Washington, the father of our Nation, said: “The constitution vests

the power of declaring war in Congress; therefore no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until they shall have deliberated upon the subject and authorized such a measure.”

This was the Commander in Chief speaking. This was the hero of the American Revolution speaking. This was the man most trusted to be the first President of the United States, who was to steer the course and make sure the Presidency did not become a kingship. And his conclusion? “[T]herefore, no offensive expedition of importance can be undertaken until after they shall have . . . authorized such a measure.”

This is enormously at odds with the vision our colleague from Arkansas presented on the floor—dismissing the role of Congress, dismissing the Constitution, and instead saying let the President, as Commander in Chief, do what he will. That was not the vision.

George Mason of Virginia—if you stand in DC, you can look across the Potomac River, and you can see a monument to George Mason. He made notes of the Constitutional Convention. George Mason remarked that he was “against giving the power of war to the executive” because the President “is not safely to be trusted with it.” That was the point, that no one individual, no matter how wise—not even a George Washington—could be trusted with this decision. George Washington, as President, agreed with this completely, that despite his expertise as a Commander in Chief, it was not to be the judgment of one person.

Thomas Jefferson, one of the most brilliant minds our country has ever produced, commented: “We have already given in example”—referring to the Constitution—“one effectual check to the dog of war by transferring the power of letting him”—the dog of war—“loose from the Executive to the Legislative.” So he is commenting on the Constitution and saying: We have put a check on the dog of war by putting that power in the legislative body, not the executive.

Jefferson became President. Did he change his mind when he became President? His initial quote I gave you was from 1789, but later he became President of the United States. And what did he think then? He thought the same exact thing, just as President Washington had. Jefferson said: “Considering that Congress alone is constitutionally invested with the power of changing our condition from peace to war, I have thought it my duty to await their authority for using force in any degree which could be avoided”—his message to Congress in 1805.

He recognized what the Constitution did. Are we going to recognize the constitutional vision? Now, there may be folks in this Chamber who simply disagree with the Founders and say that Congress is too complicated, that the power to declare war and the power to go to war should be vested solely in the Commander in Chief. Well, then, come

and present a constitutional amendment on the floor of the U.S. Senate. You took an oath to the Constitution of the United States, and that oath says that power rests in this body.

If you want to change the Constitution, then, have the guts to come down here and propose doing so. I guarantee it will be roundly defeated because the wisdom of our Founders that it is a mistake to give the power of war to one person is wise and does stand the test of time.

Alexander Hamilton noted the following:

The Congress shall have the power to declare war; the plain meaning of which is, that it is the peculiar and exclusive duty of Congress, when the Nation is at peace, to change that state into a state of war. . . .

Alexander Hamilton said: “exclusive duty of Congress” and “the plain meaning” of our Constitution.

This viewpoint continued to carry the day far into the future. Abraham Lincoln was speaking in 1848, and he said:

The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making powers to Congress, was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons.

Those are Lincoln’s words.

Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This, our [Constitutional] Convention understood to be the most oppressive of all Kingly oppressions and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no one man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us.

In the words of these great leaders of America—Washington, Hamilton, Mason, President Lincoln—all point to the power and wisdom of putting the decision about war with the House and the Senate, not the President.

Now, this resolution before us says: Mr. President, there is no foregoing authorization to go to war against Iran. It says: Any authorization has to come after debate specifically on that topic.

And why is this? Because we have heard from the administration that they want to use the 2001 authorization for the use of military force, an authorization specifically about al-Qaida in Afghanistan, to authorize war with Iran. Nothing could be more convoluted, and that is why we need to stand up and say: That is wrong. That is not right.

Anyone who pays even just a modicum of attention knows that the resolution to take on al-Qaida in Afghanistan is very different than going to war against the Shiite Islam nation of Iran. But we have to say it because the administration has been trying to prepare the case saying this 2001 resolution somehow has a link that authorizes war.

And why are we so concerned at this moment? Why are we here on the floor in this debate? Well, it is because the drums of war are beating loudly. It is because the President has deployed the *Abraham Lincoln* carrier strike force to the Gulf to threaten Iran. It is because

the President has preplaced a squadron of B-52 bombers to be ready to bomb Iran. Why are we so concerned—when we have a National Security Advisor who has said that no agreement can ever be reached with Iran and we have to bomb them and when we have a Secretary of State who says that no one has ever stood up to Iran and we have to teach them a lesson, or words to that effect, and we have a President who has proceeded to say that any attack will be met by great and overwhelming force?

So envision these preplaced forces. And, in fact, the President has declared that a section of the Iranian military, the Revolutionary Guard is a terrorist force. Add all of that up, and the President is talking about looking for a trigger to apply great and overwhelming force. That is why we are here. A response in proportion to defend a direct attack on the United States is authorized by the War Powers Act. That is honored by the resolution that is before us, the Udall-Paul-Kaine amendment that is before us. That is honored. But as for the use of great and overwhelming force the President is threatening, that is war. That has to come before this body.

The President went on and said: “In some areas, overwhelming will mean obliteration.” So for any attack? And we have heard the Secretary of State say if there is a Shiite force in Iraq that we can tie to Shiites in Iran and some communication, we will consider that an attack by Iran—looking for a trigger to go to war. And the President has said any act will be met with overwhelming force.

Not under our Constitution. You want that authority? You come here. You want to change the Constitution? Then, come here. I say this to my fellow Senators: Do you want to change the Constitution? Bring your amendment to the floor of the Senate to change the Constitution.

The Constitution speaks clearly. The President has no authority to apply overwhelming force or obliterating force and conduct a war against Iran. Make your case here or honor the Constitution.

We are in a troubling and difficult time, and I would like to see every Member of the Senate down here talking to each other about this. That is the gravity of the consequences. It is not a few Members who are here to stand up for our Constitution and the vision of wisdom in our Constitution. This is the time, before there is that trigger in which the President responds with great and overwhelming force and before he responds with obliterating force. Now is the time to pass this amendment put together in a bipartisan fashion that lays out the fundamental requirements of our Constitution and the fundamental requirements embraced by the Founders and the fundamental requirements repeated and honored by the greatest Presidents who have ever served our Nation.

Let us not allow the vision of our Constitution to be shredded. Let us honor our responsibility when we took an oath in office to defend it, and let us honor the wisdom of holding that debate on the floor, should the President ever ask us for such authorization to go to war against Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

MILITARY WIDOW'S TAX ELIMINATION ACT

Mr. JONES. Madam President, I approach to say how much I appreciate my colleagues, Senator MERKLEY and Senator KAINE, for their eloquent thoughts on an important issue of our time.

Let me also now rise in total frustration on a completely different issue—but total frustration, bafflement, and, quite frankly, just angry and disappointed in this body. I am angry because we have turned our back for over 40 years on military families. We have turned our backs on the widows of the very men and women who have given their lives to protect this country, to uphold our democratic ideals, and to make possible the very work that we are doing in the Senate and the very work that we, as Members of the Senate and as Members of Congress, are charged to do every day on behalf of the American people and, particularly, on behalf of veterans and their families.

I am talking about this body's refusal to bring up the Military Widow's Tax Elimination Act—the refusal to bring it up for a single floor vote—despite the fact that we have 75 cosponsors—75 cosponsors of this bill. It is the most bipartisan legislation, except for the robocall bill, which everybody could agree on. And we can't get that to a vote in this body?

Where have we gone wrong? Where have the rules of the body—the rules that the leadership of both parties are operating under—gone off the rails that we can't bring this to a vote, to just get a simple up-or-down vote, on a process that is ripe, and that is the NDAA?

In my 17 or 18 months—I forget how many now in this body—I have had some frustrating moments, as I know all of my colleagues who have been here for a long time have had a lot of frustrating moments. We have shut down this government three times since I have been a U.S. Senator—three times. I have seen disaster relief held up for 5 or 6 months, with farmers and others needing that relief, needing that money, needing that help, and we held it up for political reasons so that someone can score a point because everything is seen through the eyes of a political gamesmanship. That is how we are operating today, and it is incredibly frustrating for those of us who want to make sure we go forward with things when we see bipartisan efforts.

In this situation, we are talking about military families who are getting ripped off by us. You can call it

the government if you want to, but at the end of the day, they are getting ripped off by every single Member of this body and the House of Representatives, and they have had it. It is no wonder that the American people think that Congress and Washington, in general, are just completely broken. If we can't fight for military widows and spouses, who are having their survivor benefits shortchanged, then, for whom are we going to fight? For whom are we going to stand up?

We always talk about standing up for the least of these. I have people wanting to stand up for the immigrants coming across the border. I have people wanting to stand up for corporations and to make sure that they are paying their share of the taxes, as opposed to overburden. I have people standing up for people every day, but here we have a chance to stand up for people who have given their lives for this country, and we are not doing it. We are not doing it.

If we can't do the right thing on this, with 75 cosponsors, how can we possibly tackle immigration reform? How can we possibly tackle healthcare reform or education in this country if we can't come to some agreement and one simple vote when we have 75 cosponsors?

How can we not fight for people like Cathy Milford, a retired schoolteacher from Mobile, AL, whose husband passed away unexpectedly 25 years ago from a service-connected illness just months after his retirement from the Coast Guard? Instead of a long and happy retirement together, Cathy has been fighting to right this wrong for all of the some 65,000 military spouses who are hurt by the current law.

During a recent visit here to Capitol Hill, she said: "Every time I talk about this"—and she is up here a lot talking about elimination of the military widow's tax—"I have to dig up my husband and bury him all over again."

Just think about that. Let that just sink in a minute: a military widow, one of many of thousands, who had to return to lobby Congress year after year at their own expense, saying she feels like she is digging up and burying her husband all over again when she has to talk about this issue. That is not only sad, it is shameful.

We have tried to pass this legislation. The Senate has, in some form, repeatedly over the last almost 20 years. It has been included in the NDAA numerous times only to be stripped out during conference. It has been included without an immediate pay-for to offset the budget issues that everybody kind of falls back on and hangs their hat on. We don't have that immediate pay-for.

It has passed before. It has passed before in this body with bipartisan support, but for some reason it just hasn't been able to get across the finish line. For some reason, even though the bill today has historic levels of cosponsorship, we are not allowed to bring it up for a vote as an amendment to this

NDAA. Frankly, that is the frustration.

It is a frustration that goes beyond just this bill. It is a frustration that we can't debate on the floor of the Senate anymore. We can't bring up amendments. I think we have brought up one amendment in legislation in this Congress because of the rule between the leader and minority leader. There are all these deals going on. You have to have a Republican package; you have to have a Democratic package; you have to play one against the other. We are constantly playing the political games in this body when we should be working for the American people as a whole.

That is why today, at this time, I am once again calling for our bill to eliminate the military widow's tax, to pass it or get it voted on and bring it to the floor and pass it on unanimous consent. Every one of my colleagues would do well to remember that we are the ones who should be fighting for these spouses. We are the ones. We are the only people they can turn to. This can't be fixed on the streets. It can't be fixed at the Department of Defense or the Veterans' Administration. The legislature, the Congress of the United States, is the only one that can do it, and we are the ones who should be fighting for these military spouses, the widows and widowers whose loved ones gave their lives for this country, the widows and widowers whose lives are forever changed because of their family's selfless service to this country.

Caring for military families has long been part of the foundation of our government. In President Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address, he spoke in no uncertain terms on this obligation. In the midst of the Civil War, he addressed a nation that had sustained unimaginable loss—unimaginable loss—in order to preserve the Union we so cherish.

The country was then more divided than it ever had been, and God help us if it ever gets that divided again, but the values Lincoln asserted during that speech were so fundamental that, even at war with itself, it could agree on the importance.

He said this:

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan, to do all which we may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

Let me repeat that critical phrase today: "... to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow, and his orphan."

This is the promise we have made to those who raise their hand in service to our Nation. This is the contract, the solemn contract, that we have made to those who have raised their hand in service to this Nation; that we will honor and support them and care for their families if tragedy occurs.

President Lincoln was assassinated just over a month after he issued this appeal, but the weight of his words still resonate today. In some ways, on this issue, they resonate more because in those days you could count on the fact that the legislative body, the Congress of the United States, heeded those words and took care of those families.

It has been 154 years since President Lincoln spoke those words; yet the Government of the United States, the Members of this body, the Members of the House have yet to fulfill that promise. It has been 154 years, and we still get caught up in the deals that are made as to what gets on the floor and what does not get on the floor, the political deals that have to be jockeyed, where we give and take, and it is one over the other. We need to fix that today.

We need to fix it in a broader sense and let this body get back to its real work and be the great deliberative body it is supposed to be. We are not doing that, but that is a different issue for a different time.

Let's start today and stand up and exhibit just a fraction, a small fraction—a small, small fraction—of the courage that these military spouses did on our behalf. Let's let our actions speak louder than words simply ever could. Let's put the issue to rest and give these widows some peace.

Let us do our duty.

It was Atticus Finch, who told the jury in "To Kill a Mockingbird," as he closed out, knowing what the outcome was going to be, as I do here—knowing what the outcome was going to be, it was Atticus Finch, who said: "In the name of God, do your duty."

I say that to this body. I say that to the leadership. In the name of God, let's do our duty to these people. Let's get behind the political deals and let's do our duty, once and for all.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT
NO. 269

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to set aside the pending amendment; that amendment No. 269 be considered and agreed to; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, reserving the right, let me share a story of something that happened.

The timing sometimes happens at very inconvenient times, but on September 7, 2011, I was in my State of Oklahoma and was in Collinsville, OK. Probably not many people have been to Collinsville, OK, but I have. It was the home of a really beloved individual and family. The family was the Chris Horton family, and the wife was Jane Horton.

I remember it so well. This was September 7, 2011. I was talking to the group, and I was telling them that I

was preparing to make one of my regular trips to Afghanistan. At that time, I was not chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, but I was a high-ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In the audience was Jane Horton, and Jane said: Well, if you are going to go over there, why don't you go by and see my husband, Chris? I said: I will do it. I found out his whereabouts, exactly where he was. I got over there to look up Chris, only to find out that 2 days after I made that commitment in Collinsville, OK, that Chris died in action. Chris died in action. I was the one who had to call on and share that with his wife, Jane Horton.

In fact, after that, we hired Jane to go around and help us with the widows' benefits. Starting at that time, I was the leader and continued to be a leader long before the Senator from Alabama was into this, and he will agree that I was actively working on this issue.

I support and will continue to support the permanent fix. It is going to happen. We are going to do it. In fact, I am the first Senate Armed Services chairman to cosponsor this legislation.

Mr. JONES mentioned there were 75 people who cosponsored it. That is I. I was on there on the initial legislation and will continue to be and will always be, and that reflects my commitment to the permanent fix.

Here is the problem we have. There has to be a fix, but it can't be on this bill. The reason it can't be on this bill is because it has a mandatory spending that has no offset, and there is not an exception to this on the bill. This is part of the agreement in bringing the bill up.

Now, what we can do is go ahead and do what is necessary with this very popular cause, and I will be standing with the Senator from Alabama to make sure this happens.

Let's assume that were not true, that we couldn't do it under the rules. Under the rules, there is another rule that, if there is an objection to any amendments coming up, then I, as the chairman of the committee, if the party objecting is not here, I have to offer his objection.

There is an objection to this, and I will therefore object and be in the strongest position of helping this to become a reality. I owe it not just to the many people I know but also to the family whom I just referred to from Collinsville.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. JONES. I thank my friend and colleague Chairman INHOFE, and let me say I know where he has been on this issue. I have seen his speeches from years past on this issue, and I do appreciate that, and I appreciate the fact that he is a cosponsor.

I also know this has been put on an NDAA before in this body without a pay-for, without an offset, in order to have a sense of the Senate and to go on

record, and that is what I think we should do. I understand we are not there this year for whatever reason. I still believe, in part, that it is a procedural issue that ought to be put aside for this, but that is an argument for another day.

I do so very much appreciate the chairman's remarks. I have enjoyed working with him, Senator REED, and others on the NDAA. That has been an effort. I told folks back home and across the country where I have spoken that I wish people could have actually seen what happened in that markup behind closed doors and the bipartisan-ship that the chairman showed and the other Senators showed. I wish people could have seen it because we don't get to see it. I don't think if we opened it up that we would have seen it, but it was remarkable.

So we are where we are in the Senate. I understand that, and I knew that coming in here. I will simply say this. The House of Representatives is also going to take up the NDAA, and I hope my colleagues on the other side of the wonderful Capitol are listening. Put it in. It is not in the committee bill. Put it in. Bring it to conference because, if it gets to conference, I am going to continue to have this in this NDAA, and let's get this done, once and for all.

Thank you, Chairman INHOFE, and thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS
BILLS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if I might, let me describe where things are in the state of play with respect to the supplemental appropriations bill that deals with the border.

I know the situation at our border has been at a crisis point for weeks now. Our agencies are stretched to care for the overwhelming flow of migrants; yet we have House Democrats continuing to play politics with the border funding bill.

Again, to describe the state of play, we had a request from the President 7 weeks ago for \$4.5 billion to address this humanitarian crisis we are having at our southern border, and the Democrats didn't act on it. They described it as a manufactured crisis. When I say the Democrats, I am talking about the House Democrats, which is where most spending bills originate.

After the House failed to act and failed to respond to the President's request for emergency funding, the Senate decided to act. So the Senate Appropriations Committee took up and passed a bipartisan bill out of the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to 1—not a vote that you see all that often around here these days.

So that bill was reported out to the floor. In the meantime, the House Democrats decided that maybe it wasn't, after all, a manufactured crisis and perhaps they needed to act. So

they picked up a bill—a partisan bill—and passed it out of the House of Representatives on a party-line basis, after which the Senate voted on its bill, the bill I mentioned that was reported out of the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to 1, and it came to the floor where it passed yesterday by a vote of 84 to 8—84 to 8 in the U.S. Senate.

Well, just to demonstrate that the bipartisan bill passed by the Senate is the vehicle that should move forward and should go to the President for his signature, the President had indicated he would veto the House-passed bill, but we took it up. We took up the House-passed bill yesterday on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We had a vote on it. It got 37 votes here on the floor of the Senate—not nearly enough, obviously, to pass the Senate. Of course, it was going to meet a certain veto by the President even if it had.

That being said, there were 37 votes for the House-passed partisan bill that came out of the House of Representatives. Here on the floor of the Senate, there were 84 votes for the bipartisan bill produced by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Where we are right now is that was sent back to the House. The House, frankly, should just take up that bill and pass it. We know for certain the President would sign it. Again, I think it demonstrates a body of work that reflects the will of both sides, Republicans and Democrats—certainly in the Senate—to get a vote of 30 to 1 out of the Appropriations Committee or 84 to 8 on the floor of the Senate. You had to have a high level of bipartisan cooperation.

That bill to address the humanitarian crisis at our border is awaiting action by the House of Representatives. All they have to do is simply pick it up and pass it and send it to the President, where it will be signed into law, and we will get much needed resources and much needed manpower to the southern border, where they desperately need it. I hope that will be the case.

We are being told that the House is now considering sending yet another partisan bill over here to the Senate. The only thing I can tell you is, if you want to get legislation signed into law by the President of the United States that actually does deliver and put the much needed assistance on the ground that is desperately needed on the southern border, the only surefire way to do that right now is for the House to pick up the Senate-passed bill, which passed here with 84 votes, pass it, and send it to the President, where it will be signed into law, and that \$4.5 billion will be on its way to the border to assist with all the needs down there that are currently being unmet. I hope that can happen yet today.

That is the state of play with respect to the supplemental appropriations bill.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY

Mr. President, I think 2019 is going to go down in history for the Democratic Party. It has been a notable year.

While the Democratic Party has obviously always been left of center, I never expected to see the Democratic Party running so far to the left of the American people or wholeheartedly embracing socialism and a government takeover of a large part of the economy.

The socialist fantasies are rapidly piling up: a government takeover of healthcare, a government takeover of the energy sector, government-funded college, a government writeoff of all student loan debts, guaranteed income, government-guaranteed housing, and on and on. So what is wrong with that? After all, those proposals sound really nice—free healthcare, free college, the government guaranteeing you an income. Here is the problem: Providing all that stuff is going to cost a lot of money, an almost inconceivable amount of money. Somebody is going to have to pay. You might say that obviously the government is going to pay, but the government has to get its money from somewhere. Here is the catch: The government gets its money from the taxpayers.

Can't we just take that money from rich taxpayers? If you talk to some of the socialist Democrats offering these proposals, they will talk about making the rich pay. The rich are their favorite funding mechanism. Want free college? We just get the rich to pay for it. Want free healthcare? We can just get the rich to pay for it. There is just one big problem with that: There aren't enough rich people in America to even come close to paying for Democrats' socialist fantasies. Deep down, Democrats know it, which is why they tend to get very foggy when pressed on the details of how they are going to pay for some of their plans.

Take the junior Senator from Vermont's proposal of a government takeover of America's health insurance, the so-called Medicare for All plan. A conservative estimate puts the cost of that plan at \$32 trillion over 10 years. The current cost is likely much higher since the Senator from Vermont's most recent plan for government-run healthcare also includes long-term care, which we all know is an incredibly expensive benefit.

The Senator from Vermont did release a list of proposed tax hikes to pay for his proposal. The only problem is, the tax hikes wouldn't come close to covering the estimated cost of his original Medicare for All plan, much less the cost of his new expanded Medicare fantasy.

Of course, as staggering as the costs of Medicare for All would be—more money than the Federal Government spent in the last 8 years combined on everything—they pale in comparison to the cost of the so-called Green New Deal. An initial estimate found that the Green New Deal would cost some-

where between \$51 trillion and \$93 trillion over 10 years—\$93 trillion. That is more money than the 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world. That is right. You could take the entire economic output of every country in the world in 2017, and it still might not pay for the Democrats' socialist fantasy. Once you realize that, it is pretty obvious that the Green New Deal is not a plan that could be paid for by taxing the rich.

How about taxing every household making more than \$200,000 a year at a 100-percent rate for 10 years? That wouldn't even get you close to \$93 trillion. How about taxing every household making more than \$100,000 at a 100-percent rate for 10 years? That wouldn't get you anywhere close to \$93 trillion. Like Medicare for All, the Green New Deal would be paid for on the backs of working families.

I have talked a lot about the money aspect of Democrats' socialist proposals, and that is one of the major problems with these proposals—they sound nice until you realize that actually nothing is really free. Working Americans are still going to be paying for the cost of all those programs through new and much higher taxes.

But that is far from the only problem with some of the Democrats' socialist fantasies. Leaving aside the fact that the Federal Government is not exactly known for its efficiency or bringing programs in on time and on budget, there is the tremendous cost Americans will pay in the loss of their freedom, the loss of their autonomy. Americans are used to choices and being able to make their own decisions. It is part of our heritage. Those are freedoms we cherish. That is not the way things work under socialism.

Nowhere is this more obvious than with Medicare for All. Medicare for All doesn't give Americans health insurance options; it takes them away. Are you part of the majority of Americans who are happy with their current healthcare? Too bad. Medicare for All eliminates all private insurance plans and replaces them with a single, government-run, one-size-fits-all plan. Under Medicare for All, private health insurance plans as we know them would actually be illegal. If you are not happy with the government-run plan, too bad; you won't have any other choices.

The treatment options would also be limited by what the government decides. If the government doesn't want to pay for a particular cancer treatment, for example, as has happened in other countries with socialized medicine, you will be out of luck.

Then, of course, there are the long wait times that are the hallmark of socialized medicine. Imagine having to wait months for diagnostic imaging or needed surgery or having to stand by while your spouse or child is forced to wait months for care. That is the kind of thing Americans would have to look forward to under Medicare for All.

Margaret Thatcher once said that the problem with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money. Once Democrats have taken every dollar they can from the rich to pay for their socialist fantasies, they will come after the paychecks of ordinary Americans, who will face higher and higher taxes for fewer and fewer benefits and greatly reduced choices. Democrats' socialist dreams would quickly trap the American people in a nightmare.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, before I deliver comments on a bill that I am introducing, let me express my disappointment that the Senate will not be voting today on the amendment that Senator JONES and I have filed to eliminate the military widow's tax. This is a tremendous inequity, as is recognized by the fact that 75 of our colleagues have cosponsored our freestanding bill.

Nevertheless, I am heartened by the commitment and the compassion of the Senate Armed Services Committee chairman, Senator INHOFE, who has indicated his receptivity to dealing with this issue but in a different way on a different bill. I hope that today is just a temporary setback and that we can see this bill taken up as a freestanding bill by the entire Senate.

Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be received and appropriately referred.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2018 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

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

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

(The remarks of Mrs. MURRAY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2008 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mrs. MURRAY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

S. 1790

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise to explain the context in which I will vote for the Romney amendment.

First, I am grateful for Senator ROMNEY's substantive contributions and his collegiality as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee.

The plain text of the amendment states the obvious—that funds authorized by the NDAA may be used to ensure the ability of our Armed Forces to defend themselves and U.S. citizens.

I believe every Member of this body certainly shares the fundamental un-

derstanding that our Armed Forces must have the ability to defend themselves and our citizens against foreign enemies. Indeed, the purpose of the NDAA is to provide the authorizations that are necessary to ensure the Department of Defense is in a position to defend the United States and our citizens.

In my opinion, in that respect, this amendment is not necessary. For anyone who argues that the Romney language is somehow necessary because of the Udall amendment that we will be voting on tomorrow, I say reread the Udall amendment. It includes an explicit exception for self-defense.

I am concerned that this administration will seek to twist the Romney amendment into something that is completely unrecognizable, something that we are not voting on today, and something that has no basis in law. As a legal matter, the amendment does nothing more than to explicitly provide the authority to use funds under the act to ensure this ability.

Let me be clear. This amendment does nothing more than that. Either implicitly or explicitly, it does not authorize the use of military force. Let me repeat. It is not an AUMF. An explicit authorization would have to come to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee following serious and substantive engagement by the executive branch.

It is no secret that there are some in this administration who are eager to engage militarily with Iran. This week, the President himself argued that he does not have to go to Congress to seek authorization. But those who don't want to completely bypass our congressional prerogative will be grasping at any purported source of authority that could justify, in their minds, that Congress has authorized these actions.

Look no further than the Secretary of State, who is purportedly pushing the bogus legal theory that the 2001 AUMF, which Congress passed in the wake of 9/11, somehow provides authority to use force against Iran. Apparently, Secretary Pompeo is not dissuaded by the facts. The plain language of the 2001 AUMF does not extend to Iran. Congress did not intend for the 2001 AUMF to cover Iran, and neither Republican nor Democratic Presidents who have operated pursuant to this AUMF have claimed such authority.

Against this backdrop and a President who has evaded Congress in unprecedented and unlawful ways, we must make crystal clear that the Romney amendment cannot be abused by those in this administration who appear to be desperate to build a case that the President has all of the authority he needs to take us into war with Iran.

We cannot leave anything up to chance when it comes to the choice of whether we send our sons and daughters into war. I believe we should be having a serious conversation about our use of military force and about

what constitutes self-defense and attacks on our allies.

I am pleased that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has previously committed to holding these hearings, and I believe we should commence with hearings with multiple stakeholders, including the administration itself. Previous administrations have sent up representatives to explain to Congress their rationale for war or to explain the type of authorizations they are seeking. We should demand nothing less from this administration.

I support the amendment, and I look forward to continuing appropriate oversight over the executive branch's pursuit of military action around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I thank my esteemed friend and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee for his kind words in support of my amendment.

As we debate the Defense Authorization Act today, one of our most pressing concerns is how we deter Iran from further escalating its attacks. The decisions we make on this bill will have a direct bearing on the options the President and the military have available to keep our military, our citizens, and our friends and allies safe.

The Senate is poised to vote soon on my amendment, No. 861. It would reaffirm what has long been American policy. Our military is authorized to defend itself and to protect our citizens. Enacting this amendment makes it clear to our military, as well as to any potential adversary, that America does not shrink in the face of attack. This is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else; it is a statement of continued commitment to our national defense.

Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war, but also under the Constitution, the President can defend against attacks and can respond in an appropriate manner to an attack that has been made.

As we all know, my esteemed colleague from New Mexico, Senator UDALL, has proposed an amendment on a related topic which I wish to briefly address.

We do not need the Udall amendment to tell us what the Constitution already demands—that Congress alone can declare war. His amendment is clearly intended to limit the President in some other ways that he has not yet explained to this body.

As it is written, the Udall amendment would dramatically limit the existing authority that the Constitution provides to the President to respond to Iran. It would prevent the President

from defending U.S. citizens, U.S. interests, and our allies. This is not only my opinion; it is the carefully considered conclusion of the U.S. Department of Defense.

In its letter on June 26 to Chairman INHOFE, it states this, referring to the Udall amendment:

“The Department strongly opposes this amendment . . . At a time when Iran is engaging in escalating military provocation . . . this amendment could embolden Iran to further provocations.”

Tying the President's hands in some undefined way in the midst of the current crisis is misguided, dangerous, and surely sends the wrong message to both Iran and to our allies.

Last week, the Iranians continued their provocative escalation in the Middle East. After weeks of buildup in which Iran attacked six commercial ships, and its proxies bombed an oil pipeline and launched a rocket into a commercial Saudi Arabian airport, Iran shot down an American drone over international waters.

The Udall amendment raises serious questions about how the military could respond to these attacks after the fact. Could we fire on the missile launcher that downed our drone? Could we sink one of their small, outboard motor vessels that attached the mines to the ships that were attacked?

Imagine for a moment that in the future, another American aircraft, perhaps one that is manned by an American pilot, were to be shot down by an Iranian rocket. It is possible that the Udall amendment would limit our military's options to subsequently respond to such an outrage.

I don't pretend to know whether Iran will continue its pattern of aggression, but I do know that when bad actors think they can escape consequence for malevolent acts, such acts are more likely to occur in the future.

I am glad that Senator UDALL's revised amendment concedes the broad point that our military has the inherent right of self-defense. But in the case of a rocket hitting one of our planes, the President should not have his hands tied in responding after such an attack in an appropriate manner.

Note also that while the Udall amendment provides for the military to defend itself from attack, it does not provide for the defense of our citizens. Iran could take this as an invitation to attack Americans abroad.

Further, it would prohibit our military from defending or responding to an attack by Iran on our Iraqi partners so long as it didn't directly hit American troops. Passing the Udall amendment would effectively give a green light to Iranian forces to carry out attacks in Iraq so long as they don't attack U.S. forces.

If Iran were to attack Israel, one of our NATO allies, the Udall amendment would not allow the President to respond.

Finally, by carving out Iranian territory, the Udall amendment would po-

tentially prevent us from pursuing and taking out terrorists who seek refuge in Iran.

I oppose the Udall amendment not because I want to go to war with Iran or rush to respond without carefully evaluating our long-term strategy to counter Iranian aggression. I know no one who wants to go to war with Iran.

I fully concur with my many Senate colleagues who desire to reassert the constitutional role of Congress in declaring war. But to engage in this effort now, and in an undefined way, and then to attach that to Iran when Iran has just shot down an American aircraft would send a terrible message to the Ayatollahs and to the world.

I mean, think about it. Iran shoots down an American aircraft, and what does the U.S. Senate rush to do? It rushes to vote in some undefined way to restrict military consequence. That is simply unthinkable.

My amendment is not about Iran. It does not even mention Iran. My amendment is about affirming the constitutional authorities that any President must have to properly protect and defend this Nation.

As the Department of Defense maintains, the President of the United States must always have the option of responding to attacks by Iran or anyone else at a time and place of our choosing—today and in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

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 bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 764, as modified, to S. 1790, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 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.

James M. Inhofe, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, Deb Fischer, Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, John Thune, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, John Boozman.

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. 764, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, as modified, to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, 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.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 186 Leg.]

YEAS—87

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

NAYS—7

Booker	Markey	Wyden
Klobuchar	Merkley	
Lee	Paul	

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Rounds	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 7.

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

AMENDMENT NOS. 864, 863, AND 862 WITHDRAWN

Under the previous order, amendment Nos. 864, 863, and 862 are withdrawn.

The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 861

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes, equally divided.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am voting in favor of the Romney amendment, No. 861, because it does nothing more than restate the longstanding principle that the Armed Forces of the United States have the ability to defend themselves and citizens of the United States from foreign attack. The

amendment does not constitute an authorization to use military force, nor is there anything in the amendment that confers any new authority on the President.

As Senator ROMNEY, the author of the amendment, stated on the floor a half-hour ago, “[t]his [amendment] is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. . . . Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I will reassert the same thing I just heard from the minority leader. I appreciate his words.

This amendment would reaffirm a basic principle. The United States has the right to defend itself and our citizens when attacked. It asserts what has always been a bedrock constitutional principle. This is not an AUMF. It is not an authorization for the use of military force.

Passing my amendment today would send a strong signal to our adversaries that we will defend ourselves if our interests, our people, our military, our allies are threatened and attacked.

My amendment is something that I believe everyone in this body can and should support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to recommit and the amendments pending thereto fall.

All postcloture time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment (No. 861), offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, on behalf of the Senator from Utah, Mr. ROMNEY.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 90, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Capito	Crapo
Baldwin	Cardin	Cruz
Barrasso	Carper	Daines
Blackburn	Casey	Durbin
Blumenthal	Cassidy	Enzi
Blunt	Collins	Ernst
Boozman	Cooms	Feinstein
Braun	Cornyn	Fischer
Brown	Cortez Masto	Gardner
Burr	Cotton	Graham
Cantwell	Cramer	Grassley

Hassan	Menendez	Scott (FL)
Hawley	Merkley	Scott (SC)
Heinrich	Moran	Shaheen
Hoeven	Murkowski	Shelby
Hyde-Smith	Murphy	Sinema
Inhofe	Murray	Smith
Isakson	Paul	Stabenow
Johnson	Perdue	Sullivan
Jones	Peters	Tester
Kaine	Portman	Thune
Kennedy	Reed	Tillis
King	Risch	Toomey
Klobuchar	Roberts	Udall
Lankford	Romney	Van Hollen
Lee	Rosen	Warner
Manchin	Rubio	Whitehouse
Markey	Sasse	Wicker
McConnell	Schatz	Wyden
McSally	Schumer	Young

NAYS—4

Booker
Duckworth

Hirono
Leahy

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet
Gillibrand

Harris
Rounds

Sanders
Warren

The amendment (No. 861) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the NDAA.

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

S. 1790

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the importance of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 legislation that authorizes \$750 billion for defense, consistent with the administration's budget request and the National Defense Strategy Commission report.

The NDAA is a critical piece of legislation. It supports our Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform, and provides for the defense of our Nation. Among its notable provisions, the bill supports a 3.1-percent pay increase for the members of our armed services, the largest in nearly a decade and very much deserved by the men and women in uniform who protect us.

It establishes a Space Force and ensures that America retains its leadership in this critical domain. It opens the way for significant investments in new weapons systems, such as hypersonic missiles and directed energy weapons along with missile defense and cyber security capabilities. It also responds to concerns about family housing across the Department of Defense.

Importantly, the bill continues to provide for the modernization of our nuclear forces. This legislation fully authorizes fiscal year 2020 spending on our nuclear deterrent, including support for all three legs of the Nation's nuclear triad. It also fully authorizes the warhead life extension programs at the Department of Energy.

I want to highlight a couple of amendments I worked on and are included in the legislation relative to modernizing our nuclear triad. One of the amendments that has been included requires that the Air Force and the National Nuclear Security Administration report to Congress on the de-

velopment of the next intercontinental ballistic missile and the W87-1, which is a modified warhead that will be placed on the new ICBM for decades to come.

It is vital that the Air Force's missile development program, known as the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent, GBSD, be synchronized with the W87-1 warhead so that a decade from now, we have a complete new weapons system that is ready for deployment. My amendment will help ensure that the deployment will happen on schedule and avoid unnecessary delays in that development.

The other amendment highlights the importance of our Nation's ICBM force and demonstrates how ICBMs enhance deterrence as a part of the triad. ICBMs provide the most prompt and most dispersed segment of our nuclear forces, and they magnify the deterrent power of our nuclear triad.

I commend my colleagues for their support of these amendments, which is a strong statement of the continuing importance of the ICBM and the need to ensure that it is modernized along with the rest of our nuclear forces in order to keep us safe.

The bill is also critically important for military activities in my home State of North Dakota. Specifically, we worked to secure a number of provisions to support the missions at the Minot Air Force Base, which is home to two of the three legs of the nuclear triad. Importantly, the NDAA authorizes funding for B-52s, including the procurement of new engines. As a member of the Senate Defense Appropriations Committee, I have worked to authorize and appropriate money for new engines which will help modernize the B-52 and extend its life for years to come.

The NDAA also advances replacement of the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that provide security for the missile fields, and it supports the construction of a new helicopter facility at Minot to house the Huey replacement. It also makes a strong commitment to the Long-Range Stand Off, LRSO, Program that will provide a new nuclear cruise missile for the B-52, as well as continuing to advance the investments in GBSD.

The bill also supports priorities at Grand Forks Air Force Base, which is home to the Global Hawk, which provides important intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities for the Air Force. In fact, it was the Navy version of the Global Hawk which was recently shot down in the Strait of Hormuz by Iran.

The bill authorizes more than \$240 million for the Global Hawk Program and more than \$115 million for the Battlefield Airborne Communications Node that is carried on the Global Hawk Block 20 aircraft. These investments in the Global Hawk have been a priority because the Global Hawk BACN system is urgently needed to provide communications support for operations around the world.

Finally, I would like to emphasize support for items that some of my colleagues put forward that I think are critically important both for my State and for the Nation as a whole.

I am pleased to cosponsor an amendment from Senator GRAHAM that commits us over the next decade to building our capacity to produce plutonium pits. We must build up this capacity so we can extend the life of our nuclear stockpile and preserve our nuclear deterrent in the future.

I also cosponsored an amendment from Senator MURKOWSKI that requires the Defense Department to report on Russian and Chinese activities in the Arctic, which is an area of the world where we need to build up our capabilities in the coming years.

I would similarly express my support for Senator HAWLEY's amendment that requires a report from our military commanders on their ability to deter aggressive actions from Russia and China. I hope that can be included on this legislation as well.

The bill also includes an important provision from Senator KLOBUCHAR that I cosponsored to help ensure that the children of National Guard and Reserve servicemembers have access to additional support services in schools.

I cosponsored a provision from Senator BALDWIN, who joins me on the floor today, that will protect veterans' benefits if and when they have to file for bankruptcy. I am pleased to cosponsor her amendment.

All of these items demonstrate just what a large undertaking the National Defense Authorization Act really is. It includes thousands of provisions and represents a lot of work from many Members in support of our military servicemembers and their families.

I look forward to passing the legislation today and moving it to conference and getting it enacted into law for our men and women in uniform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FOURTH OF JULY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am so grateful we had the opportunity to be on the floor this week and to have a discussion about our Nation's security and how we protect and preserve freedom. I have just a couple of thoughts that I wanted to bring forward as we begin to think about July 4th and Independence Day and how we commemorate that day and do honor to the heritage and the tradition of that day and of the freedoms that we enjoy.

I came across something this week that I think is just so pertinent to our discussions of this week as we focus on freedom. In 1826, a very feeble and old John Adams received a group of Quincy, MA, town leaders. They were seeking his help in planning an anniversary celebration of the Declaration of Independence. They wanted the former President to pen a toast that would be read at the event. Imagine their sur-

prise when what they got from John Adams was two words. The toast that he penned for them was simply this: "Independence forever." It is what we had fought for, what had been won, what people had desired, and their passion—independence.

Keeping that independence is indeed the task. I am certain they wanted something much more ambitious and eloquent, but they simply got the nugget of what centered him and what should center us.

In the Declaration, our Founding Fathers recognized that "Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes," but that true liberty could not thrive in the grasp of tyranny.

Today, freedom reveals itself in the lives and actions of every American, and it is our responsibility to preserve it on the battlefield and through our actions each and every single day.

With every confirmation of a district or a circuit court judge, we preserve an essential right guaranteed by the First Amendment—the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Earlier this month, I introduced a resolution supporting free speech on college campuses because it is beyond distressing to hear students and their professors argue that encouraging the open exchange of ideas amounts to an act of violence. Our Founding Fathers probably never dreamed they would hear of such a thing. This proud hostility toward diversity of thought should serve as a reminder that questions of freedom rarely remain settled.

Last week, famed economist Dr. Art Laffer, who is a beloved Tennessean, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The "father of supply-side economics" only became so because he was free to learn and apply the knowledge that he gained to his own groundbreaking work that led to the Laffer curve.

Looking beyond Washington, it is easy to see many more examples of freedom in action each and every day.

Every Tuesday, my friend and fellow Senator, LAMAR ALEXANDER, hosts "Tennessee Tuesday." This gives us an opportunity to meet with Tennesseans who have come to Washington. They are students, small businessmen, writers, and teachers. They have a host of talents that they share, and they have been allowed to invest in those talents.

Back home in Nashville, we enjoy the artistry of some of the world's most talented songwriters, singers, and producers. Guess what. In the United States of America, they do not have to go seek permission from any government official to write a song about a broken heart or any other act of injustice that they want to write that song about, sing that song about, or write that screenplay about.

The connections we form with each other—whether it be through art, song, or a conversation at a cash register—all run deep. The thoughts and emotions we experience when confronted

with provocative ideas are just as much a celebration of freedom as is a flag-raising ceremony or a fireworks display. This is why the very idea of censorship or a global standard of speech and association rouses immediate dissent.

We know that these collective understandings regarding a particular type of speech or behavior inevitably lead to collective insistence that the problems of the world could be resolved if only we could agree to compromise on the finer points of freedom. Those understandings assume that the intellectual comfort of the many simply must, just this once, override the ideas of the vocal minority.

As we prepare to leave Washington in anticipation of Independence Day, I would encourage my friends in Congress to challenge their own ideas of what freedom looks like. How do they exercise it and enjoy it every day? While John Adams probably never imagined a world of cable news and the comments sections, he provided us with the only context we need when confronted with the choice of preserving freedom or allowing it to slip away—his admonition: "Independence forever."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the 50th anniversary of a critical milestone in our Nation's march toward equality—the Stonewall uprising of June 28, 1969.

The Stonewall Inn, which opened in 1967 on Christopher Street in Greenwich Village in New York City, was one of many establishments in cities across this country that served as sanctuaries for members of the LGBTQ community from persecution by police and by society at large.

In the late 1960s, every State in America, save one, criminalized same-sex relationships. Many State and local governments also had harsh laws that restricted the ability of transgender people to express their identities, and LGBTQ people were prohibited from gathering socially. As a result, LGBTQ individuals in places like Stonewall Inn, where they gathered, were targeted frequently by law enforcement, including the New York City Police Department. However, by the late 1960s, LGBTQ individuals had already begun to stand up to police harassment, including at places like Cooper Do-nuts in Los Angeles in 1959, Compton's Cafeteria in San Francisco in 1966, and the Black Cat Tavern in Los Angeles in 1967.

In the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, the NYPD raided the Stonewall Inn and arrested several people, just as it had done repeatedly over the days, weeks, and months prior. But this night was different. A few brave individuals—particularly transgender women of color, like Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera—stood up and

fought back against this injustice. That night, they sparked an uprising against the NYPD with confrontations and protests at the Stonewall Inn and the surrounding area that lasted over the course of 6 days, until July 3, 1969.

The Stonewall uprising empowered thousands of LGBTQ individuals to emerge from shadows and to come out publicly as they stood up for their community the night of June 28, 1969, and beyond, putting their lives and their safety at risk.

Along with public protests in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, DC, and elsewhere, the Stonewall uprising became a catalyst for the LGBTQ civil rights movement to secure social and political equality and inspired the formation of many advocacy organizations.

A year later, members of the LGBTQ community commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall and reaffirmed the solidarity of the community by organizing the first Pride marches and events in New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Now, we remember and celebrate the Stonewall uprising every year in June as Pride Month.

Three years ago, President Obama declared the Stonewall Inn and its surrounding area a national monument, becoming the first national monument to commemorate the LGBTQ civil rights movement.

Last month, New York City announced that it would dedicate a monument honoring pioneering transgender activists and key leaders in the Stonewall uprising, including Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera. It would be the first public monument in the world honoring transgender women.

Just a few weeks ago, the NYPD Commissioner issued an official apology on behalf of the department stating: "The actions taken by the NYPD were wrong—plain and simple."

I was just a kid when the Stonewall uprising happened. I didn't hear about Stonewall on the news or even learn about it later in my history class. It wasn't until I was in college when, as a part of my own coming out process, I began to research the history of the gay rights movement and I learned more about the events at Stonewall, the people involved, and the movement that it created.

Five years after Stonewall, in 1974, Kathy Kozachenko became the first openly gay person elected to political office in the United States, winning a seat on the Ann Arbor City Council in Michigan. Three years later, in 1977, Harvey Milk was elected to the San Francisco City Council.

In 1986, I had the honor of winning election to the Dane County Board of Supervisors in Madison, WI. It was my first role in elected office, but I wasn't the first. In fact, I was the third openly gay person to serve on the Dane Coun-

ty Board. I was really fortunate to have role models who had come before me.

In 1998, I became the first openly gay person elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a nonincumbent, and, in 2012, I became the first out member of the LGBTQ community to be elected to the U.S. Senate in its history.

I remember my early years in public office when there were only about two dozen or so elected officials who were out across the country. We would meet on an annual basis to discuss how we could work together to exchange ideas about legislation that would advance equality, and we talked about how we would help to expand our numbers at the local, State, and national levels. I am proud to say that, today, there are more than 700 out LGBTQ people who are serving in elected office across the United States.

All of these public servants bring their unique life experiences to the job, and they give the LGBTQ community a seat at the table of our local, State, and Federal Governmental bodies. Perhaps just as importantly, each of these public servants is a role model for the next generation. This is important progress, but we are not there yet. We have more work to do, and we must keep fighting to move our country forward.

Members of the LGBTQ community continue to experience bias in policing and are still at significant risk of violence and discrimination. According to the annual hate crimes report, which is published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, LGBTQ individuals and, particularly, LGBTQ individuals of color continue to be the target of bias-motivated violence, but efforts to address this violence may be hindered by a continued lack of trust in law enforcement. At least 100 transgender people, primarily women of color, have been murdered in the United States since the beginning of 2015.

No LGBTQ person in the United States should have to live in fear of being the target of violence. In a majority of States in this country, LGBTQ Americans can still be fired, evicted from their homes, or denied services because of who they are or whom they love. Because there is no explicit, uniform Federal law protecting LGBTQ people from discrimination in education, employment, housing, credit, and more, too many Americans are at the mercy of an inadequate patchwork of State and local laws.

The House took a historic step forward last month when it passed the Equality Act. It is time for the Senate to do the same so that all LGBTQ Americans, no matter where they live, can finally have the freedom of full equality.

This week, I introduced a Senate resolution to honor the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising. It is the first resolution in the U.S. Senate to recognize the story of Stonewall. This reso-

lution commends the bravery, solidarity, and resiliency of the LGBTQ community in the face of violence and discrimination, both past and present. It also condemns violence and discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community and recommit to securing justice, equality, and well-being for LGBTQ people in our country. Stonewall is the story of those who came before us and let their voices be heard—of those who bravely stood up and spoke out so that others would not feel compelled to live in silence or invisibly or in secrecy.

When we look back at the Stonewall uprising and the activism that grew out of that moment, even the most basic progress seemed as if it would take a revolution to achieve—so we had one. We should be proud of the enormous progress that we have made over the last 50 years. Let us remain inspired by the courage of this story, the story of Stonewall.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

S. 1790

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, Congress has no greater responsibility than providing for a strong national defense and keeping American citizens safe.

The National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation to be considered by the U.S. Senate. It authorizes the weapons systems, programs, and resources that support the men and women who serve our country in the Armed Forces. For decades, it has been approved with strong, bipartisan support.

In my home State of Colorado, our military installations, including Fort Carson, the Air Force Academy, and Buckley, Peterson, and Schriever Air Force Bases, are on the cutting edge of readiness in protecting our national security. This legislation is foundational to their mission, their work, and our show of support for the military.

I thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their bipartisan leadership on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the floor. The tremendous responsibility of providing for national defense cannot be overstated, and they have handled the process with respect and the seriousness that it deserves. The security of the United States should always be more important than any partisan politics, and I appreciate their commitment that they have placed on national defense above all else.

I also thank my colleagues for their bipartisan work on the National Defense Authorization Act. In working with them, I was able to achieve a number of great victories in amendments for Colorado and the Nation as well.

Senator SCHATZ and I have a bipartisan amendment that will improve the public alert system and allow military communities access to clean and safe drinking water, which was another

amendment that we were able to work on.

I was able to work with Senator TOOMEY and Senator VAN HOLLEN—Senators from both sides of the aisle—to impose sanctions on the murderous North Korean regime.

We will also vote today to support a bipartisan effort that I authored that will encourage the U.S. Congress to stand with the people of Hong Kong and their democratic values while we urge Hong Kong's authorities to permanently withdraw their flawed extradition bill and support human rights in Hong Kong.

When one family member serves our country in uniform, the entire family serves. This legislation supports military families in Colorado and all over the world. It provides the largest pay increase in a decade for troops, and it continues to support military spouses. The NDAA addresses the challenges that servicemembers and their families face when they live in privatized housing, and it expands resources to address the PFAS water contamination in many of our military communities. This is an issue of life and health, and it matters greatly to the people of Colorado. I was pleased to work with my colleagues to continue addressing PFAS contamination.

Of course, in Colorado, we are proud to play a very key role in defending the United States. These installations that I talked about are critical to national security and supporting our operations in space. I am thrilled that this year's NDAA authorizes the U.S. Space Force so that the United States can remain a global leader in space and not fall behind China or any other foreign competitor.

Almost everything in today's age relies on space technology—telecommunications, GPS, transportation logistics, precision agriculture, and, of course, the U.S. military. Establishing the U.S. Space Force will better organize the military to handle space operations and will put all military members who work in the space domain under the same organizational umbrella. Colorado is home to the North American Aerospace Defense Command and the U.S. Northern Command, and it is the legacy home of the Air Force Space Command. As we establish the U.S. Space Force, Colorado is uniquely positioned to continue its support of our Nation's military operations in space and the mission set that space involves.

We cannot risk falling behind our foreign competitors in the second space age. In order to guarantee the safety and security of American citizens, we must maintain our leadership in space operations and defense. I urge my colleagues to support the National Defense Authorization Act, which supports defense operations across the globe and the brave women and men who serve in the U.S. military. I will always fight to protect and grow the presence of the U.S. military in Colo-

rado and work to ensure that these bases, which are essential to both national security and Colorado communities, remain strong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator JACK REED be given such time as we shall consume prior to the vote that will take place.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, the Senate will vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

Throughout the last week and a half, we have debated the legislation here on the Senate floor in a fair process. I thank my colleagues who have supported this bill and have helped to make a better bill through the amendment process. While I would have liked to have had more open amendments—and Senator REED and I both wanted to have more amendments on the floor—we knew that there was a problem and that we could not do that.

We are pleased that we will at least be able to clear the 93 amendments that we added on yesterday as part of the bipartisan substitute amendment in the manager's package. These include the annual Intelligence Authorization Act, the Maritime Administration Authorization and Enhancement Act, and the Fentanyl Sanctions Act.

Ultimately, the job of the NDAA is to make tough choices about where we want to invest our resources. We put our resources where they matter—in taking care of our people, in implementing the national defense strategy, and in applying recommendations from the NDS Strategy Commission Report. This is something we have used as a blueprint, and it has been very successful in taking us through this process.

Everyone agrees there are things that are going to have to happen in order to rebuild our military. That is why our top line is \$750 billion. Without that, we can't achieve the goals that we all know are necessary. It also must happen as soon as possible. We can't delay on this bill.

We still have more work to be done on the NDAA. We need to conference it. The Conference Committee can sometimes take a little bit of time. We know that is going to be done for us. We know that we want to get this thing done by our deadline, which would be October 1.

In the month of July, we have to do a lot of other things. We have to do annual appropriations bills. We have to do the budget deal. So these are some of our most important responsibilities.

We have to get them done, and here is why: Things are happening right now.

Two days ago, MSG Michael B. Riley of Heilbronn, Germany, and SGT James G. Johnston of Trumansburg, NY, lost their lives in Afghanistan while engaged in combat operations. It was tragic.

Their service and sacrifice is a reminder of why this bill is so important. We have to make sure our troops have the very best of everything, and we are in the process of getting there with this bill.

Our prayers are with Master Sergeant Riley's and Sergeant Johnston's families and loved ones. We will never forget their service or their sacrifice that they made, reminding us that freedom is not free.

There is no doubt in my mind that the NDAA we are about to pass will give our troops what they need, make American families safer, and enable to us stand up for democratic values around the world.

Let me single out and thank publicly the next speaker, the ranking member, Senator REED, for being a great partner in this. We stayed together on this. We had areas where we disagreed, but we got around those, we got things done, and the end result is a very good one.

I know Senator REED is going to want to recognize, as I do, the significance of the staff we worked with and why that is so important. Of course, we want to make sure people know—you know, Senator REED and I get a lot of credit for doing a lot of stuff that other people do. We truly appreciate these people.

Let me list some of them. First of all, John Bonsell and Liz King from my staff and from Senator REED's staff. They are the ones who really got involved in this, and we feel, without them, it would have been almost impossible—along with other people.

We had John Wason, Tom Goffus, Stephanie Barna, Diem Salmon, Greg Lilly, Marta Hernandez, Jennie Wright, Adam Barker, Augusta Binns-Berkey, Al Edwards, Jackie Kerber, Sean O'Keefe, Tony Pankuch, Brad Patout, Jason Potter, J.R. Riordan, Katie Sutton, Eric Trager, Dustin Walker, Otis Winkler, Gwyneth Woolwine, Katie Magnus, Arthur Tellis, Leah Brewer, Debbie Chiarello, Gary Howard, Tyler Wilkinson, John Bryant, Patty-Jane Geller, Baher Iskander, Keri-Lyn Michalke, Jacqueline Modestett, and Soleil Sykes.

I have a few more so just relax for a minute.

I think the others are actually from the minority side, and I am sure Senator REED is going to be recognizing them.

From my personal staff, Luke Holland, Andrew Forbes, Leacy Burke, Don Archer, Kyle Stewart, and Bryan Brody.

Lastly, from the floor staff, that is Laura Dove, Robert Duncan, Chris Tuck, Tony Hanagan, Katherine Kilroy, Brian Canfield, Abigail Baker, and Megan Mercer.

All these people worked hard. They are all a part of this team, and it certainly goes far beyond just Senator REED and myself.

I yield the floor to Senator REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join Chairman INHOFE in support of the fiscal year 2020 Defense authorization bill. I thank the chairman for his great bipartisan leadership, thoughtful, sensible, and delivering what I think is an excellent piece of legislation.

It was based on thorough hearings, discussions, and debate on both sides of the aisle, and it came out of the committee with strong bipartisan support. I hope it enjoys that support on final passage.

As the chairman indicated, the bill provides for many different aspects that are necessary to our national defense. It provides a pay raise for the men and women of our Armed Forces who do so much for us. It includes over 30 provisions to address the privatized military housing crisis. It authorizes military construction in almost every State in this country. It provides funding and authorities for our military personnel on the frontlines and for those who are back in the United States building the ships and the tanks and advancing the technologies we need for the future fight.

This bill also contains numerous amendments from many of my colleagues, again, on both sides of the aisle, on other issues of great importance, such as the Intelligence Authorization Act, the authorization of the Maritime Administration, and provisions addressing the fentanyl crisis and the dangers of PFOS-PFAS in our water.

There are numerous provisions here that go beyond the narrow definition of the defense establishment. They are bipartisan, and they are strongly supported by both sides of the aisle.

Again, let me thank Senator INHOFE for his leadership. It made a great difference in terms of his approach to this important legislation.

Finally, I would like to thank the committee staff. Particularly, I would like to thank the majority staff and their staff director, John Bonsell. He did a superb job—they did. “Diligence,” “professionalism,” and “bipartisanship” were the watchwords of their efforts. I thank them for that.

Let me thank my staff. In particular, Jody Bennett, Carolyn Chuhta, Jon Clark, Jonathan Epstein, Jorie Feldman, Creighton Greene, Ozge Guzelsu, Gary Leeling, Kirk McConnell, Maggie McNamara, Bill Monahan, Mike Noblet, John Quirk, Arun Seraphin, Fiona Tomlin, and my staff director, Elizabeth King, who, with John Bonsell, did a superb job.

Let me thank the floor staff who have helped us over the last few days immensely.

I urge all of my colleagues to join the chairman and me in supporting this excellent legislation.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 764

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 764, as modified and amended.

The amendment (No. 764), as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the third time.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion is withdrawn.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Leg.]

YEAS—86

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

NAYS—8

Booker	Lee	Paul
Braun	Markey	Wyden
Klobuchar	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Rounds	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 8.

The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, as amended, is passed.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was passed.

(The bill, as modified, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the escalating tensions between the United States and Iran, my concern about the administration's current approach—a path that I am worried will lead us to war—and my support for the Udall amendment to the NDAA, which will be voted on tomorrow.

I believe that diplomatic efforts, in concert with our international partners, should be pursued immediately to avoid another unnecessary armed conflict in the Middle East.

Let me be clear. Iran is a dangerous and destabilizing force in the region. It supports terrorist proxies and meddles in the internal affairs of other states. Iran continues to pursue ballistic missile capabilities in violation of international norms and abuses the rights of its own people. Unfortunately, the administration's chosen course of action with respect to Iran has isolated the United States from the international community and made it more difficult to collectively address these issues.

The administration's actions and rhetoric related to Iran have created a credibility deficit. This is a fast-changing and dangerous situation, and it is clear that there is not a consensus within the international community with respect to Iran's plans and intentions.

Given these disconnects, it is imperative for the administration to provide Congress with current, unvarnished intelligence so that we may reach substantiated conclusions.

Taking a step back, it is important to recount the actions that have precipitated the current state of affairs. Current tensions are an entirely predictable outcome of the administration's ill-conceived approach to Iran.

Despite then-Candidate Trump's campaign rhetoric, I and others hoped that he would heed the advice of the advisers with respect to the Iran nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA.

For example, despite personal concerns about the JCPOA before it was signed, former Secretary of Defense Mattis told the Armed Services Committee at his confirmation hearing that "when America gives her word, we have to live up to it and work with our allies."

In October 2017, Secretary Mattis told the Armed Services Committee that he believed it was in our national interest to remain in the JCPOA. General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, echoed these sentiments at the time and cautioned that, in his words, "the U.S. will incur damage vis-a-vis our allies if we unilaterally withdraw from the JCPOA. Our allies will be less likely to cooperate with us on future military action to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and less likely to cooperate with us on countering other destabilizing aspects of Iranian behavior that threaten our collective interests."

The administration should have sought to work with the international community to address the challenges posed by Iran by building upon the foundation of the JCPOA rather than squandering that opportunity in favor of "putting Iran on notice" and other inflammatory rhetoric.

Just over a year ago, President Trump made the disastrous decision to unilaterally withdraw the United States from the JCPOA and reimpose nuclear-related sanctions, in violation of previous U.S. commitments under the deal. Since withdrawing from the deal, the Trump administration has taken a series of additional escalatory actions, including the imposition of new sanctions on various aspects of the Iranian economy; cancellation of waivers that previously allowed importation of Iranian oil by China, India, Japan, South Korea, and Turkey; and the designation of the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps—often referred to as the IRGC—as a foreign terrorist organization.

The designation of a foreign government entity as a foreign terrorist organization was unprecedented, and it is not clear what purpose it served other than to unnecessarily raise tensions with Iran. As I learned during a recent visit to Iraq and Afghanistan, the IRGC designation has significantly complicated our relationships with foreign partners who described the action as provocative and destabilizing.

While the JCPOA was not a perfect deal, it was a necessary deal. It is important to remember that when the JCPOA was signed, Iran's "breakout" timeline—the amount of time Iran would need to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon—was only 2 to 3 months. Even by the most

conservative estimates, the JCPOA stretched that timeline to more than a year.

By all accounts, the JCPOA has worked as intended. The JCPOA commits Iran to never seeking to develop or acquire a nuclear weapon and effectively cuts off all pathways for Iran to achieve a nuclear weapon until at least 2030. The agreement dramatically reduced Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium and the number of installed centrifuges. It also prevented Iran from producing weapons-grade plutonium and has subjected Iran to the most intrusive monitoring regime in the world to ensure it is living up to its commitments.

The JCPOA was appropriately built upon the concept of "distrust and verify," and I support efforts by our European partners, as well as Russia and China, to preserve the JCPOA despite challenges the Trump administration has put in their way.

According to General Dunford, in the absence of the JCPOA, Iran would likely resume its nuclear weapons program, and, in his words, "a nuclear-armed Iran would likely be more aggressive in its actions and more dangerous in its consequences."

Unfortunately, the administration's withdrawal from the agreement and reimposition of sanctions has left us isolated from our allies and partners while emboldening the hardliners in Iran.

In May of last year, subsequent to the decision to withdraw from the JCPOA, Secretary of State Pompeo articulated a set of 12 "demands" and indicated that "major changes" would need to be made by Iran before sanctions relief would be provided. The administration has sent mixed messages on whether its demands should be viewed as a set of preconditions for discussions on sanctions relief. The demands outlined by Secretary Pompeo are widely viewed as maximalist and leave little room for negotiation, especially given that the administration has already reneged on previous diplomatic commitments related to Iran's nuclear program.

Without greater certainty by the administration on what specific actions would need to be taken by Iran to relieve U.S. economic pressure, I fear that Iran has little incentive to engage in negotiations.

Indeed, the administration has followed that initial set of 12 demands with a succession of orchestrated steps to force Iran into an ever-smaller corner that only serves to increase the odds of miscalculation and reduce diplomatic opportunities. The economic sanctions by the United States have left the Iranian economy reeling, with its gross domestic product shrinking by 5 percent and the inflation rate rising by 50 percent.

As part of this so-called "Maximum Pressure" campaign, the administration has just announced personal sanctions against Supreme Leader Ali

Khamenei and other Iranian leadership. The Iranians have responded by indicating that these sanctions mean "the permanent closure of the doors of diplomacy."

Rather than modifying its behavior, Iran has responded to these demands and subsequent escalatory actions by increasing its malign activities in the region, including in Yemen and Syria, and announcing that it would stop complying with certain aspects of the JCPOA. If Iran follows through on threats to completely withdraw from the JCPOA and resume nuclear weapons development activities, the United States and the international community will be in a much less unified and therefore weaker negotiating position than we had leading up to the JCPOA.

As I assess the current state of affairs, I see four potential outcomes of the current approach being pursued by the administration.

First, Iran could bend to the will of the administration and announce its compliance with the so-called 12 demands laid out by Secretary Pompeo. However, Iran has a long history of struggle against outside forces. A notable example is the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s. Additionally, Iranian capitulation would likely threaten its top priority of regime survival, so clearly this is an unrealistic outcome.

Second, Iran could remain in the JCPOA despite seeing little of the economic benefits promised by the deal and hope that a future U.S. administration would return to the agreement. Iran's recent announcement that it would stop complying with aspects of the JCPOA is a signal that it views the current arrangement as unsustainable and is willing to abandon the JCPOA completely if its economic situation does not improve in the near term.

Third, Iran could agree to return to the negotiating table, seeking a reduction in tensions and easing of sanctions. However, both the administration and Iranian leaders have made clear that they are not interested in such an approach.

In announcing the administration's strategy for Iran last May, Secretary Pompeo stated that President Trump is "ready, willing, and able to negotiate a new deal" but also made clear that "we will not renegotiate the JCPOA itself."

On May 8, Iranian President Rouhani stated:

We are ready to negotiate, within the boundaries of JCPOA. . . . It is not us who left the negotiation table.

These seem to be irreconcilable positions, especially after the latest round of sanctions directed at the Iranian leadership.

Lastly and most significant, I believe, the current approach could result in a military conflict between the United States and Iran. The destruction of an American unmanned drone flying in international airspace by a missile fired from Iran is an example of the potential for widespread conflict. Only at the last minute did President

Trump call off a strike against the Iranian missile sites in retaliation. He concluded correctly that such a strike would be disproportionate. But the incident underscores the precarious position we are in after months of the misguided “maximum pressure” campaign.

Iranian action, either directed by national leadership or mistakenly taken by zealous supporters, could put us on an escalatory ladder of strike and counterstrike that would involve the entire region from Afghanistan to the Levant.

In addition and equally troubling is that an unarticulated goal of this so-called “Maximum Pressure” campaign is to prompt Iran to leave the JCPOA either officially or by gradually increasing its stock of highly enriched uranium or other aspects of its nuclear program. This could give advocates for a military strike on Iran increased leverage. Again, such a strike, even targeted to nuclear facilities, would likely prompt a regional asymmetric response by Iran, with significant military as well as economic consequences.

Like all of my colleagues, I am deeply concerned about Iranian threats to U.S. personnel facilities in the Middle East. U.S. forces have the unquestioned and inherent right to defend themselves, but absent an Iranian directed or sponsored attack or the imminent threat of such an attack on U.S. personnel facilities or key strategic interests, military actions should be pursued only as a last resort and as part of an international coalition, which the administration has so far failed to bring together.

I will be supporting the amendment offered by Senator UDALL because it would make clear that any offensive military action against Iran must be consistent with domestic and international law, including a specific authorization for the use of military force, or an AUMF, provided by Congress.

In this context, the President’s demonstrated willingness not just to bend the facts but to indulge, in certain cases, in fabrications is particularly concerning and unacceptable when it may come to deploying our troops into harm’s way. Congress has the responsibility to demand and, if necessary, challenge the basis for unsupported assertions of Iranian aggression and provocation that could be used to take this country to war.

Echoing one of the themes used in the Bush administration’s justification for the 2003 Iraq war, Secretary of State Pompeo testified to the Senate in April that “there’s no doubt there is a connection between the Islamic Republic of Iran and al Qaeda. Period. Full stop.” And he refused to rule out the use of the 2001 AUMF as a means to conduct military action against Iran.

While Iran is a state sponsor of terror, I am not aware of compelling evidence to suggest Iran or Iranian affiliated groups are an “associated force” of al-Qaida for the purposes of the 2001 AUMF.

In fact, such an arrangement is hard to fathom, given the deep religious and ideological differences between the Shia leadership of Iran and the Sunni leadership of al-Qaida. The administration must come to Congress if it seeks to pursue offensive military action.

Likewise, any consideration of military action against Iran must fully account for the likely cost of such an engagement—in lives, resources, potential negative impact on the global economy, disruption of U.S. bilateral relationships, and other unintended consequences. The administration must provide the American people with a clear-eyed assessment of what those costs may be in advance of any contemplated military engagement.

The Trump administration’s escalatory attacks may soon place Iran in an untenable position. As a result, Iran may seek to change the status quo by initiating a limited military conflict with the United States, thereby requiring the intervention of the international community. If such a scenario comes to pass, our recent efforts to deter Iran through the deployment of additional military capabilities to the region will have failed, and even a limited conflict would be very difficult to manage or to bring to a conclusion.

The President and others in the administration have consistently downplayed the potential costs of conflict with Iran. In fact, just yesterday, the President said that “if something should happen [with Iran], we’re in a very strong position. It wouldn’t last very long.” The President’s assessment is undercut by his own Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, who told Congress earlier this year:

Iran continues to develop and approve a range of new military capabilities to target U.S. and allied military assets in the region, including armed UAVs, ballistic missiles, advanced naval mines, unmanned explosive boats, submarines and advanced torpedoes, and antiship and land-attack cruise missiles. Iran has the largest ballistic missile force in the Middle East and can strike targets up to 2,000 kilometers from Iran’s borders. Russia’s delivery of the SA-20c SAM system in 2016 has provided Iran with its most advanced long-range air defense system.

In addition to the conventional military capabilities laid out by Director Coats, Iran maintains a network of proxy forces throughout the region, many of whom operate in close proximity to U.S. military personnel in Iraq and Syria. They maintain the capability to conduct lethal action against our forces and facilities without notice.

Recently retired commander of the U.S. Central Command, General Votel, told the Armed Services Committee in February:

The Iranian regime masks its malign activities through proxies and surrogates enabled by the Iran Threat Network in Yemen, Syria, Iraq, and Lebanon. Iran is also attempting to build ground lines of communication through Iraq and Syria into Lebanon to support its proxy Hezbollah. Iran has gained influence with Iraq’s armed forces with the formalization of Popular Mobiliza-

tion Forces, and also exerted influence in Lebanon, Iraq, and Yemen, oftentimes affecting established sovereign governments.

The combination of Iran’s known conventional and asymmetric capabilities should dispel any notion that conflict with Iran would be quick or could be won only through the use of U.S. air power. As former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates reportedly said in a recent speech: “If you think the war in Iraq was hard, an attack on Iran would, in my opinion, be a catastrophe.”

He continued: “[Iranian] capacity to wage a series of terror attacks across the Middle East aimed at us and our friends, and dramatically worsen the situation in Iraq, Afghanistan, Lebanon, and elsewhere is hard to overestimate.”

All of the competent military analysts I have engaged with believe that we cannot conduct an effective land campaign in Iran, and an extended air and sea campaign will undercut the priorities laid out in the national defense strategy, which focuses not on the Middle East but on Russia and China.

Absent the full mobilization of our Armed Forces and those of our allies, ground operations in Iran are simply beyond our capacity. The last ground war involving Iran, the Iran-Iraq war of the 1980s, resulted in the death of nearly 1 million troops, the majority of whom were Iranians who died fighting a superior Iraqi military during a brutal and prolonged conflict. There is clearly no widespread U.S. or international support for another such military engagement in the Middle East.

Considering the costs associated with ground operations, a more limited conflict involving a series of tit-for-tat actions is far more likely, with Iran utilizing its asymmetric advantages and proxies in response to U.S. precision and standoff strikes.

It is unlikely that U.S. deterrence could be quickly reestablished under such a scenario, and Iran may use the time to restart and advance its nuclear weapons efforts, thereby increasing its negotiating leverage and also making the situation much more volatile.

War with Iran is not inevitable. To date, the administration has tried to use every instrument of national power to get Iran to change its behavior—except diplomacy and negotiations. The administration’s ill-conceived approach has not worked, and the time has come to try real and sustained diplomacy, rather than relying on coercion.

I urge the President and those in the administration to take this moment of high tension to engage with our allies and partners with the goal of seeking a diplomatic solution to the current situation. In that context and in that spirit, I will support the Udall amendment tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the 116th Congress, so far, has just talked about the humanitarian crisis at the border. Most of our Democratic colleagues have claimed up to this point that there is no crisis or emergency at the border.

We will recall that we started out the year with a government shutdown because of the battle over border security, and our Democratic friends made one thing perfectly clear: They would oppose any effort to fund our security mission at the border. That resulted in the 35-day shutdown.

The Speaker of the House at the time called the situation “a fake crisis at the border,” and the minority leader here in the Senate referred it to as “a crisis that does not exist.” Well, they weren’t the only ones. Throughout the Halls of the Capitol, Democrats in Congress used terms like “phony,” “imaginary,” and “make-believe” to describe the challenges our frontline officers and agents were facing every day.

While our Democratic colleagues have reflexively denied the existence of a crisis at the border, the problems have grown only bigger each day. Of course, it was 2014, I will remind my friends across the aisle, when Barack Obama, then President of the United States, declared a humanitarian and security crisis at the border. So it seemed very odd to me that, in 2019, they decided—when the numbers kept getting bigger and bigger and conditions worse and worse—all of a sudden that the humanitarian and security crisis had gone away.

The fact is, over the last 3 months, the number of illegal crossings across the southwestern border have hit six figures, something we haven’t seen since 2006. We surpassed the number of unaccompanied children apprehended at the height of the 2014 crisis that President Obama was speaking about.

This mass migration has nearly depleted our Federal resources, causing the President to request \$4½ billion for humanitarian assistance and border operations. That request came almost 2 months ago—almost 2 months ago, and Congress has not acted.

Now, it seems, our Democratic colleagues have finally accepted the facts. There is a very real and very urgent humanitarian crisis on our southern border. The bill they passed earlier this week meets the dollar amount requested by the President, but the substance of the bill shows that House Democrats don’t want to send funding where it is actually needed the most.

Unlike the Senate’s bipartisan bill, the original House bill excluded funding for the Department of Defense, immigration judge teams, and underfunded both Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection. This morning, they made a last-ditch effort to inject some of their deeply partisan provisions back into our Senate bipartisan bill. While the House Democrats did increase needed

funding in some areas, the newly amended version still includes divisive provisions and reduces funding in areas that the Senate overwhelmingly rejected yesterday.

Here is just one example. Democrats in the House cut the Senate bill’s appropriation of \$21 million for ICE Homeland Security investigations to conduct—get this—human trafficking investigations. So the House wanted to cut \$21 million in the Senate appropriations bill that was dedicated to investigating human trafficking. This is just the latest example of their fundamental lack of interest in sending money where it is needed most—only where it is politically convenient.

It is unfortunately not much of a surprise. Our Democratic friends are trying to keep up with their candidates running for President, whose positions on immigration and border security get more extreme each day. Now, more than one Democrat running for the nomination for President actually supports making entering the country illegally legal—in other words, no orderly immigration system at all—a free-for-all, where it is easier for human traffickers and drug smugglers to come and go as they please. And, of course, there is this: no consideration given for those would-be immigrants who are trying to wait patiently in line and do things exactly the right way and no consideration of the unfairness of those who would jump ahead of the line and enter the country illegally before those who are trying to do it the right way.

The House bill stands in stark contrast to the bipartisan agreement we passed here in the Senate, which funds a range of programs at the Federal departments and agencies working to manage the crisis, and, importantly, it is the only bill in town that has the support of the President. It is, after all, important to get the President’s signature on legislation for it to become law.

The Senate Appropriations Committee overwhelmingly supported this bill, and it passed the committee by a vote of 30 to 1. When the full Senate voted on it yesterday, only eight Members of the Senate voted no.

We have simply waited long enough. We waited too long, in my view, for Democrats to acknowledge this real humanitarian crisis. The House bill is inadequate and mostly a partisan effort.

Our Democratic colleagues have resisted acting for far too long already, making this humanitarian crisis worse. They circulate the very tragic pictures of a father with his young child face down in the waters of the Rio Grande River, and they somehow fail to acknowledge their own complicity in failing to act to provide the sorts of fixes to our asylum laws that would deter, if not prevent, that sort of thing from occurring in the first place. They really do need to look in the mirror.

We need to take action now, and I hope we don’t have to wait any longer

for our colleagues in the House to pass the Senate’s bipartisan bill.

S. 1790

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another note, I listened with great interest as the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Rhode Island, spoke about Iran and the challenges we face there. I agree with some and maybe even most of what he had to say.

The American people were appalled when, last week, Iran took down an unmanned American aircraft over international waters. As the Senator said, ordinarily, Iran operates by proxies or by third parties, whether it is the Shia militia in Iraq or Hezbollah or one of their other terrorist proxies like those operating in Yemen, the Houthis. But Iran escalated its attack against the United States by shooting an unmanned drone flying over international waters, so it was quite a shocking move from that standpoint, even from a nation as untethered as Iran.

Iran has been engaged in a 30-year conflict with the United States, one that has resulted in the death of U.S. servicemembers in Iraq and elsewhere—victims of explosively formed penetrators and other training that the IRGC, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, their Quds Force, their Special Operations force—the training they gave to terrorists operating in Iraq to kill Americans.

Then there is the periodic harassment of American and other international vessels operating in the Strait of Hormuz, a narrow strait through which a huge portion of the world’s energy supplies flow. So this is, in some ways, an escalation of what has been a 30-year conflict between Iran and the United States.

Tehran has waged acts of aggression against the United States and our allies. It has exported terrorism around the globe. It is the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism, and it has engaged in gross human rights violations against its own people.

As I indicated, Iran’s Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, or IRGC, is the loyal henchman responsible for leading these acts. It is a branch of Iran’s Armed Forces which tries to squash democracy movements at home and abroad by pushing its extreme ideology beyond Iran’s borders.

The Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps wields vast power and influence and uses its capabilities to encourage turmoil and conflict and violence throughout the Middle East. It funds arms, training, and foot soldiers to the terrorist groups that spread their radical ideology.

While the terrorist activities alone are enough to cause concern, the IRGC is also in control of Iran’s ballistic missile program, which unfortunately has only accelerated under the previous administration’s deeply flawed nuclear deal, known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the JCPOA. Once

we saw the details of that deal in 2015, it quickly became clear that it was not much of a deal at all. If the goal is to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon—well, it obviously failed in that goal.

As the majority leader said at the time, it “appears to fall well short of the goal we all thought was trying to be achieved, which was that Iran would not be a nuclear state.”

Despite the restrictions it would impose, the deal would leave Iran with a vast nuclear program and allow it to continue to conduct research and development on advanced centrifuges and building intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Perhaps worse, the nuclear deal would lift those restrictions in a decade. In other words, it was 2015 when the JCPOA was signed by the relevant parties. So by postponing Iran’s ability to develop a nuclear weapon, we are already half of the way there almost. It is no wonder that then-Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu delivered an address to Congress in March of 2015 and said the JCPOA “doesn’t block Iran’s path to the bomb; it paves Iran’s path to the bomb.” That certainly seems to be the case. We have seen Iran violate the nuclear deal and U.N. resolutions time after time, and it is clear that their resolve to create nuclear weapons remains their highest priority.

Just a year ago, President Trump announced the United States would pull out of the nuclear deal, a decision I strongly supported. Even at the time Secretary Kerry, the Secretary of State, admitted that the tens of billions of dollars the United States released to go to Iran would be used to fund their terrorist activities, he supported it nonetheless. He supported it even though it paved the way for Iran to get a nuclear weapon 10 years after the JCPOA was signed.

Since the Trump administration has withdrawn from the JCPOA, it has taken resolute action against Iran, including stronger sanctions on entities and individuals and the designation of the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization, which it clearly is. Somehow, though, despite the unprovoked attacks, flagrant violations of international agreements, and human rights violations, some of our friends on the left and the mainstream media have grossly mischaracterized the situation and have somehow managed to point the finger at the Trump administration for starting the fight in the first place. They want to blame America, and they want to blame this administration.

Let me be clear. Iran is the aggressor. Their history as the chief mischief-maker in the Middle East began long before President Trump took office, so don’t lay this at his feet. From the Iran hostage crisis to their outright support of terrorist groups in the Middle East, to this latest strike at a U.S. aircraft, something they admitted—they said: We did it—their actions at

every turn have demonstrated a desire not only to escalate the conflict with the United States and our interests and allies but to spread their violent extremism without regard for anyone else.

I have to say it has been 74 years since a nuclear weapon was exploded during World War II, and I hope and pray there is never again a nuclear weapon exploded on our planet, but can you imagine Iran, the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism, getting a nuclear weapon? We can never ever allow that to happen.

This last week marked the 23rd anniversary of a notable episode in Iran’s sad history of terrorism. That was the 23rd anniversary of the Khobar Towers bombing in Saudi Arabia. In 1996, a truck bomb was detonated adjacent to a building housing members of the U.S. Air Force’s 4404th Wing, killing 19 U.S. Air Force personnel and a Saudi local and wounding 498 others.

If Tehran expects to continue exporting terrorism and violence around the world without a response from the United States and our allies, they are sorely mistaken.

If Iran can continue to escalate with no response from the United States or our allies, they are going to continue to escalate as much as they can, which I think is more dangerous than a proportional U.S. response to what happened in the Strait of Hormuz.

The President has opted for hard-hitting sanctions, which I think are a good start. Those sanctions announced by the administration earlier this week represent an appropriate response to the Iranian escalation consistent with President Trump’s maximum pressure strategy on Iran. These sanctions will deny the Supreme Leader, the Supreme Leader’s office, and close affiliates access to resources they need to finance their rogue regime. There is no benefit—in the interest of peace—to applying anything less than maximum pressure on Iran to change their behavior. The tentacles of the IRGC run deep into their economy, and these sanctions will prevent them from amassing even greater power to develop sophisticated weapons.

We have seen reports that the economic challenges they are encountering as a result of the sanctions already in place are making it harder for them to finance their terrorist operations through their proxy.

The actions taken by Iran show that they are feeling the squeeze of these sanctions, and they know exactly what they need to do before they can get relief. As Secretary of State Pompeo said, “When the Iranian regime decides to forgo violence and meet our diplomacy with diplomacy, it knows how to reach us.”

I sincerely hope to see the day when the Iranian people can live without fear, when their government respects its own citizens and international allies and lives by international norms and finally decides to forgo its nuclear weapons. Until that day comes, I hope

our allies will stand with us in confronting the tyrants in Iran and doing everything in our power to push back against the world’s largest state sponsor of terror.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

S. 1790

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, tomorrow this body faces an opportunity, in fact, an obligation to reassert its proper constitutional role in warmaking.

I urge my colleagues to support the Udall-Kaine amendment, a provision to prohibit funding for unauthorized and unapproved military operations against Iran. No vote will be more important during this session than the one we cast tomorrow. It is not only the imminence of potential conflict, it is the reality that we would be surrendering our proper constitutional responsibility and our right if we fail to adopt this amendment. The American people already believe we have ceded too much authority to the executive branch; that we are implicitly, if not directly and explicitly, approving an imperial presence. This amendment puts us to the test before the American people.

The Congress has a job to do. We should do that job tomorrow. We should insist that we have the authority and we have the obligation to consider whether there are military operations against Iran.

We can talk about policy. There is no question that Iran is a malign and treacherously bad actor in that part of the world. There is no doubt that it poses a clear and present jeopardy to the world community. Iran may well have installed mines on the two tankers that were severely damaged recently and may well be the culprit in shooting down an American drone in the past week, but the United States is on a perilous course. We are on a dangerous course toward continued escalation and possible miscalculation that may create a spiral of uncontrollable military responses.

It isn’t that we have a dangerous policy, it is that we have no policy, no strategy, no endgame articulated by the President of the United States or anyone in this administration. To resort to military action rather than reliance on diplomatic approaches is a recipe for potential disaster.

This unintended escalation could result from more miscalculation or it could result from purposeful desire on one side or both sides among a small number of advisers or military leaders that there be a resort to kinetic activity, but we have, in the meantime, an opportunity to resort to diplomacy, to enlist our allies and partners. This situation is the result of our putting those allies, in part, in an extraordinarily difficult position.

The current tensions with Iran today are the direct result of President

Trump's ill-conceived policy toward Iran ever since he carelessly and recklessly discarded the Iran nuclear deal last year. His approach to foreign policy has been indecisive and chaotic, and that is partly the reason why tensions have escalated with an adversary rather than preserving key nuclear agreements and engaging in diplomacy.

We must now deescalate and resort to diplomacy. Even if one disagrees with that point, puts aside the President's bellicose and bullying rhetoric, and even if there is the thought that Iran is solely and completely responsible for this situation, the United States should not engage in military operations without the authorization of Congress. Yes, it may defend against or deter an immediate attack that is so urgent that defense of the country has to be undertaken by the Commander in Chief. But this Senate should prevent the President from entering and starting and engaging in another war in the Middle East under the misguided idea that there is a 2001 authorization that allows him to do so legally.

Let me be perfectly clear. A failure of the prohibition funding amendment we will consider tomorrow is not itself an authorization for the President to wage war with Iran. The Constitution trumps any statute. The Constitution requires action by Congress. Without congressional authorization and anything short of specific authority for declaration of war from Congress, starting or waging a war with Iran would be unconstitutional.

But the NDAA on the floor this week is an opportune time—in fact, a perfect opportunity—for Congress to reassert its constitutional authority over the role of the declaration of war. We must seize this moment. We can't simply allow or rely on the outdated 2001 authorization for the use of military force. We cannot allow its intent to be so distorted and stretched and our constitutionally required oversight to be disregarded. We have an obligation to conduct oversight continually and push back on an administration that makes false claims to advance its war-mongering agenda.

The NDAA we passed today gives us the authority to undertake our defense of the Nation.

S. 1790

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Let me begin by thanking Ranking Member JACK REED of Rhode Island and Chairman INHOFE of Oklahoma, as well as my other colleagues on the committee and my staff, who have worked tirelessly on this to include key elements of my proposal that are important to our military, as well as to our Nation.

This NDAA includes comprehensive reforms to the Military Housing Privatization Initiative. It changes military housing in ways that are long overdue and will prioritize families, ensure long-term quality assurance, and enhance accountability.

In the hearings held by the Armed Services Committee with military families who have experienced adverse health effects and financial burden from residing in hazardous housing, one point was absolutely clear: Our Nation is failing military families who live in this military housing. The conditions, widespread and prevalent, are entirely unacceptable. I was heartbroken to hear much of this testimony from military families who already sacrifice so much and who have struggled to secure safe and livable conditions.

I visited some of the homes at the New London base, and I was struck by the mold, the repairs that were needed, the defects in appliances, and the complaints about lack of proper air-conditioning and heating. We owe our military families much better, and we owe law enforcement the support they need to crack down on fraudulent private contractors.

I am also proud that the NDAA includes my provision to prohibit the Trump administration from modifying military installations to detain migrant children who have been forcibly separated from their parents. The separation policies of this administration have been absolutely abhorrent and antithetical to our values and ideals. They have been shameful and disgraceful.

We have seen the photos, and those pictures are worth a thousand of my words today, but the misuse of military resources, as I have repeatedly emphasized, to implement this administration's radical immigration enforcement agenda—this provision is a small but necessary step toward protecting migrant families from the cruelties of this family separation policy. It is only the beginning. We need to ensure that the Department of Homeland Security reimburses the Defense Department when military resources are used for support at the border. This kind of measure will hopefully prevent DHS from using the Pentagon as a piggy bank—a financial resource for cruel and inhumane policies.

We need to ensure that the President is stopped from abusing his Executive authority by deploying troops to assist in deportation.

We also considered floor amendments to the NDAA. I want to highlight an amendment that I offered to improve equity in the post-9/11 GI bill benefit. Last July, the Pentagon issued a new policy on servicemembers' ability to transfer unused education benefits to their family members. These new policies prevent servicemembers with more than 16 years of military service from transferring education benefits at the time that military servicemembers opt to transfer rather than when they become eligible. The Pentagon argues that these changes were made to ensure that the Department keeps a key retention tool—all while breaking our promise to military families by moving the goalpost of transfer eligibility and

exacerbating inequities in transferring educational benefits. Most notably, disqualifying servicemembers with more than 16 years of military services counterintuitively penalizes the men and women who have served this country in uniform for the longest time.

My amendment would make the post-9/11 GI bill an earned benefit rather than a retention tool and ensure that all servicemembers who have completed 10 years of service in the armed services and Armed Forces are eligible to transfer their benefits to dependents at any time, both while serving on Active Duty and as a veteran.

Despite the passage of the NDAA and the need for this amendment continuing, I will continue to champion equitable education benefits for our military families.

This year's NDAA makes important, unprecedented investments in the submarines, helicopters, and aircraft built in Connecticut. They are not only manufactured in my State—employing thousands of skilled workers vital to our defense industrial base—but they are also critical to our national security. They keep our country safe, and they make sure our Nation and our military have a fair fight. They play a vital role in our defense industry thanks to the unparalleled skills and unstinting dedication of our manufacturing workforce. Because of that workforce, we are able to build the best submarines and the best F-35 engines and other aircraft engines and helicopters in the world—not only through that skilled workforce and those major contractors but the workers at suppliers and contractors, who are equally vital.

Last year, we built two submarines. This year, there will be two more, with procurement for another major part of a submarine. As we begin accelerating production of those Virginia-class submarines, the New London Sub Base must have the capacity to support increased submarine output. That is why I fought for \$72.3 million to replace Pier 32 at Sub Base New London, ensuring a modern landing to accommodate multiple Virginia-class submarines.

I was proud to lead the fight for increased investment in those Virginia-class submarines. That included \$4.7 billion for those two submarines and nearly \$4.3 billion in that advance procurement for a third Virginia-class submarine.

The NDAA also includes \$2.3 billion—which is \$140 million above the President's request—for the Columbia-class program.

I was proud, as well, to champion over \$10 billion for 94 F-35s, which are important to all of our military services. That is an additional 16 above the President's request.

In helicopter production, we will keep faith with the warfighters and with our defense industrial base at Sikorsky.

Today's effort is a tribute to the leadership and the bipartisan efforts in

this Congress. I thank and applaud my colleagues for coming together on behalf of our Nation's defense, which is especially important in a time of disillusionment and seeming dysfunction for the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

REMEMBERING WILLIAM MODEN

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an officer of the Colorado State Patrol whose watch tragically came to an end earlier this month when he was killed in the line of duty.

On June 14, 2019, Trooper William Moden was responding to an accident that occurred on I-70 in Deer Trail, CO. He was doing what he did every day—responding to an incident and giving a helping hand to Coloradans in need. He was assisting the passengers of a vehicle who were involved in a crash—one of whom was an 18-month-old child—when he was struck by a passing vehicle.

Like too many of our Nation's law enforcement officers, Trooper Moden gave his life while protecting and serving others.

William Moden was 37 years old and had served in the Colorado State Patrol for 12 years. His fellow troopers remember him as someone whose uniform was always perfect and whose boots were always polished. There is no doubt for any of them that he was meant to serve and that he did so with the utmost honor and dignity.

While Trooper Moden carried out his duties with seriousness, his friends and loved ones remember him as someone with a tremendous sense of humor. At a memorial service held last week, he was described as having an infectious laugh—a laugh that was usually the loudest in the room. Many at the service remembered the time he put on a dog's shock collar just to see how it felt and to make others laugh. These are the kinds of memories his loved ones will remember forever.

Just as he answered when his Coloradans called, his friends and family say he was someone who could always be counted on. He was reliable, dependable, and they often described him as their “knight in shining armor”—someone who is always there to provide care and comfort. The chief of the Colorado State Patrol, Colonel Matt Packard, described William Moden as “the true personification of what it means to be a Colorado State Trooper.”

At the memorial service last week, Trooper Moden was awarded the title of “Master Trooper”—a rank given only to those who show great leadership and character. To those who knew him, William completely exemplified these characteristics and is certainly deserving of this high honor.

We know we can never pay the debt of gratitude owed to people like William Moden, who risk their lives every

day to ensure their communities are safe. The best we can offer is to never forget and to continue to celebrate the lives of those who sacrifice everything.

I know my Senate colleagues will join me in mourning the loss of Trooper Moden and all those who have given their lives in defending the thin blue line.

So for the second time this year, I come to the floor of the U.S. Senate and remember the words of LTC Dave Grossman, who said, “American law enforcement is the loyal and brave sheep dog always standing watch for the wolf that lurks in the dark.”

I hope the outpouring of love and support that Trooper Moden's family and friends have received in the past few weeks bring them a small bit of comfort.

To Trooper Moden's family and loved ones, our State thanks you for your service, sacrifice, and willingness to share William with the people of Colorado.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to speak about a humanitarian crisis that is not taking place in Yemen or in Syria or in any foreign country but, rather, right here at the southern border of the United States.

They say a picture speaks a thousand words, but I think it is even more than that. Photographs have the power to cut through noise, speak the truth, and invoke action.

We all remember the heartbreaking image of a little boy who was covered in ash while he sat in an ambulance in Syria. It told us all we needed to know about acts of mass murder committed by Bashar al-Assad. Likewise, we remember the look in the eyes of the malnourished girl who was on the brink of death in Yemen—one of more than 85,000 children to have succumbed to hunger during Saudi Arabia's disastrous bombing campaign. Yet the photo I have brought to the floor today has shaken me to the core as a father, as a grandfather, as a son of immigrants, and above all else, as an American.

Like the other photographs I mentioned, this one tells a story too. This one speaks an ugly truth, and that truth is that President Trump's cruel, inhumane, and un-American border policies have failed. They have failed to make us safer. They have failed to reduce migration to our border. They have also failed to live up to the American values that define our leadership around the world.

We will never forget this heartbreaking photo. More importantly, we will not forget the names of Oscar Alberto Martinez and his 23-month-old daughter, Valeria. They drowned in a

desperate attempt to claim asylum in the United States.

Oscar, Valeria, and Tania, her mother, fled El Salvador in the hopes of seeking asylum in the United States.

The Washington Post reported:

They traveled more than 1,000 miles seeking it. . . . But the farthest the family got was an international bridge in Matamoros, Mexico. On Sunday, they were told the bridge was closed and that they should return Monday. Aid workers told The Post the line to get across the bridge was hundreds long.

The young family was desperate. Standing on the Mexican side of the Rio Grande, America looked within reach. Martinez and Valeria waded in. But before they all made it to the other side, the river waters pulled the 25-year-old and his daughter under and swept them away.

Later, when Mexican authorities recovered their bodies, Oscar and Valeria were still clinging to each other.

Here in the United States, it is hard to imagine what kind of desperate conditions would propel you to flee your home and embark on a perilous journey in search of protection from a foreign nation.

Most of these families who arrive at our border come from Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras—three countries that are collectively known as the Northern Triangle. It is a region that is plagued by transnational gang violence, weak institutions, and poverty. Young boys are forced into servitude by gangs. Young girls are beaten and raped if they refuse to become their girlfriends. Parents who try to protect their children end up getting killed. These countries are among the most dangerous in the world. In El Salvador, a woman is murdered every 19 hours, and in Honduras—the country with the highest homicide rate in the world for women—a woman is killed every 16 hours.

To be blunt, these families face an impossible choice. It is either stay and die or flee for a chance to live.

Well, if this horrific and tragic photograph does anything, I hope it dispels us of the ludicrous notion that you can deter desperate families from fleeing their homes in search of safety. That is how the Trump administration describes its cruel policies at the border—deterrence.

In the name of deterrence, it is tearing children and babies away from their mothers and fathers. In the name of deterrence, it is shutting down legitimate ports of entry, effectively encouraging migrant families to seek more dangerous methods of getting into the United States, like crossing the Rio Grande. In the name of deterrence, children are being housed in unsanitary conditions, which leaves infants in dirty diapers and children without soap or toothpaste.

Let me share with our colleagues just a few of the statements that the children who have been kept in these abhorrent conditions have made.

Said one 8-year-old boy:

They took us away from our grandmother, and now we are all alone. They have not

given us to our mother. We have been here for a long time. I have to take care of my little sister. She is very sad because she misses our mother and grandmother very much. . . . We sleep on a cement bench. There are two mats in the room, but the big kids sleep on the mats, so we have to sleep on the cement bench.

Consider the words of a 16-year-old girl:

We slept on mats on the floor, and they gave us aluminum blankets. They took our baby's diapers, baby formula, and all of our belongings. Our clothes were still wet, and we were very cold, so we got sick. . . . I have been in the U.S. for 6 days, and I have never been offered a shower or been able to brush my teeth. There is no soap, and our clothes are dirty. They have never been washed.

Finally, here are the words of a 17-year-old mother:

I was given a blanket and a mattress, but then, at 3 a.m., the guards took the blanket and mattress. My baby was left sleeping on the floor. In fact, almost every night, the guards wake us at 3 a.m. and take away our sleeping mattresses and blankets. . . . They leave babies, even little babies of 2 or 3 months, sleeping on the cold floor. For me, because I am so pregnant, sleeping on the floor is very painful for my back and hips. I think the guards act this way to punish us.

This is not the America I know. Yet this administration wants us to forget who we are. This administration wants us to believe that if the Government of the United States is cruel enough, that if it denies those who seek asylum all semblances of humanity, that if we ignore basic standards of child welfare, and that if we abandon fundamental American values like respect for human rights, then desperate families who flee Central America will stop coming here.

It is not true. The entire doctrine of deterrence is grounded in hideous lies, beginning with the lie the President has fed the people from the moment he launched his campaign in 2015—the lie that immigrants are a threat to our security. President Trump has cast immigrants as criminals and rapists and drug dealers when the truth is that these migrants are the ones who are fleeing the criminals, the rapists, and the drug dealers.

I am sick and tired of these lies, like when the President repeatedly says he inherited the policy of family separation from the Obama administration. That is a lie. The Trump administration masterminded this despicable policy, pure and simple.

These cruel policies are not working. They have done nothing to stem the tide of families who seek asylum in the United States. They have done nothing to stabilize Central America and to alleviate the conditions that force families to seek refuge here.

It is time to turn the page. There are so many alternatives to detention that are available to the DHS that are far more humane and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Consider the Obama administration's pilot program known as the family case management system. It established procedures to treat migrant fam-

ilies humanely as their cases moved forward. Pregnant women, nursing mothers, or mothers with young children were given caseworkers who helped to educate them on their rights and their responsibilities. They were connected to community resources or to family in the country who could help them.

According to an inspector general's report, the program was an enormous success. It had a compliance rate of 99 percent. That means that 99 percent of the time, families in the program showed up for their ICE check-ins and appointments. Likewise, they showed up 100 percent of the time for their immigration court hearings. Tell me—how many government programs work 100 percent of the time? It is very rare. This one did, but that didn't stop President Trump from terminating it. Even though it had a 99-percent compliance and check-in rate and had 100 percent who showed up for their hearings, oh, no. Evidently, that was not good enough for the Trump administration, for it was far more humane and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Beyond embracing alternatives to mass detention, we must ramp up humanitarian assistance at the border. That is why I voted yesterday for the House's emergency supplemental bill, which would provide desperately needed support to on-the-ground organizations and would better ensure the humane treatment of children who are in CBP custody.

The House bill included strong guardrails to prevent this White House from using these funds to pursue its draconian detention practices and mass deportation agenda. While the Senate bill fell short in these areas, I hope the administration uses whatever money it receives to ensure that the children are properly cared for—in a way that respects basic human rights.

Solving this crisis will take more than humanitarian funding. If President Trump were serious about reducing migration, he would be working day and night to improve the conditions that are driving families to flee Central America in the first place. Instead, he has cut off aid to the Northern Triangle and has undermined critical U.S. efforts to work with Central American governments to crack down on gang violence, strengthen the rule of law, and alleviate poverty.

These programs were working, and the Trump administration knows it. Why do I say that? In recent years, Congress has not only increased funding for foreign assistance to Central America, but it has required these governments to meet clear benchmarks in order to demonstrate their progress in areas like combating drug trafficking and strengthening their legal systems.

The Trump administration has acknowledged the effectiveness of these programs on several occasions. In fact, it has sent Congress not one, not two, but nine different reports that have certified these benchmarks have been met.

Here is just one of them that has been signed by Secretary of State Mike Pompeo:

I hereby certify that the central government of El Salvador is informing its citizens of the dangers of the journey to the southwest border of the United States; combating human smuggling and trafficking; improving border security, including preventing illegal migration, human smuggling and trafficking, and trafficking of illicit drugs and other contraband; and cooperating with the United States Government agencies and other governments in the region to facilitate the return, repatriation, and reintegration of illegal migrants arriving at the southwest border of the United States who do not qualify for asylum consistent with international law.

This one is dated August 11, 2018. There are nine certifications by the Secretary of State saying that the programs we had going on and working in Central America were, in fact, working.

But we all know this President has no respect for facts or evidence-based reality. His decision to punish Central American governments for the migration crisis by slashing aid is only making the crisis worse. It absolutely makes no sense.

If we want to reduce migration from Central America, we need a bold strategy to address the root causes driving families in fear from their home. That is why my colleagues and I have introduced the Central America Reform and Enforcement Act. Our bill would dramatically expand U.S. engagement in Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala through proven programs that help strengthen the rule of law, combat violence, and build prosperity. Our bill would also minimize border crossings by expanding refugee processing centers in the region in an effort to reduce demand at the border, and, finally, it includes several measures to protect the welfare of children and ensure efficient, fair, and timely processing of asylum seekers.

Now, this administration may wish the Northern Triangle's serious problems would just go away, but the longer we let these conditions fester, the greater this migration crisis will become.

There is a very real possibility that President Trump views a growing crisis at the border as an asset in his path to reelection in 2020. The President believes his best shot at winning elections is to stoke fear of migrant children who pose no threat but desperately need the safe embrace of Lady Liberty.

After all, President Trump cannot campaign on solving the student loan debt crisis or providing Americans with better, cheaper healthcare, or making sure that big corporations pay their fair share. He has failed on all these fronts and more. The only play left in the Trump playbook is to blame immigrants for America's problems instead of solving America's problems.

That is what I call the politics of hate. The politics of hate is what led

President Trump to attempt to ban Muslims from traveling to the United States. The politics of hate is what led President Trump to end DACA and threaten 800,000 Dreamers with deportation to countries they have never called home—young people who through no choice of their own were brought to the United States, the only country they have ever pledged allegiance to is the United States and to the flag of the United States. The only national anthem they know is the Star Spangled Banner. The only place they have ever called home is America.

The politics of hate is what led President Trump to attack TPS holders and jeopardize thousands of parents to American-born children. The politics of hate is what led the administration to forcibly separate nearly 2,800 children from their parents—and maybe thousands more, because they don't even have a recordkeeping system of where all of these children are. That is a policy that will forever be a stain on our history.

The politics of hate is what led President Trump to tweet out his plan to send ICE agents into our communities to terrorize our towns and cities with mass arrests and mass deportations. It is a plan that would leave millions of U.S.-born American citizen children wondering: Why mom never came to pick me up at school or why dad never made it home for dinner. It is a plan that would inflict traumatic and irreparable harm on American children who would not only have to reckon with the loss of a parent but the loss of the income provided by that parent. The politics of hate led to the remain-in-Mexico policy, which forces asylum seekers to remain in Mexico amid dangerous conditions.

Indeed, just yesterday, U.S. asylum officers requested that the courts block the Trump administration from requiring migrants to stay in Mexico, stating it is "fundamentally contrary to the moral fabric of our Nation and our international domestic legal obligations."

Now, in the latest action, I fear it is the politics of hate that explain the awful press reports we heard today suggesting that President Trump plans to end a program that protects undocumented members of U.S. military families from deportation. Imagine that—someone who wears the uniform of the United States, who may serve halfway around the world in service to the Nation, who risks their lives, and now you are going to take the one program that put their mind at ease—that their spouse or child, who may be undocumented in the country and had the ability to stay because of that service-member's service, and now you are going to say you are going to deport their children, their spouse.

Well, if someone is willing to wear the uniform of the United States, pledge allegiance to our flag, and risk their life to defend this Nation in battle, the last thing we ought to do is to deport their loved ones.

The Trump administration's policies at our border have brought us nothing but chaos, despair, and shame. We cannot let the politics of fear and hate degrade the values that make America great.

We cannot wall off our country from the strife gripping Central America. We cannot tweet our way out of this problem. We must lead our way out of this problem with real solutions and strategies that bring sanity, dignity, and order back to our border and prevent the kind of tragic loss of human life we saw earlier this week on the banks of the Rio Grande. We are just better than this. We are just better than this.

If my colleagues do not raise their voices, then, they are complicit to this. History will judge us poorly.

I hope we will have bipartisan voices who say: This is not who we are; this is not what we stand for. And we can work toward making sure this tragic photograph never ever happens again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I was coming to floor today to talk about legislation we just got passed in the last week in the Homeland Security Committee with the hopes that I can convince some of my colleagues to join us in this effort, and I will talk about that bill in a moment. But first let me, if I could, address the photograph and the comments from my colleague from New Jersey.

He showed a tragic photograph that so many of my constituents and all Americans have seen—Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez and his daughter Valeria, facedown in the Rio Grande.

This man came from El Salvador. We don't know all the details yet, but clearly he was interested in coming to the United States and applying for asylum, as so many others have come—hundreds a day, thousands a week, hundreds of thousands a month now, overwhelming the infrastructure at the border, pulling 40 to 60 percent of our Border Patrol off the border to deal with the humanitarian crisis that has occurred.

That tragic photograph—and it is a horrific photo of a daughter clinging to her father's neck, having drowned in the Rio Grande coming over from Mexico—should be a wake-up call. I agree with that, but it should not be a wake-up call to have us continue to point fingers around here at the other side and blame someone else for the problem. It should instead be a wake-up call for solutions—for bipartisan solutions—because that is all that works to be able to resolve these issues.

I hope the first step will be taken today, because I just learned, as I came to the floor, that the House of Representatives is now considering taking up the legislation we passed here in the

Senate just yesterday. It provides immediate emergency funds for humanitarian assistance at the border that is needed right now. We passed it with over 80 votes here in the Senate—82 votes, with 9 of our Members absent, I believe. Over 82 votes is very unusual for anything to pass around here, particularly something so substantial.

It is bipartisan. It came out of the Appropriations Committee with a 30-to-1 vote to get these funds and these resources down to the border now to help with this true humanitarian crisis that we are facing. Everyone must acknowledge that.

The House was balking at that. They were sending us another bill that had some partisan elements to it that no Republican could support in the House—not a single one.

Finally, I think they have decided to pick up our bipartisan bill and pass it, and thank God, because now the President can sign it and that aid can go down to our border immediately where it is needed.

But I have to be frank with you. That humanitarian aid going down to the border is not enough because I don't think it would have had an impact on the tragic photograph that was talked about on the floor earlier.

That incident did not occur because of the lack of humanitarian aid that is badly needed. That incident occurred because there is this pull factor to come to our country, particularly from these Northern Triangle countries—Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador. This particular gentleman, Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez, came from El Salvador.

Then, there are push factors from those countries. And, again, this is causing so many families to come here, so many unaccompanied children to come here from these three countries in Central America.

The traffickers are telling them: If you come to America and you ask for asylum, you will be let in.

Let's be frank. These countries are countries that have real challenges and real problems.

My colleague from New Jersey is right. We have sent a lot of American taxpayer dollars down to those countries, and he noted that the reports back from the administration and others are positive, saying it is beginning to make a difference. He noted that that funding is now being reduced or even eliminated in some cases, but it was during the time when that funding was there that the people started coming.

So, yes, we should have more funding that is effective for those countries. I agree with that. The Millennium Challenge Corporation funding is the new way we send that funding. It is more effective because it says: What are you doing in Central America to improve your infrastructure, your conditions, your judicial system, your rule of law, and to fight corruption? We need to do all those things.

But let's be frank. Let's be honest. We have been doing that, and yet the push factor is still there.

So I believe it is part of the answer, but I don't think logic applied to this situation means that you could say that it is all of the answer because we have been doing it.

My taxpayers and other taxpayers, I think, around this country are willing to do more, but they also want to deal with the pull factor, and the pull factor is very simple. If you come to America and you apply for asylum right now, with the system being overwhelmed and with certain laws in place, including a court decision, you are released into the community, meaning you come into America. Most of the court cases that deal with whether you are successful or not in your asylum claim take over 2 years now. It takes over 2 years until you are before a judge for a hearing.

When those court cases occur, we are told on the Homeland Security Committee, that about 15 percent of those individuals are granted asylum—15 percent.

Now, in America, our wages are 10 to 20 times higher than they are in these Northern Triangle countries—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras. Is it any wonder that they come here seeking a better way of life? No, you would too. But we have to have a system of laws here in this country where, yes, we accept refugees and, yes, we accept people who have claims of asylum that are granted, but we don't have open borders.

We have a system here, a system of laws, and it has clearly broken down now. Again, thousands come in every week, hundreds of thousands every month—mostly families, mostly children because of the way our laws work. I don't think we should be separating families, by the way. So, if you have a child with you or you are a child, then under a court decision you could be held only for a short period of time, 20 days maximum, in emergency situations. What happens is that people are released into the community.

I will be frank with you. From what we have heard from Customs and Border Protection and from the Department of Health and Human Services, which are responsible for many of these detention facilities, they are so overwhelmed, they don't even have room for 20 days, so people are allowed to come into the community. Again, the court cases happen a long time after that, and people are granted work permits. That is why people are coming. It is a pull. They are saying: If you get to America, we will get you in.

These traffickers are charging a lot of money. It is horrible. They are taking mortgages on people's homes. They are saying "We will take half your pay for the next year," promising things that are frankly beyond what can be accomplished.

A situation in Ohio occurred a couple years ago with kids from Guatemala.

Unaccompanied kids coming from Guatemala were told: You can get in. It is good. We will take care of you. In this case, the traffickers took mortgages on the parents' homes. They brought these kids to the United States, to the Department of Health and Human Services, HHS, detention facility. They were then sent out to sponsor families, which is what they do. They take these minor children, underaged, and send them to sponsor families. Sometimes they can find families; sometimes they can't. In this case, our own government sent these kids back to the traffickers because the traffickers applied for the very kids they had brought up from Guatemala.

Despite claims and promises to their parents that they would get a good education with a family taking care of these kids, do you know what they did with these kids? They put them on an egg farm in Ohio—underage kids—and exploited them. They took away their pay, had them live in conditions none of us would find acceptable for any member of our family. They had them living in trailers, some of them under trailers, on mattresses without sheets, working 12 hours a day. Some of these kids were working 6 days a week, some 7 days a week. This is not America. Yet this was happening. Again, our system is broken. These traffickers were exploiting these children.

Finally, in this case, law enforcement stepped in, and we have been able to indict and convict the traffickers. Thank goodness. But this is not a situation that can or should continue.

In the tragic photo of the story I just told, the answer is not politically pointing fingers. Blaming Donald Trump isn't going to solve this problem. We need as a body to change the laws. We need as a body to provide more effective aid to those countries. That is true. The push factors and the pull factors both need to be addressed. But if we just play politics with this on both sides, we will have more unnecessary deaths. We will have more tragic situations.

Again, I had planned to come and talk about something else, and I will, briefly. But I must say, with regard to this immigration challenge we face as a country, I hope the tragedy we have now all seen online and on TV serves as a wake-up call to get to bipartisan solutions that actually help solve this problem and stop the push factors and the pull factors that will continue to bring hundreds of thousands of people from these three countries to our border, which has overwhelmed us.

Today there is a start. Today there is a start with the humanitarian aid package. Thank goodness.

Tomorrow we need to get to work to talk about these bigger problems. I will say, I have worked on this with some of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I heard the words today from my colleague from New Jersey about refugee processing centers. I think that is part of the answer. In the Obama ad-

ministration, you could apply for refugee status from your country—El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras—and not come to the border. The refugee criteria is almost identical to the criteria for asylum. The United Nations does this all over the world. I agree, that is a much better solution.

Let's have these processing centers in the Northern Triangle countries. Let's have one in Mexico, maybe one in Mexico at the southern border with Guatemala, maybe one at the northern border of the United States. Let's deal with this processing problem. Let's determine who is qualified, who has a legitimate fear of persecution. Again, 15 percent of them are now being granted. The other 85 percent are not. For the others, we have to say: You can apply to come to the United States as everybody else does, from Mexico, from the Philippines, from India, from countries in Africa, and we need to continue to be a generous country with regard to immigration. But we have to have a system of laws, and we have to stop these tragedies where people are being told by traffickers: You can make this journey to the north. It will be fine.

It is not fine. It is arduous, it is dangerous, and you see the results.

The trafficking that is going on of girls and women is all part of this too. It is not going to stop unless we as a group here in Congress, on a bipartisan basis, deal not just with the push factors but also the pull factors and deal with them realistically.

NONPROFIT SECURITY GRANT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, the legislation I came to the floor to talk about today passed in the Homeland Security Committee last week to help make our synagogues, our churches, our mosques, and other nonprofit institutions safer.

Sadly, we have seen a troubling pattern in recent years. Hate-fueled attacks at houses of worship and religious institutions, not just in our country but around the world, are becoming more and more common. A couple of months ago, a shooting at a synagogue outside San Diego took the life of Lori Gilbert Kaye, who heroically sacrificed herself to save her rabbi. Exactly 6 months to the day prior to that, the shooting at the Tree of Life synagogue outside of Pittsburgh, PA, claimed 11 lives, the worst act of anti-Semitic violence in U.S. history.

Sometimes this hate is manifested in other ways: bomb threats at the Jewish Community Center in Columbus, OH, and anti-Semitic graffiti sprayed on the Hebrew Union College walls in my hometown of Cincinnati, OH.

Right after the attacks on the synagogue in Pittsburgh last year, I went to the Jewish Community Center in Youngstown, OH, only 60 miles away from Pittsburgh, to meet with Jewish community leaders. An attack on one is an attack on all. We must all stand up.

In Youngstown that somber day, we talked about where we go from here to stop anti-Semitism and hatred. I asked them for input about what the Federal Government can do to help keep the Jewish community safe. Part of the input I got was that we need more help on best practices on security and more resources to protect our community centers, our schools, our churches, our synagogues, our mosques.

The resurgence of this anti-Semitism must be confronted and defeated with all the energy we can bring to bear. But sadly, it is not just related to the Jewish community, which has known it for over the centuries. Hate seldom stops at one religion or one country.

Hundreds of Christians in Sri Lanka were massacred in churches and hotels on Easter Sunday. In New Zealand, the shooting at the mosques in Christchurch killed at least 49 people. We will never forget the 2015 tragic killings of African-American parishioners at Emmanuel AME Church in Charleston, SC, where I have visited and prayed, or the 2017 attacks on the First Baptist Church in Sutherland Springs, TX.

While I have highlighted unconscionable mass murders, there are so many other examples of vandalism and harassment. We saw this in my home State of Ohio this February, where a man holding a gun smashed the windows of a mosque in Dayton while worshippers were praying inside. We saw it in Louisiana this April when three historically Black churches were deliberately burned down within the same parish. This violence is senseless and contrary to our values as Americans.

Our first obligation as Americans and certainly as public officials is to stand up and say this must stop. Stop the hate—not just partisan finger-pointing but a single, unified message. Targeted communities cannot stop it on their own. We must remind all of our fellow citizens that we are all made in the image of God, and the anti-Semitism, the hatred, and the violence are not acceptable in this country.

Sadly, if these trends are any indication, we also have to recognize these attacks are likely to continue, and I think Congress can and should do more to provide synagogues, mosques, churches, and other faith-based organizations with best practices and more resources to secure their facilities effectively.

Based in part on the input I received in Youngstown that sad day, I have been the leading supporter of the Nonprofit Security Grant Program. This grant program allows nonprofits, including synagogues and other faith-based organizations, to apply for funds they can use to access best practices to secure their facilities and to train personnel.

Some good news came out recently. Under the new Department of Homeland Security rules, nonprofits are now permitted to hire armed security personnel with these funds. That is some-

thing I had promoted. I think it is a good idea because it is needed. Last year, I led a bipartisan letter with Senator CASEY to push for a total of \$60 million for the program nationwide. I am happy to say that funding level was incorporated in the final Homeland Security appropriations bill.

This year, I am working with my colleagues to actually authorize this program to be sure it will be there in the future and to increase the amount of funding in the program to \$75 million so that nonprofits outside of the largest urban areas—which are currently being served through the initial program—also have access to this funding. Unfortunately, in a lot of instances I talked about earlier, it was not in major urban centers. So it is being spread well beyond our big cities.

To support that effort, my colleague Senator GARY PETERS and I have introduced bipartisan legislation called the Protecting Faith-Based and Nonprofit Organizations from Terrorism Act to provide best practices and more funding for hardening vulnerable nonprofits and faith-based institutions and for training resources for those congregations.

The bill authorizes \$75 million annually for the next 5 years, \$50 million to be used by nonprofits located within high-risk, large urban areas, and the rest will be available for nonprofits in other areas.

I am pleased to report that the Homeland Security Committee unanimously approved this bill last week. I look forward to its coming to the floor, where I hope it can be passed on a bipartisan basis. While our bill is pending, I hope my colleagues in the Appropriations Committee will once again be receptive to the letter and spirit of our bill to make those resources available to urban and nonurban areas alike.

I will continue to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure that the thousands of religious and other nonprofit institutions in Ohio and across our country are safe and welcoming places. I pray we will see the day when such security grants are not necessary because we will abide by the admonition to love our neighbors as ourselves. But in the meantime, let's do what we can to give our communities the know-how, the resources, and the best practices so they can be safer and more secure.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

FISCAL CHALLENGES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his outstanding comments on faith-biased security and the immigration crisis that we are facing and the solutions he suggested. We have a lot of work to do there.

Now you get to hear from the accountant.

I come to the floor today to call attention to the Federal Government's unsustainable fiscal outlook.

Yesterday in the Senate Budget Committee we had a hearing on fixing our broken budget and spending process, with a focus on securing our country's fiscal future. Our witness was the Comptroller General of the United States, the head of the Government Accountability Office.

In April of this year, GAO issued its third annual update on the nation's fiscal health. The report concluded that the Federal Government is on an unsustainable fiscal path.

A Congressional Budget Office report released this week on the long-term budget outlook painted a similarly bleak picture, noting that our surging Federal debt is putting our Nation at risk of a "fiscal crisis." This is one of the charts we got to see. I know it is pretty hard for people to read. We are figuring out a way to make this bigger.

The impact will be tremendous. It shows that, in 2019, Social Security spending passed the \$1 trillion mark annually. In 2021, the highway trust fund will be unable to meet all obligations. In 2022, the discretionary spending caps will expire, allowing unlimited spending. In 2025, the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation multiemployer fund will be depleted. It will be insufficient to pay full benefits to insolvent pension plans. In 2025, CBO projects the net interest spending will surpass the spending on national defense. In 2026, the Medicare hospital insurance trust fund will be depleted. With some incoming revenue, it will be sufficient to pay 91 percent of hospital-related Medicare spending, which is already forced to be low.

In 2030, the net interest spending will exceed \$1 trillion annually. The interest will exceed \$1 trillion annually.

In 2031, mandatory spending and interest will consume all Federal revenue. It means we will not get to make any decisions on anything that isn't mandatory, which we don't get to make decisions on right now.

In 2032, the Social Security trust fund will be depleted. The amount of money coming in that will be paid out right away will only pay 77 percent of the scheduled benefits. I will cover that more later.

Those are a few of the fiscal cliffs we are facing that could be solved now, that have to be solved now. If they are solved now, they have simpler, less impactful problems than if we wait until the cliff gets here.

The Federal Government is swimming in a sea of red ink that threatens to drown America's future generations. If current laws don't change, debt as a percentage of GDP, will soar to unprecedented levels over the next 30 years. Let me repeat that. If current laws don't change, debt as a percentage of GDP—that is production—will soar to unprecedented levels over the next 30 years. By 2037, our debt-to-GDP ratio—that is debt-to-production—will surpass the historical records set in the aftermath of World War II. By 2049, debt will stand at 144 percent of GDP.

That is how bond investors determine the likelihood of getting their money back. Interest rates reflect that fact and go up as risk increases. As that percentage goes up, the risk increases. The amount we have to pay to borrow any money will go up, if people still loan us money, which gets us to what is on the chart.

In 2030, net interest will exceed \$1 trillion a year annually. That is not buying anything; that is paying the interest.

In most of the Nation's history, we have only seen periods of high spending and debt during wars and other emergencies, and the increase has been temporary, but today's fiscal situation is different.

We are facing a demographic fiscal storm. For decades, nonpartisan experts, including the Congressional Budget Office and the Government Accountability Office, have warned of the budget pressures that we would face as baby boomers aged and began to retire. We heard yesterday from the GAO that, on average, more than 10,000 people per day turn 65 years of age, and in the next few years, that number will rise to more than 11,000. Here is a little chart of how those thousands per day grow.

Some of us were under the impression, of course, that the baby boomers eventually would die. That is kind of an inevitable sort of thing. What we didn't count on was the extra longevity that everybody will have and the fact that there are other generations coming up. So the chart does not tail off here on the end. The chart continues to grow, even though the birth rate is down.

The combination of aging population, longer lifespans, and rising per-beneficiary healthcare costs put enormous pressure on our spending.

According to the CBO, the projected explosion in debt we will see over the next few decades and beyond occurs because of mandatory spending—particularly Social Security and major healthcare programs, specifically, Medicare and Medicaid—not to mention the interest payments on the national debt that will permanently grow faster than Federal revenues.

This autospent money—spending that is never looked at—has already grown from about 36 percent of the Federal budget 50 years ago to 70 percent today. If left unchecked, CBO projects that more than 80 cents of every dollar the government spends will be on mandatory spending, guaranteed to be spent without further approval, not to mention the interest by 2049.

Because mandatory spending operates on autopilot, not subject to the annual appropriations process, it often escapes congressional scrutiny and proper oversight. It would be one thing if mandatory spending programs bypassed the appropriations process because they were fully funded through their own dedicated source of revenue, but that is not the case.

As this chart shows, many of the largest mandatory programs, such as Medicaid and food stamps, don't have their own source of funding and instead rely entirely on money from the Treasury's general fund. You can see the blue here. That is money that will be coming in. The red is the extra money that has to be spent to meet the obligations. On some of these, you will note that there is no blue at all. That means this is coming out of the general fund, which is where we expect to be able to get defense, education, and all of the other things we do. So there is enough spent right here on excess that doesn't have a source of revenue that forces everything else we do to be borrowed, and I already mentioned the problems of borrowing.

Even though some of these programs do collect some revenue—and a few of them do collect their own revenue—they often spend more than they take in. It didn't used to be the case. We used to have a lot more people working and paying into Social Security than were receiving Social Security, and there used to be a huge surplus, which we spent and then put as bonds in the drawer. We are now drawing down on those bonds, even though there is no real money to back them up, but that is about to be depleted as well.

Over the next 10 years, CBO projects that Social Security spending will total \$14.4 trillion, but the program's dedicated tax revenues will only cover \$11.8 trillion of that. That is \$14.4 trillion going out and \$11.8 trillion coming in. You can't do that very long.

CBO projects that under current law, Social Security's combined trust funds would be exhausted through 2032. You may say: That is a long time into the future, 2032. Well, that is 3 years earlier than the Social Security trustees estimated just earlier this year. How many times can we have that accelerated by 3 years before we are at the cliff?

Total Medicare spending will amount to \$11.5 trillion over the next 10 years, but the program just collects \$6 trillion in dedicated taxes and premiums—again, \$11.5 trillion going out and \$6 trillion coming in.

CBO and the Medicare trustees both projected Medicare's Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, which covers inpatient hospital services, hospice care, skilled nursing facilities, and home health services, will be depleted in 2026.

Spending on military and civilian retirement programs will total nearly \$2 trillion, but Federal employees' contributions toward their pension will only be \$70 billion. I don't like that word "trillion." It is kind of hard to wrap your head around it. Billions are tough enough, but \$2 trillion is \$2,000 billion. That is what is going out, \$2,000 billion. What is coming in is \$70 billion. There is a little bit of a gap. Just as with most other spending programs, this difference will be made up with general fund revenues, which today are all borrowed funds.

Social Security and much of Medicare is supposed to be different though. Under current law, once their respective trust funds are exhausted, those programs will still pay out money, but they will only be able to pay out as much in benefits as they have coming in. We heard yesterday from the Government Accountability Office that, for Medicare, that means only being able to pay 91 cents on the dollar for hospital-related Medicare spending. How long do you think doctors will put up with that? How many hospitals will that put out of business? For Social Security, revenue is projected to be sufficient to cover only 77 percent of scheduled benefits. Who on Social Security will be able to afford a cut of 23 percent? That is the fiscal cliff.

Of course, this shouldn't be news to lawmakers. For years, the warnings that these programs are on an unsustainable fiscal course have gone largely unheeded, hoping that the next Congress, the next President, or maybe the next generation would be more willing to deal with the problem.

To be clear, I want to make sure Social Security and Medicare are able to continue providing benefits to current beneficiaries, as well as those who may need these programs in the future. That will require us to work together in a bipartisan manner to ensure these programs' solvency. If we don't make changes to the way these programs currently operate, a lot of people in the future will just be out of luck. There are levers that can be pulled on these. If any one is pulled, it would be a tragedy to whomever it affects. If they are all pulled, it is less noticeable but still noticeable based on how long it is before we ever reach a solution on these problems.

Ignoring the problem will not make it go away and, in this case, the opposite is true. The longer we wait to address this imbalance, the more severe the changes will need to be, and we will have fewer options.

We need to change the way we do things around here. Too often we wait to make the difficult decisions that everyone knows has to be made until we have a crisis on our hands. In the Budget Committee, we are focused on trying to put together bipartisan budget process reform proposals that will help us confront these thorny fiscal issues in a more reasoned, timely, and responsible way.

I am hopeful we will get there. I am encouraged with the conversations we have had that we will get there. These issues are too important to ignore, and we are going to need to work together if we are to put our country on a more sustainable fiscal course. We owe it to future generations to try.

We have handled some crises around here. Recently, we handled one of national disasters. The national disasters don't have to be paid for. They aren't a part of the budget caps—they should be a part of the budget caps, but they don't have to be a part of the budget

caps—so they just get exempt as long as they are voted on, but everybody wants to help everybody with a problem, so we go ahead and pass those straight to debt. One week, at the beginning of the week, when we proposed it, it was \$13 billion. When it actually passed it, it was up to \$19.1 billion. That all went to additional debt.

It is a crisis. We need to plan for it. We need to prioritize for it. We need to fit that in, but we can't do everything, continue to escalate everything, and consider that things we haven't look at for years are OK to keep doing the same way we are doing them or to have the duplication. We are doing hearings all the time on ways this problem can be solved, but it is important that we start solving it soon or future generations will be drastically affected.

In fact, the dates I had up here earlier, present generations will be affected. We need to get everyone on board looking for solutions and biting the bullet now to do them.

I have had a penny plan for a long time. Under the penny plan, if we just stopped spending 1 cent out of every dollar we spend, not counting Social Security, no change in Social Security—if we just found ways to do things 1 percent better, and we did that for 7 consecutive years, our budget would balance. If we started with a penny, I am pretty sure we would say: That really didn't hurt too bad. How about if we do 2 cents? Now we cut it back to 4 years, and we can start paying down debt, which we have to do for our future generations, if our kids and grandkids are going to have the kind of life we had.

I am working for and hoping for everybody working together to solve these problems. If we just talk about them, and we don't work on them, it is pretty depressing but not as depressing as it will be hurting.

I ask my colleagues to take a look at this and help come up with solutions. I am impressed with those who are working with me on it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I sit here every Thursday from 3 o'clock to 6 o'clock and hear several speeches that are made. I happen to sit on the Budget Committee with Chairman ENZI. I hope everyone listened carefully to what he just said. The Comptroller General was in yesterday.

One of the reasons I ran for Senate is that being a Main Street entrepreneur from Indiana, you never could have gotten by with the way this place runs its business. The Federal Government

is somewhere around six to seven times the size of Walmart and runs its business by the seat of its pants, in the sense that we have not done a budget that we have appropriated in nearly 20 years.

If you listened closely, you know we have some hard deadlines. The chairman referred to it as cliffs. Well, sometimes that is so figurative that you don't believe it is going to happen or that it is going to be real. These are things we are going to have to contend with.

When the Medicare fund is depleted fully in 2026, benefits get cut immediately. Social Security is farther down the trail, and there are going to be all kinds of issues. We are lucky, currently, that other countries and our own citizens will lend us money when we run trillion-dollar deficits routinely.

He mentioned the "Penny Plan." In any business, if you were charged with fixing your company's problems by cutting back by either freezing expenses by a 1-percent cut or a 2-percent cut, that would be done easily because you have hard accountability. If you would perform in a business or a State government like we do here, I can guarantee you there wouldn't be a lender that would let you perpetuate and keep doing it. The fact that we have a credit card that we can put it on year after year eliminates the accountability that you have anywhere else.

I was on a school board for 10 years. I was in State government in Indiana, where we always have a cash balance and operate in the black and have a balanced budget. Even though we do that so routinely there, we passed a balanced budget amendment to our State constitution simply because government, even in a place like Indiana, oftentimes views how they spend the people's money different, and this place does it worse than any other place in the country.

So do we want to get to the point where we deplete the Medicare trust fund and where we run out of funds to pay pensioners or do we want to make the hard decisions?

It is funny. When I got here, I looked at the budget process. Budgets, even though they are not adhered to, might be a resolution, and it is not the law. Always, even if they do incorporate savings, you never see it until year 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Well, again, in the real world, if you are running at a 20-percent loss on your P&L, you do not have the luxury to wait 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 years to fix it.

I ask the American public to hold their Senators accountable and their congressmen, because this time, unlike in 2008, which we all know was bad enough, the main people holding the bag will be retirees and the elderly who depend on the government for healthcare, and individuals who depend on healthcare who are not well to do, through Medicaid, will be left holding the bag.

Only 22 Republicans—it should have been all 53 of us who were on the Penny Plan bill that Senator PAUL put out just a few weeks ago, but only 22 of our own conference, which talks about fiscal conservatism—got on that bill. I would hope that the American public holds their representatives accountable so that we don't hit the cliff and go over it and pay the consequences, which will be dear.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks while seated.

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

TRIBUTE TO GARY WOODLAND

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, while my remarks in front of me say "I rise today," I sit today on this Senate floor to congratulate a Topeka, KS, native, a 2019 U.S. Open champion, Gary Woodland.

Gary Woodland grew up in Topeka and attended Shawnee Heights High School. After high school, Gary attended Washburn University on a full basketball scholarship before transferring to the University of Kansas to join the golf team. This U.S. Open was the first major championship victory of Gary Woodland's career, and Gary made history by becoming the first graduate of the University of Kansas to ever win a PGA major tournament.

Gary's performance at Pebble Beach was truly elite. He scored under par in all four rounds, including an impressive 6-under-par 65 in the second round. On Sunday's final round, Gary battled the elements and a late surge by last year's U.S. Open champion, Brooks Koepka. On hole 18, Gary sunk a long birdie putt to solidify his win at 13 strokes under par, 1 stroke better than Tiger Woods' historic 2000 U.S. Open victory at Pebble Beach.

I congratulate Gary on this historic win, but I also recognize his actions off the course. Gary is an advocate for Special Olympics and also partners with Folds of Honor, a nonprofit organization that grants scholarships to family members of U.S. servicemembers. Gary even wore patriotic golf gear to honor our troops and Folds of Honor at the U.S. Open. After the win, Gary thanked our troops for their service and stated: "There's men and women who sacrifice and do so much for us so I can go out and play a game of golf and live my life under freedom."

The final round also coincides with Father's Day, and this undoubtedly made this championship even more significant as Gary's father watched him sink the final putt on 18. Gary said, after his win, that his dad worked nights so he could pursue his love of sports and spend time with him during the day.

I recognize Gary, but I also want to recognize the entire Woodland family—

his parents, Dana and Linda; his wife, Gabby; his son, Jaxson; and the twin girls they are expecting. This is a tremendous achievement.

Kansans are extremely proud of you, Gary. We wish you and your family the best of luck moving forward, and we will continue to root for your success.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks on the floor, Senator BROWN resume his remarks.

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

PUBLIC SERVICE FREEDOM TO NEGOTIATE ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, conservative, rightwing forces in our country are engaged in an all-out assault on working people. Their target? Private and public sector workers and the unions who are fighting on their behalf. While private sector unions at least have some protections under the National Labor Relations Act, public employees have been historically forced to rely on Supreme Court precedent to protect their basic rights.

That is why the Court's decision last year in *Janus* was so damaging. In one fell swoop, the Court overturned more than 40 years of precedent from the *Abood* decision and barred public sector unions from collecting fair share fees from employees who had opted out of the union but whom the union is still legally required to represent.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Janus* was not unexpected. Its decision was the culmination of decades-long efforts by groups like the Federalist Society and the Heritage Foundation to undermine settled precedent in *Abood* in order to weaken public sector unions. These groups worked methodically to achieve their goals.

First, Justice Alito all but invited a challenge to *Abood* when he wrote his decision in *Knox v. SEIU Local 100* and *Harris v. Quinn*. He called the justification for allowing a union to collect fair share fees "an anomaly." He said "the *Abood* Court's analysis is questionable on several grounds" and laid out the grounds as he saw them for someone to bring a case to overturn *Abood*.

This was an open invitation to conservative groups to then go looking for a plaintiff to do just that—to create an opportunity for the Supreme Court to overturn *Abood*. They funded *Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association*, which was fast-tracked to the

Supreme Court in 2016, where "the signaler," Justice Alito, awaited the case. Public employee unions received a temporary reprieve in a deadlocked 4-to-4 decision because of Justice Antonin Scalia's unexpected death.

The well-funded conservative interests then saw a huge opportunity to fill the vacancy with a Justice to their liking. From applauding Senator McConnell's single-handedly blocking the nomination of Merrick Garland to spending millions to confirm Neil Gorsuch, they wanted a Justice who was on their side.

They got it in Neil Gorsuch, who delivered the decisive fifth vote in *Janus*, torpedoing 41 years of precedent under the pretext of protecting "fundamental free speech rights." Justice Elena Kagan saw right through this argument. In a strong dissent, she said: "The majority overthrows a decision entrenched in this Nation's law . . . for over 40 years . . . and it does so by weaponizing the First Amendment, in a way that unleashes judges, now and in the future, to intervene in economic and regulatory policy."

Undermining public employee unions and, in fact, all unions has gained momentum because of the conservative majority on the Supreme Court. With this narrow majority, we are likely to see a lot more 5-to-4 decisions on ideological, partisan lines. This is not good for the country and not good for the credibility of the Court. We need a Supreme Court that strives to achieve consensus as often as possible, not one pursuing a hard-right ideological agenda.

In the face of these onslaughts from the Supreme Court and conservative interests, unions are fighting back. We have seen tens of thousands of teachers taking to the streets in cities and States across the country demanding and in many cases securing more investment in schools, smaller class sizes, and a living wage for teachers.

In the year since *Janus*, public sector employee unions like AFSCME are adding thousands of new dues-paying members energized to fight back against the conservative assault on unions' very existence.

Our public employee unions are doing their job to stay in the fight and Congress needs to do its part. That is why I joined 35 of my Senate colleagues and 27 of my House colleagues this week to introduce the Public Service Freedom to Negotiate Act of 2019.

This legislation affirms to all 17.3 million public sector workers nationwide that we value their service to the public and that we are fighting to protect their voice in the workplace.

Our bill codifies the right of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively in States that currently do not afford these basic rights.

Under our legislation, States have wide flexibility to write and administer their own labor laws, provided they meet the standards established in this

legislation, and it will not preempt laws in States that substantially meet or exceed this standard.

The right to organize shouldn't depend on whether or not your State has robust worker protections, like the State of Hawaii, and workers shouldn't be held captive to the anti-union bent of the Roberts Five on the Supreme Court.

The fight to protect the right to organize is not an abstract issue. Unions have lifted people into the middle class, especially women and people of color.

I speak from personal experience. When I was a young child, my mother worked for years in low-wage jobs that provided no job security, no healthcare, and no stability. We lived paycheck to paycheck. That all changed when my mother and her co-workers organized and formed a union. That union happens to be the CWA.

Unionization brought job and economic security to our family. Our public employee unions are fighting on behalf of millions of people across our country who are serving our communities. They are our teachers, our firefighters, social workers, EMTs, and our police officers. They are us.

These are not normal times. We all need to come together to fight back against an all-out assault on working people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I want to first of all thank Senator HIRONO for introducing one of the most important bills this session. It is all about collective bargaining rights. It is all about workers' voices being heard and all about the dignity of work.

Just last week I was with Senator HIRONO with a number of her constituents from her State, and they talked about her support for manufacturing or especially her support for workers. I was particularly pleased when she mentioned the Communications Workers of America. I have staff with me on the floor—some of my Ohio staff, including my State director, who came out of the CWA. I know how important workers' rights are. So I thank Senator HIRONO for introducing this bill. If we did nothing this session but pass that legislation, it would be a huge victory for workers.

Unfortunately, we have a Supreme Court that puts its thumb on the scales of justice in every case, choosing corporations over workers, choosing Wall Street over consumers, choosing, in far too many cases, health insurance companies over sick people. And today's Supreme Court case is aimed and targeted directly at States like mine, Ohio, a State that is a swing State and has 12 Republican House Members, 4 Democratic House Members and has had that same configuration of 12 and 4 for 4 State elections because of redistricting. But it is no surprise, with the Supreme Court deciding that they were

going to put their thumb on the scale of justice again, against voting rights, against civil rights. That is what has happened in support of corporate money.

So dark money has affected the special-interest Supreme Court. We have never seen a Supreme Court in my lifetime that is this beholden to corporate interests, that is this beholden to billionaire contributors, that is this beholden to special interests. We have never seen a Court like this.

What does this mean? It means that instead of citizens choosing their elected officials, it is politicians choosing whom they represent. That is why you get these districts that will stay 12-to-4 Republican, where voters have no real say in these elections because of the way it is lined up.

We have a Supreme Court that is hostile to voting rights, hostile to worker rights, hostile to women's rights, hostile to LGBTQ rights. That is what this Supreme Court has given us, as Senator MCCONNELL, in his office down the hall, continues to push judges like this who don't look toward the public interest. They are always looking toward rewarding their billionaire contributors.

Again, I thank Senator HIRONO for her work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST— S. 386

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act, an important and bipartisan piece of legislation on which I have been a proud sponsor and on which I have been proud to work with Senator HARRIS to bring this bill to fruition.

It has been many years in the making, and I am pleased to stand behind this legislation and to push it forward. There is no question that immigration is one of the most important and also politically fraught and politically charged issues in front of Congress right now. More often than not, we can't even seem to agree on what the problems in our immigration system are, let alone come to an agreement about how best to solve them.

That makes it all the more important for us at least to come together to get something done in those areas where we can find common ground and do so across party lines on issues that are neither Republican or Democratic, neither liberal or conservative, but that are simply American issues that are central to who we are.

We are great as a country not because of who we are but because of what we do, because of the fact that we choose freedom, we choose to be welcoming, and we choose to be that shining city on the hill, where anyone can come into this country, be born or immigrate into this country as a poor

person, and hope and have the reasonable expectation that one day, if they work hard and play by the rules, they might have the opportunity to retire comfortably, in some cases wealthy.

We have to find common ground in these areas. The Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act is an important point of common ground.

Employment-based immigration visas—the one significant area of our immigration system based on skills and based on merit—are currently issued in accordance with rigid, arbitrary, antiquated, and outdated per-country quotas. This means that in a given year, immigrants from any one given country cannot, in most cases, be given more than 7 percent of the total number of visas allocated. As a result of this, immigrants from nations with large populations have significantly longer wait times to get a green card than do immigrants from smaller countries. In some cases, they could be stuck in a backlog of green card petitions for decades.

This makes no sense. This is arbitrary. It is capricious. It is unfair. It is un-American. It is not what we do. This is one of the many features of our Buddy Holly/Elvis Presley-era immigration code that are outdated and that need to be cast into the dustbin of history. These per-country visa caps cause serious problems for good people, for American businesses and American workers alike, and they cause unfair, undue, and immense hardship for the immigrants who happen to be unfortunate enough to be stuck in that very backlog.

While employment-based green cards are supposed to go to immigrants with high skills who will help grow the American economy, the per-country caps distort this system by causing some immigrants to wait years before receiving a green card for a reason that may be totally unrelated and generally is completely detached from their qualifications. This undermines our ability to bring the best and the brightest individuals to our country. It is to our harm, and it is to our own shame.

Further, the per-country caps force the immigrants that are stuck in this backlog—95 percent of whom are already inside the United States—to make the difficult choice between, on the one hand, staying in America and waiting decades for a green card, or on the other hand, leaving and taking their talents to a country that provides a fairer process for allocating legal immigrant status as a worker.

Worse still, because individuals in the green card backlog can only sponsor temporary visas for their children while these children are younger than 21, the per-country caps force families to choose between separating and sending their children back to their country of origin as they age out of their visas while their parents keep waiting in the United States for their own opportunity to receive a green card or

giving up entirely on their dreams of becoming lawful permanent residents within the United States of America. In many cases, these are children who legally immigrated with their parents and did so at an early age and who have come to call America their home, adopting our customs, our language, our ways of life, having been educated here and socialized here.

Because immigrants in the backlog are also severely limited in their ability to change jobs, the per-country caps often force them to work under conditions that other employees would justifiably and understandably find completely unacceptable. This exposes these immigrants to harassment, exploitation, and abuse, without any option of switching employers. What is more, because these employees can't switch jobs, they have less power to negotiate fair salaries, which depresses wages not only for these immigrant workers themselves but also for their colleagues, whether or not they are American citizens.

Fortunately, the solution to these problems is not only straightforward but agreed upon by a broad, bipartisan coalition of lawmakers. We must eliminate the per-country caps to ensure a fair and reasonable allocation of employment-based green cards. That is exactly what the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act would accomplish, and that is exactly what this bill is all about.

Without the per-country caps, our skills-based green card system would operate on a first-come, first-serve basis, ensuring that immigrants are admitted into the United States purely based on merit rather than on the arbitrary, outdated, unreasonable basis of their country of origin. This, after all, is what the American dream has often been about. It is about who we are as a people rather than where our parents came from, who they were, what they looked like, and what language they might have spoken.

This reform would also ensure that the hardships caused by decades-long wait times would be eliminated.

Importantly, the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act also contains critical safeguards to ensure that the transition from the per-country cap system to a first-come, first-served system would occur smoothly and without unduly disrupting existing immigration flows. Specifically, this bill includes a 3-year set-aside of green cards for immigrants who are not in the backlog to ensure that they can continue to enter the country as we process backlog petitions.

In addition, the bill contains an important "do no harm" provision to make certain that green card applicants who are at the front of the line now will stay at the front of the line and not be faced with new delays as we work through the backlog during this transition process. These provisions will ensure that we are truly treating all immigrants in the employment-based system fairly.

For many years, this critical legislation was stalled because of the concerns of some Members that any reform to the employment-based visa system should be accompanied by new protections against fraud and abuse in the H-1B program. To address those concerns this Congress, I negotiated an amendment to the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act with Senator GRASSLEY to include new protections for American workers in how we process applications for H-1B visas.

This amendment negotiated with Senator GRASSLEY does three things: First, the Grassley amendment would strengthen the Department of Labor's ability to investigate and enforce labor condition application requirements. In addition, it would reform the labor condition application process to ensure complete and adequate disclosure of information regarding the employer's H-1B hiring practices. Finally, it would close loopholes by which employers could otherwise circumvent the annual cap on H-1B workers.

Importantly, the Grassley amendment—like the underlying bill itself—consists of provisions that have long enjoyed support from Members of this body on both sides of the aisle and from every point along the ideological spectrum. They are drawn from an H-1B reform bill that has been championed both by Senator GRASSLEY and by Senator DURBIN.

I am grateful that Senator GRASSLEY was willing to come to the table and work in good faith on achieving a reasonable compromise on this bill. I believe the deal we have struck is a fair and evenhanded way to address longstanding concerns about our H-1B system while eliminating country-of-origin discrimination in how we allocate skills-based green cards.

The reason the Fairness for High-Skilled Immigrants Act enjoys such broad, solemn, deep, and unwavering bipartisan support is because it does not include any of the typical partisan poison pills and other controversial provisions that so often undermine and in many cases doom other immigration reform efforts. This is a narrow, surgical reform—one that is necessary, one that is palatable, and one that is long overdue.

I would like to conclude by thanking Senator HARRIS, who has been an indefatigable partner with me on this bill. I have been proud to work side by side with her to eliminate the country-of-origin discrimination and bring about a system of fairness in how we allocate employment-based green cards.

This is an important and, indeed, essential reform to our immigration laws and one that has been a long time coming.

Mr. President, I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 386 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the Grassley amendment at

the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, I have offered a modest compromise amendment to this legislation. I stand ready and open to negotiate and discuss this. We have often discussed it in private and in public. I will object until we can get to negotiating terms, and we can hopefully pass this bill once we enter into a dialogue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I approach with great sadness and disappointment the response just brought about by my distinguished colleague, my friend, the junior Senator from Kentucky. I have a great deal of respect for him. The fact that he and I have worked on so many issues side by side together in order to improve government makes this not easier but makes it more difficult.

The reforms to which my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky, refers are themselves born of a genuine desire to improve our immigration system. But, alas, the reforms he has proposed are not, in my view, compatible with the scope of this bill, nor are they compatible with something that can reasonably pass through this body. That is one of the reasons I have introduced the legislation as I have.

I worked on this nearly the entirety of the 8½ half years I have had the opportunity and great privilege to serve the people of Utah in the Senate. This is by far the closest we have ever come to having a deal, and we achieved that deal by keeping this bill focused on the very things this legislation deals with.

The suggestions that Senator PAUL has made, while born of great concern for our country and a noble degree of commitment to serving the people of his State, are not themselves compatible with the scope of this legislation, nor are they compatible with what would likely be passed by this body.

We have an opportunity right now to pass this. This could pass this body right now. I find it greatly disappointing that my colleague and my friend has chosen not to allow this to pass this body today. This is something that could and should and otherwise would pass this body today without that objection.

I would respectfully but with all the urgency I am capable of communicating implore my colleague, the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, to reconsider his objection and allow this to pass.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. UDALL. 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. 883 TO S. 1790

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up Udall amendment No. 883.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. UDALL], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 883 to S. 1790, as amended.

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

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

The amendment, as amended, is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit unauthorized military operations in or against Iran)

At the end of subtitle C of title XII of the amendment, add the following:

SEC. 1226. PROHIBITION OF UNAUTHORIZED MILITARY OPERATIONS AGAINST IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No funds authorized by this Act may be used to conduct hostilities against the Government of Iran, against the Armed Forces of Iran, or in the territory of Iran.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed—

(1) to restrict the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against an attack upon the United States, its territories or possessions, or its Armed Forces;

(2) to limit the obligations under the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1541 et seq.); or

(3) to affect the provisions of an Act or a joint resolution of Congress specifically authorizing such hostilities that is enacted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak on my amendment.

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise to respond to some of the criticisms of the Udall amendment that I believe are misleading and deserve a response.

To start, I want to point out an area of agreement. The opposition says our amendment is simple, and it agrees on its intent—that this amendment would prohibit a war with Iran without there being congressional approval, and that is what the vote is about. The arguments from those in the opposition mislead to avoid that simple truth. They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution and open the door to war with Iran without having a vote. President

Trump has said he was 10 minutes away from doing just that.

Here is some of what we have heard. Critics say we only have one Commander in Chief, not 535, and so we should not pass this amendment.

We agree. We only have one Commander in Chief, but the Commander in Chief executes wars. Only Congress can declare them. Our Founders made that decision for good reason. Dictators and Kings declare war unilaterally. Democracies don't. In our democracy, the people decide whether we go to war or whether we don't go to war through their elected representatives. Congress is the most direct voice of the people.

Once that decision has been made, then it is up to one Commander in Chief to execute that war. The people of New Mexico did not send me here to be a battalion commander or a general, and I have no intention of acting like one. The people of New Mexico sent me here to do my constitutional duty, and article I, section 8 vests the power of declaring war with the Congress.

Critics also falsely say our amendment limits our forces' ability to defend themselves or take incoming fire before they can respond. The majority leader said our amendment defines "self-defense" too narrowly.

I am confused at what he is referring to. Our amendment does not include a separate definition of "self-defense." Our amendment expressly states that it does not restrict "the use of the United States Armed Forces to defend against attack." This language does not, in any way, change the Department of Defense's rules of engagement that guide how to exercise our inherent right of self-defense. The DOD does not require a unit to absorb an attack before it can defend itself, and neither does our amendment.

The only restriction in the amendment is that the President cannot enter into hostilities without having congressional approval. It is a restriction that is embedded in our Constitution. If the Republicans are proposing to do away with that restriction, I agree with my colleague Senator MERKLEY that they must come to the floor and propose a constitutional amendment to do so.

Our forces in Iraq, Bahrain, and other locations in the Middle East are fully capable and empowered to defend themselves, and this amendment does not affect that. Unfortunately, the opposition is just repeating itself, trying to generate a reason to abdicate its own constitutional duty.

We have also heard criticism that this amendment is "appeasing the Ayatollahs" and represents "weakness" and that we must allow the President to launch military action to be tough.

We have heard these kinds of arguments before. They were very common in the run up to the disastrous Iraq war. Do not question the arguments for war. To do so is to be weak.

I could not disagree more.

Our Constitution is our strength, and this amendment simply reaffirms our

Constitution in the face of a President who is threatening to flout it. Our Nation is strong when we are united. We do not need to give up congressional authority over war and peace to one man, the President, in order to be strong.

Congress has authorized military action before, and when majorities believe that the circumstances warrant it, Congress will do so again. If we fear Iran so much that we are willing to walk away from the constitutional requirements to authorize military action, that would be the real sign of weakness.

We have also heard that we cannot rely on Congress to authorize force if we need it to. We heard that Congress can barely name a post office. So how can we trust it with this kind of decision? What if Congress is out of town and cannot vote?

First, it is disappointing to hear Members of the Senate speak so cynically about this body on the floor during a debate as important as this. The Congress does not function perfectly. That is very true. Yet history is clear that Congress has authorized military force many times in the past. I have supported some, and I have opposed others, but we had debates and votes. Only recently has the 2001 authorization been so abused to authorize military action all over the globe—far beyond the al-Qaida and Afghanistan mission that Congress thought it was voting on.

Congress, though, has had these debates and has voted, and those decisions represent our national decisions. I see no reason to turn our back on our Constitution just because Iran is a regional threat and this administration has manufactured a crisis to exacerbate that threat.

If there is a national security crisis that requires Congress to vote on military force, we can all get on a plane and come to Washington and do our jobs. Maybe we will even have a vote on Friday. Congress voted after Pearl Harbor, and Congress voted after 9/11. Both were in the middle of national crises. Our troops will be the ones making real sacrifices. We can bear the cost of some inconvenient recess travel. Our job is to debate and vote on matters of war and peace—period, end of story.

We have also heard that the Department of Defense is opposed to our amendment.

Yesterday, Mr. John Rood, the Under Secretary for Policy at the Department of Defense, sent a letter to the leaders of the Armed Services Committee in its opposition to our amendment. The letter is short, and while it contains speculation and rhetoric, it includes no legal analysis and fails to address the plain language of the amendment or longstanding DOD authority or rules of engagement.

I am disappointed in the letter, but it should not be a surprise from a political appointee from the Trump admin-

istration, not when the President is openly declaring that he needs no authority from Congress to launch a war against Iran. The letter reads that the amendment "purports to limit the President's authority in discharging his responsibility as Commander in Chief," which is simply false.

The amendment straightforwardly affirms the constitutional authority of Congress to authorize military action—authority that the President is openly flouting in his public comments.

If Congress authorizes military action against Iran, the Commander in Chief would be free to execute it.

The letter asserts, without evidence, that our amendment will embolden Iran. I hope we are not so weak that we think our Constitution emboldens Iran.

Overall, the letter cites nothing—the Constitution, no law, no DOD policy, no legal analysis, nothing—in support of its claims.

This letter from DOD, which lacks a confirmed Secretary, is a disappointment, but it should not be read as any authoritative take on this amendment, its intent, or its effect.

Some have said that this amendment would block the United States from helping Israel defend itself from an Iranian attack. I support Israel's right to defend itself, and this argument does not hold up.

First, this amendment has no impact on our ongoing security assistance and cooperation with Israel, including the recent MOU signed with Israel by President Obama.

Second, if Israel is attacked, there is nothing in this amendment that would prohibit the United States from coming to its aid with defensive measures.

Third, if Israel is attacked and the United States wants to send our military to engage in direct hostilities, we are going to need to debate and authorize any response in Congress. That is simply what the Constitution says.

Finally, the biggest risk of Iranian attacks on Israel, according to one Israeli Cabinet Minister last month, is the escalating tension between the United States and Iran.

The best thing we can do to protect Israel is diplomacy to stop a broader regional war in the Middle East. If the United States does go to war with Iran, Israel is likely to face very serious threats, and that is something we should take seriously if we consider the use of force.

Israeli Energy Minister Yuval Steinitz said in May that "things are heating up" in the Persian Gulf.

He said:

If there's some sort of conflagration between Iran and the United States, between Iran and its neighbors, I'm not ruling out that they will activate Hezbollah and Islamic Jihad from Gaza, or even that they will try to fire missiles from Iran at the State of Israel.

So the threats to Israel from Iran only make it more important that we have a full debate and vote on military action, not less important.

Again, the purpose of our amendment is simple: The President is threatening to launch military action against Iran without authorization, publicly flouting Congress. This amendment says that we are not going to go into an unauthorized war with Iran.

If the President and Members of this body think we need to take military action against Iran, then let's have that debate and let's vote.

The Udall amendment ensures we follow the constitutional process. To do otherwise is to be in dereliction of our constitutional duty.

Mr. ROMNEY. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. UDALL. The Senator from New Mexico yields the floor.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the perspective and sincere thoughts and ideas coming from my good friend from New Mexico.

The Senator indicated that those who oppose this are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution.

I would note that in my remarks this morning I noted specifically that this is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. It is a statement of continued commitment to our national defense, and, precisely, it is saying that under the Constitution only Congress may declare war. That is something I said specifically.

But the Senator goes on to note—he says that only the Congress—specifically, his words are “ignore the Constitution, open the door to war with Iran without a vote.”

President Trump has said he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. Is the Senator saying that if the President were to do what he was contemplating, and that is to take out missile batteries with the potential of the loss of life of as many as 150, but also it could be with a prewarning, with no loss of life, but taking out missile batteries that have fired upon an American aircraft—unmanned American aircraft—if he were to have done that in response to their shooting down an aircraft in international airspace, that constitutes going to war and would have required a vote of Congress to authorize shooting down or attacking missile batteries that have fired rockets at an American airship?

I am referring to the Senator's comments precisely, and I will read the entire point.

The Senator said: “They are trying to create excuses for why we should ignore the Constitution and open the door to war with Iran without a vote.”

President Trump has said that he was 10 minutes away from doing just that. So in the Senator's view, is responding in a very limited manner, as he was contemplating, taking out missile batteries potentially—would that have constituted going to war and required the vote of Congress?

That is my question, because I believe that is not the case. I believe the President has the constitutional au-

thority and duty to respond, if necessary, in an appropriate way to return fire on the very batteries that have shot down an American aircraft.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO BLAIR BRETTSCHEIDER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to tell you about two young women from Chicago and a discovery they made together that has helped to transform the lives of hundreds of other young women.

Domitira Nahishakiye moved with her family from the African nation of Burundi to Chicago in 2007. Three years later, she found herself overwhelmed. At 18, she was attending high school, trying to prepare for college, and caring for her three younger siblings.

The refugee resettlement efforts worked mostly with boys and young men. It didn't offer many programs to help Domi balance the pressures of caring for her siblings and preparing for college. Getting ready for college is tough for almost everyone. Imagine how much harder it is if you have grown up in another culture and you are helping to care for three siblings.

Fortunately, Domi met another young woman named Blair Brettschneider.

Blair grew up in Detroit. After graduating from the University of Miami in Florida, she had hoped to become a journalist, but the Great Recession caused Blair to rethink her career path. She moved to Chicago to work for AmeriCorps VISTA, sometimes called the domestic Peace Corps. Blair was a “gofer” for the refugee resettlement agency.

Not content with coffee runs and other “busy work,” Blair started talking to the families her agency was helping. That is how she met Domi.

Blair started to tutor Domi and help her with her homework at the after-school center, but Domi's home responsibilities made it difficult for her to attend the sessions regularly.

Rather than give up, Blair started tutoring Domi at her home. She helped her master her studies and apply for college. She also helped Domi adapt to life in her new homeland.

Blair realized that Domi was not alone. Many immigrant girls and young women Blair spoke with shared the same needs, and many refugee agencies just weren't set up to help them.

That realization led Blair to establish a foundation in 2011 to provide other young women refugees in Chicagoland with the same types of support that Blair offered Domi. It is called GirlForward. It has since expanded its reach to help young women in Austin, TX, as well. Since 2011, GirlForward has helped nearly 300 refugee women in the Chicago area and in Austin find mentors, friends, support, and encouragement in America.

Amina Imran, a refugee from Pakistan, is one of those fortunate young

women. She used to joke that the only way she could attend college is if she robbed a bank, but after finishing the Chicago GirlForward program in 2017, she now attends North Park University in Chicago, on a scholarship.

GirlForward is routinely cited as one of the best charities in Chicago. Reader's Digest declared GirlForward the Best of America.

My visits to GirlForward in Chicago were some of the happiest moments on my schedule. Young women from every corner of the world found friendship and encouragement with their peers. The processes of assimilating language and culture were lifted as these amazing young women came together and shared their struggles and joys.

In helping young women refugees to thrive in their new home, Blair Brettschneider is following in the footsteps of another great Chicagoan. In 1889, Jane Addams founded Hull House on the Near West Side of Chicago. It was one of America's first settlement houses, where new citizens could acquire domestic and job skills and learn about American Government and customs. For her work with Hull House and other social justice causes, Jane Addams became the first American woman ever to receive the Nobel Peace Prize.

GirlForward is a new version of Hull House.

In July, Blair will be leaving GirlForward. Fortunately, she leaves the GirlForward programs in Chicagoland and in Austin in strong shape.

On behalf of the hundreds of young women whose lives GirlForward has helped enrich and transform and the hundreds of young women who will follow them, I want to thank Blair Brettschneider for her remarkable work and wish her all the best in her new efforts.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss Senate amendment No. 861, offered by our colleague from Utah.

The author of the amendment, Senator ROMNEY, and others have made clear that this language does not constitute an authorization of the use of military force, or AUMF. I agree with that assessment.

While this amendment appears to restate existing Presidential authority to defend the country in the event of an attack, it includes other language that could be interpreted to provide more authority to the President. That concerns me, which is why I voted against this amendment.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, amendment No. 861 fully captures the utter failure of the modern Congress to assert and defend congressional war powers that the U.S. Constitution solely vests in the legislative branch. It treats matters of life and death as mere fodder for political “gotcha”

votes and represents an approach to legislating that is ultimately as simplistic as it is dangerous.

If one asked 10 attorneys to analyze the text of amendment No. 861, one might very well receive 10 wildly different interpretations of what the undefined terms in the amendment mean, from the use of the term “attack by the government, military forces, or proxies of a foreign nation or by other hostile forces” to the phrase “used to ensure the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to defend themselves, and United States citizens.”

As the authors plausibly argue, the intent of the amendment may very well be to simply reaffirm existing legal interpretations and norms that authorize the U.S. Armed Forces to defend itself and our citizens against attack by a foreign nation or other hostile force. As supporters argue, the amendment language avoids using the specific phrase “authorization for use of military force,” and thus one may argue that it is technically not an “AUMF.”

Yet adopting such an interpretation requires ignoring years of executive branch overreach when it comes to taking unilateral military action without seeking an authorization for use of military force or a declaration of war from Congress.

It requires willfully forgetting the behavior of our current President and past Presidents of both parties, who have chosen to define the concept of Commander in Chief under Article II of the U.S. Constitution to be less a commander and more an emperor while the legislative branch has sat idly by as its war powers were rapidly seized by the modern imperial Presidency.

Congress is a coequal branch of government. It is time we started acting like it. We cannot trust any President to take a blank check and fill in a reasonable number. I must oppose amendment 861 because, in my reading, any President of any party would adopt the broadest legal interpretation possible in defining what constitutes an “other hostile force” or an “attack” or what it means to “ensure the ability of the Armed Forces of the U.S. to defend themselves.”

This language risks unintentionally authorizing President Trump to order all types of military strikes against any number of potential entities that the President deems to be a threat. How would the Trump administration determine the precise baseline that defines the term “ability” of the military to defend itself? Would allowing the degradation of any platform or capability qualify as failing to “ensure the ability” of the U.S. Armed Forces to defend itself? If so, that would authorize the use of funds in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 to take unilateral, preemptive action again a foreign nation or hostile force to preserve the current capabilities of the U.S. military.

I am confident the author of this amendment would disagree with this

interpretation of his legislative language. However, would the sponsor argue that such an interpretation is unreasonable or not possible? Would a Federal Court not defer to the Federal Agency’s interpretation of a vague and ambiguous statute? I do not know the answer to either question; yet I know this: I am not willing to take that risk.

We are living with the consequences of a previous Congress that rushed to pass a concise authorization for use of military force that appeared targeted and limited at first. We have watched as Republican and Democratic administrations alike subsequently employed creative and broad legal interpretations of that authorization to continually expand which parties were connected with the horrific terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

To this very day, the Trump administration cites this authorization for use of military force as legal justification to unilaterally deploy Americans all around the world, even though it was authorized in response to an event that took place before some of these troops were even born. To be clear, I am not asserting that I oppose the premise or substantive motivation of every military action that has taken place under the recent Presidential administrations. I am simply stating that such actions must be debated and voted on by Congress.

I deployed to fight in a war I personally opposed because it was ordered by the Commander in Chief, and these orders were pursuant to an authorization for use of military force that was publicly debated and passed by a majority of our Nation’s elected representatives. Opposing a vaguely worded amendment whose own author and proponents assert is duplicative and unnecessary and which I believe may unintentionally open the door to unlimited unilateral military action, ultimately is a vote to make our Nation stronger, more accountable, and a more perfect union in living out the principles contained in our founding document.

Critics may falsely allege that opposing amendment No. 861 is voting against our national defense and military. I will strongly reject any such ridiculous claim that slanders me with the accusation that I would ever risk the security and safety of the Nation I have proudly served in uniform. In voting against amendment No. 861, I am safeguarding our military from excessive use without congressional oversight. I am simply making clear that we, in Congress, must begin exercising the same care and attention in doing our job as our troops do when executing their missions downrange.

One of my primary motivations for serving the great State of Illinois in the U.S. Senate is to help restore congressional war powers. To remind my colleagues that whether one favors military action or opposes the use of military force, every Member of Congress should agree that such matters deserve to be debated and carefully

considered by our Nation’s duly elected representatives in the broad light of day. To remind my colleagues that we must always demand the Commander in Chief clearly outline our desired strategic end state before authorizing military action that puts our troops in harm’s way.

The bottom line is that only Congress has the power to declare war. We are the ones tasked with deciding when and how we send Americans into combat. We are the ones the Constitution charged with that most solemn duty.

For too long, too many elected officials have avoided the responsibility and burden of declaring war. Fearing electoral risks and staring down coming elections, multiple Congresses have shirked their constitutional responsibility to our troops by refusing to repeal the existing authorization for use of military force, while avoiding consideration any new authorizations for use of military force. Enough—enough of being so worried about political consequences that we fail to do our own jobs, even as we expect our troops to do theirs without complaint every day.

We need to do better by our servicemembers. We owe it to them to honor their sacrifices. Part of that means ensuring that no American sheds blood in a war Congress has not authorized, or unintentionally authorized by passing vague language such as in amendment No. 861 that can be twisted to be read as empowering President Trump to take preemptive military action.

We should be disciplined in forcing any President who wishes to go to war to bring their case to Congress and give the American people a vote through their elected representatives. That is how we truly respect our servicemembers and military families: by demanding debate that is honest and clear-eyed about the likely loss of life and the risks of escalation that accompany any use of force. It is our duty, and it is the least we can do for those willing to risk their lives in safeguarding our democracy, our way of life, and our Constitution.

So with the drums of war beating louder and louder by the day, I must oppose amendment No. 861 and keep my promise to all who served or are serving now in defense of this country we love. I must continue seeking to hold all of us who have the honor of serving in Congress accountable for taking back congressional war powers. Moving forward, I urge the leadership of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees to work with me to strike or significantly restrict this language during the conference negotiations that will take place over the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020.

LOWER HEALTH CARE COSTS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my opening statement at the Senate

Health Education, Labor and Pensions Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

LOWER HEALTH CARE COSTS ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Today we are voting on three bills:

First, the Poison Center Network Enhancement Act, offered by Senators Murray and Burr, to reauthorize and update the national network of poison control centers.

Second, the Emergency Medical Services for Children Program Reauthorization Act, offered by Senator Casey and me, to ensure that, from the ambulance to the emergency room, emergency health care providers are fully prepared to treat children, who typically require smaller equipment and different doses of medicine.

Third, the Lower Health Care Costs Act—a package of 54 proposals from 65 senators—29 Republican and 36 Democrat, including nearly every member of this Committee—that will reduce what Americans pay out of their own pockets for health care.

The Lower Health Care Costs Act will reduce what Americans pay out of their pockets for health care in three major ways: First, it ends surprise billing. Second, it creates more transparency—there are twelve bipartisan provisions that will: eliminate gag clauses and anti-competitive terms in insurance contracts, designate a non-profit entity to unlock insurance claims for employers, ban Pharmacy Benefit Managers (PBM) from charging more for a drug than the PBM paid for the drug, and require that patients receive more information on the cost and quality of their health care. You can't lower your health care costs until you know what your health care actually costs. And third, it increases prescription drug competition—there are fourteen bipartisan provisions to help more lower-cost generic and biosimilar drugs reach patients.

This legislation also extends mandatory funding for community health centers, and four additional public health programs, to ensure the 27 million Americans who rely on these centers for primary care and other health care can continue to access care close to home, offered by Senator Murray and me, along with Senators Casey, Cramer, Klobuchar, and Murkowski.

We have paid for this extension for five years with savings from other parts of the larger bill, which will prevent the uncertainty and anxiety of short-term extensions.

The Managers Amendment we are voting on today includes two additional, significant provisions: First, a bill from Senators McConnell and Kaine that will raise the minimum age for purchasing any tobacco product from 18 to 21. This has also been a priority of Senators Young, Romney, Roberts, Murkowski, Collins, Schatz, and others.

And two, from Senators Grassley and Leahy, and many others, the CREATES Act, which will help bring more lower cost generic drugs to patients by eliminating anti-competitive practices by brand drug makers.

Altogether, this legislation will help to lower the cost of health care, which has become a tax on family budgets and on businesses, on federal and state governments.

A recent Gallup poll found that the cost of health care was the biggest financial problem facing American families. And last July, this Committee heard from Dr. Brent James, from the National Academies, who testified that up to half of what the American people spend on health care may be unnecessary.

Over the last two years, this Committee has held 16 hearings on a wide range of topics related to reducing the cost of health care—specifically, how do we reduce what the

American people pay out of their own pockets for health care.

Last December, I sent a letter to experts at the American Enterprise Institute and the Brookings Institution, and to doctors, economists, governors, insurers, employers, and other health care innovators, asking for specific steps Congress could take to lower the cost of health care.

We received over 400 recommendations, some as many as 50 pages long. In May, Senator Murray and I released for discussion the Lower Health Care Costs Act. Since then, we've received over 400 additional comments on our draft legislation, and last Tuesday, we held a hearing to hear additional feedback.

Last Wednesday, Senator Murray and I formally introduced the Lower Health Care Costs Act—a bipartisan package of 54 proposals from 65 senators that will reduce what Americans pay out of their own pockets for health care.

At our hearing on this legislation last week, Ben Ippolito, an economics and health fellow at the American Enterprise Institute, said: "Together, the provisions in this bill would meaningfully increase competition and transparency in health care markets. If enacted, this legislation would lower insurance premiums and drug prices for consumers, and would ensure patients are no longer exposed to surprise medical bills. By lowering costs, this bill would also improve access to health care."

We also heard from Fredrick Isasi, Executive Director of Families USA, at our hearing, who said: "The Reducing Lower Health Care Costs Act is an ambitious piece of legislation—particularly so as a bipartisan bill in these most contentious of times."

And Avik Roy recently wrote in *Forbes*: "Overall, its provisions could be thought of as incremental in scope. But some—especially those around transparency—could have a significant impact."

Here are a few of the ways this legislation will lower health care costs:

Ensures that patients do not receive a surprise medical bill—which is when you unexpectedly receive a \$300 bill, or even a \$3,000 bill, two months after our surgery, because one of your doctors was outside of your insurance network.

Senators Cassidy, Hassan, and Murkowski have done valuable work to solve surprise medical billing by proposing a solution last fall and again this spring, and lighting a fire under Congress to end this harmful practice.

I thank them for their dedication to this issue, and for working with Senator Murray and me to reach a result that protects patients.

Senator Murray and I have agreed on a recommendation to our colleagues that the best solution to protect patients from surprise medical bills is to pay doctors and hospitals that are out-of-network the median contracted rate that in-network doctors and hospitals receive for the same services in their local geographic area, known as the benchmark solution.

This is a change for me because I was inclined to support an in-network guarantee since I believe it is the simplest solution.

Some of my colleagues are inclined to support a new independent system of dispute resolution, known as arbitration. The Congressional Budget Office has indicated that the benchmark solution is the most effective at lowering health care costs and Chairman Pallone and Ranking Member Walden have recommended this proposal to the House of Representatives.

We have also extended this protection to air ambulances, because according to the Government Accountability Office, nearly 70 percent of air ambulance transports were

out-of-network in 2017 and the median price charged by air ambulance providers was about \$36,400 for a helicopter transport and \$40,600 for a fixed-wing transport.

It is time to stop studying the issue of exorbitant air ambulance charges and take action.

Our legislation will treat air ambulances the same as health care providers—by using the local, commercial market-based rate for in-network health care.

This legislation will bring more generic and biosimilar drugs to market faster and lower the cost of prescription drugs by: Helping biosimilar companies speed drug development through a transparent, modernized, and searchable patent database. Senators Collins, Kaine, Braun, Hawley, Murkowski, Paul, Portman, Shaheen, and Stabenow worked on this provision.

Improves the Food and Drug Administration's drug patent database by keeping it more up to date—to help generic drug companies speed product development, a proposal offered by Senators Cassidy and Durbin.

Prevents the abuse of citizens' petitions that can unnecessarily delay drug approvals, from Senators Gardner, Shaheen, Cassidy, Bennet, Cramer, and Braun.

Clarifies that the makers of brand biological products, such as insulin, are not gaming the system to delay new, lower cost biosimilars from coming to market, from Senators Smith, Cassidy, and Cramer; and Eliminates a loophole that allows drug companies to get exclusivity—and delay less costly alternatives from coming to market—just by making small tweaks to an old drug, a proposal from Senators Roberts, Cassidy, and Smith.

Modernizes outdated labeling of certain generic drugs, offered by Senators Bennet and Enzi.

This legislation creates more transparency by:

Banning gag clauses that prevent employers and patients from knowing the true price and quality of health care services. This proposal from Senators Cassidy and Bennet would allow an employer to know that a knee replacement might cost \$15,000 in one hospital and \$35,000 at another hospital;

Requiring health care facilities to provide a summary of services when a patient is discharged from a hospital to make it easier to track bills, and requires hospitals to send all bills within 45 calendar days to protect patients from receiving unexpected bills many months after care, a provision worked on by Senators Enzi and Casey; and

Requiring doctors and insurers to provide patients with price quotes on their expected out-of-pocket costs for care, so patients are able to shop around, a proposal from Senators Cassidy, Young, Murkowski, Ernst, Kennedy, Sullivan, Cramer, Braun, Hassan, Carper, Bennet, Brown, Cardin, Casey, Whitehouse, and Rosen.

It will support state and local efforts to increase vaccination rates, and will help prevent disease outbreaks, through two proposals worked on by Senators Roberts, Peters, and Duckworth.

There is a provision to help communities prevent and reduce obesity, offered by Senators Scott and Jones.

A provision from Senators Schatz, Capito, Cassidy, Collins, Heinrich, Hyde-Smith, Kaine, King, Murkowski, and Udall will expand the use of technology-based health care models to help patients in rural and underserved areas access specialized health care.

And there is a proposal to improve access to mental health care led by Senators Cassidy and Murphy, building on their work in the HELP Committee that became law as part of the response to the opioid crisis.

There are other proposals:

For example, banning anti-competitive terms in health insurance contracts that prevent patients from seeing other, lower-cost, higher-quality providers. The Wall Street Journal identified dozens of cases where anti-competitive terms in contracts between health insurers and hospital systems increase premiums and reduce patient choice.

Banning Pharmacy Benefit Managers, or PBMs, from charging employers, health insurance plans, and patients more for a drug than the PBM paid to acquire the drug, which is known as "spread pricing."

Eliminating a loophole allowing the first generic drug to submit an application to the FDA and block other generic drugs from being approved.

Provisions to improve care for expectant and new moms and their babies.

Provisions to make it as easy to get your personal medical records as it is to book an airplane flight.

And provisions to incentivize health care organizations to use the best cybersecurity practices to protect your privacy and health information.

I hope we will today vote to approve this legislative package so we can present it to Majority Leader McConnell and Minority Leader Schumer for the full Senate to consider next month and would expect that other committees will have their own contributions.

Since January, Senator Murray and I have been working in parallel with Senator Grassley and Senator Wyden, who lead the Finance Committee.

They are working on their own bipartisan bill, which they plan to markup this summer. The Senate Judiciary Committee is marking up bipartisan legislation on prescription drug costs tomorrow. And in the House, the Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and Judiciary Committees have all reported out bipartisan bills to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

Secretary Azar and the Department of Health and Human Services have been extremely helpful in reviewing and providing technical advice on the various proposals to reduce health care costs.

And the president has called for ending surprise billing and reducing the cost of prescription drugs. The Administration has also taken steps to increase transparency so families and employers can better understand their health care costs. The Lower Health Care Costs Act is just one example of this Committee reaching a result on a difficult issue.

We did that with fixing No Child Left Behind, with the 21st Century Cures Act, with user fee funding for the Food and Drug Administration, and most recently, with our response to the opioid crisis that included input from 72 senators of both political parties.

We reached those results in the midst of the argument Congress has been locked in for the last decade about where six percent of Americans get their health insurance.

Especially for Americans without subsidies, the cost of health insurance remains way too expensive. But the reality is we will never have lower cost health insurance until we have lower cost health care.

That is why I am especially glad that 65 Senators, including nearly every member of this Committee, have worked together on the Lower Health Care Costs Act which takes needed steps to actually bring down the cost of health care that Americans pay for out of their own pockets.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TRENT CLARK

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JAMES RISCH, Representative MIKE SIMPSON, and Representative RUSS FULCHER, I congratulate Trent Clark on his upcoming retirement from the Bayer Corporation after 26 years of service. We have greatly enjoyed working with Trent over the course of his career and thank him for the service he has provided to the people of Idaho in both his official and individual capacities.

On behalf of Bayer, Trent has provided steadfast dedication to his responsibilities inherent as public and government affairs director. In that role, he has provided invaluable assistance to Bayer's operations in Soda Springs, which are an integral part of the southeastern Idaho economy. Most notably, Trent has played a critical role in the effort to permit Bayer's next phosphate mine, Caldwell Canyon, which has 40 years of estimated reserves and will be one of the world's most environmentally sustainable mining operations, particularly in its approach to sage grouse habitat. Trent has also helped to further important company efforts to support our local communities, particularly their school systems, and to protect our environment. Additionally, for many years, Trent has worked in a collaborative manner with key stakeholders with a genuine humility and desire to achieve a positive outcome.

As an individual citizen, Trent has also provided excellent service to the people of Idaho in his capacity as chairman of the Idaho Workforce Development Council and as a member of the boards of the Idaho Humanities Council, Idaho Community Foundation, and the Idaho Association of Commerce and Industry. Trent's prior public service includes 2 years as the State executive director of the Farm Services Administration, 3 years as chairman of the Idaho Republican Party, a year as staff to the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, and 8 years as staff to former U.S. Senator Steve D. Symms.

Prior to joining Bayer, Trent graduated with honors from Brigham Young University, where he majored in political science and botany. He also earned an associate of arts degree from Ricks College in Rexburg, ID. After college, Trent worked as a botany instructor for the Yellowstone Institute, as well as executive vice president for the Fox Creek Pack Station.

In addition to Trent's strong record of leadership and service to the community, Trent has served his family and church well. Trent has been married to the former Rebecca Lee since May 23, 1986, and together, they have four children: Brittany (deceased), Kathleen, Christin, and Alexander. Trent and his family enjoy horseback riding and backcountry hiking and

camping. It is our sincere wish that Trent be blessed with many years of retirement with his family.●

TRIBUTE TO TROY WITT

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Troy Witt, of Garfield County, for his selfless actions in helping those in need.

Troy, a rancher and commercial trucker of Sand Springs, spearheaded an effort to send much needed donations to farmers and ranchers impacted by record flooding in Columbus, NE, in March of 2019. He was inspired by Montanans who came to his aid following the Lodgepole Complex fire, Montana's largest fire of the 2017 wildfire season. After losing 85 percent of his ranch, Witt was overwhelmed by the outpouring of support and supplies he received from those he had never met.

When the opportunity presented itself, Witt decided to pay it forward. He planned to load up his 53-foot trailer with as much hay, fencing material, water and other supplies as he could and drive the 700 miles to the drop-off site in Columbus. After the Garfield County Disaster and Emergency Services echoed Witt's plans, farmers from around Montana offered to donate supplies. His efforts helped bring hope to a region where hundreds had lost homes and businesses.

Witt's act exemplifies the spirit of compassion and selflessness that Montanans embody. I and many others thank Mr. Witt for his good deed.●

TRIBUTE TO CLYDE TERRY

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I wish to salute Clyde Terry for his many years of dedicated service and staunch advocacy on behalf of people with disabilities. Clyde is retiring from his longtime role as CEO of Granite State Independent Living, and he leaves a legacy worthy of our praise and our gratitude.

Granite State Independent Living—GSIL—is a nonprofit that breaks down barriers for seniors and people with disabilities and expands the training and support services available to them. Its mission is grounded in a firm belief that all people have a right to define their own level of independence. Under Clyde's leadership, GSIL has blossomed into an essential statewide organization with a \$17 million budget and several awards and accolades to its name, including Non-Profit of the Year Awards from Business NH Magazine, NH Business Review, and the Greater Concord Chamber of Commerce. Service offerings have grown as well to meet the aging, education, and employment challenges faced by so many across the Granite State.

Clyde has tapped into a wealth of experience to build GSIL into an expansive and responsive organization that remains committed to its founding principles of personal choice and direction. Before his tenure at GSIL, he was

the executive director of the New Hampshire Developmental Disabilities Council, a State agency tasked with protecting the rights of our State's most vulnerable citizens. While affiliated with the council, he coauthored a report on the accessibility of polling locations in the United States and established himself as a national expert on election reform. He was also an administrative hearings officer in the State's service systems, and before that, he helped to create and implement New Hampshire's Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. Throughout his career, Clyde has shown an unrivaled passion for improving the lives of the disabled, the aged, and the impoverished.

I was honored to recommend Clyde when a vacancy arose on the National Council on Disability in 2009. As a member of the council, he became a sought-after voice on the potential of autonomous vehicles to broaden a sense of independence among people with disabilities. He was also a force in fighting for fair pay and equal treatment in the workplace. Clyde was eventually named chairperson of the council, a testament to his leadership and communication skills and his fluency on the broad set of issues in the disability community.

I have known Clyde for decades. We worked together on Gary Hart's 1984 Presidential race. Though the campaign eventually ended in heartbreak, Clyde emerged from the race having met Susan, who would become his beloved wife of many years. As Governor of New Hampshire and U.S. Senator, I always appreciated Clyde's guidance and counsel.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in thanking Clyde Terry for his years of service and advocacy and wishing him all the best in the years ahead.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3351. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 51312(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy: Mr. King of New York.

At 6:01 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:06 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SCOTT) has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3401. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

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

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 3351. An act making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-1783. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Ethiprole; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9984-41-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1784. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluopyram; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9994-36-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1785. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Mefenflufenazoles; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9994-51-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-1786. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of four (4) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1787. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Availability to the Public of Defense Nuclear Agency (DNA) Instructions and Changes Thereto" (RIN0790-AK55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1788. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Procedures and Delegations of the Board of Regents, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences"

(RIN0790-AK37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1789. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Public Meeting Procedures of the Board of Regents, Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences" (RIN0790-AK36) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1790. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 105th Annual Report of the Federal Reserve Board covering operations for calendar year 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1791. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Entities to the Entity List and Revision of an Entry on the Entity List" (RIN0694-AH83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1792. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Entities to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AH86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1793. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Capital, Margin, and Segregation Requirements for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants and Capital Requirements for Broker-Dealers" (RIN3235-AL12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1794. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Mid-Chesapeake Bay Island Ecosystem Restoration Project, Chesapeake Bay, Dorchester County, Maryland; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1795. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the navigation improvements at San Juan Harbor, Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1796. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approvals; California, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9994-19-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1797. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approvals; California, Antelope Valley Air Quality Management District" (FRL No. 9994-20-Region 9) received in

the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1798. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; SO₂ Emission Limitations for United States Steel-Gary Works" (FRL No. 9995-67-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1799. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; KY; Attainment Plan for Jefferson County SO₂ Nonattainment Area" (FRL No. 9995-59-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1800. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; Albuquerque/Bernalillo County; Minor New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program Revisions" (FRL No. 9995-44-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1801. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Oklahoma; Regional Haze Five-Year Progress Report" (FRL No. 9995-36-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1802. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Change of Address for Region 1 Reports; Technical Correction" (FRL No. 9995-50-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1803. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Repeal of the Clean Power Plan; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions for Existing Electric Utility Generating Units; Revisions to Emission Guideline Implementing Regulations" (FRL No. 9995-70-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1804. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical corrections to Maine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA) regulations and disposal sites designated under the MPRSA" (FRL No. 9995-28-OW) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-1805. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS-2019-0731); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1806. communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Depart-

ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to the United Kingdom to support the maintenance, repair, and overhaul of the F135 propulsion system powering the F-35 Lightning II aircraft in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-108); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1807. A communication from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Parts 4022 and 4044) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 25, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1808. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing the Outdated Regulations Regarding the National Hansen's Disease Program" (RIN0906-AB20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1809. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removing the Outdated Regulations Regarding the Health Education Assistance Loan (HEAL) Program" (RIN0906-AB21) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-1810. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to a vacancy in the position of Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-1811. A communication from the Regulation Policy Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "VA Acquisition Regulation: Special Contracting Methods" (RIN2900-AQ19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1812. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Standard for Stationary Activity Centers" (16 CFR Parts 1112 and 1238) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1813. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention Standard, MY 2018 High-Theft Light-Duty Truck and Exempted Vehicle Line Listing" (RIN2127-AL79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1814. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory

Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Revised 2017 Fishing Restrictions for Tropical Tuna in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-BH12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1815. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Final 2018 and 2019 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish" (RIN0648-XF633) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-1816. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Allow the Use of Longline Pot Gear in the Gulf of Alaska Sablefish Individual Fishing Quota Fishery; Amendment 101" (RIN0648-BF42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 26, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-97. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana urging the United States Congress to pass a federal country-of-origin labeling (COOL) law for beef and pork products that meets World Trade Organization requirements; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 16

Whereas, in 2002, Congress reauthorized the Farm Bill, which included mandatory country-of-origin labeling for beef, lamb, pork, farm-raised and wild fish, peanuts, and other perishable commodities; and

Whereas, in 2005, the Montana Legislature passed the Country of Origin Placarding Act until "funding and full implementation of federal mandatory country of origin labeling"; and

Whereas, in 2009, Montana's country-of-origin labeling (COOL) laws were voided, as the federal act was implemented; and

Whereas, in 2015, federal COOL rules ceased being enforced for beef and pork products only due mainly to a World Trade Organization ruling; and

Whereas, consumers want to know the origin of their food; and

Whereas, American and Montana farmers and ranchers want consumers to know the origin of their food; and

Whereas, Congress should pass laws and the U.S. Department of Agriculture should administer rules and regulations for COOL certification for beef and pork products that do not impose undue compliance costs, liability, recordkeeping, or verification requirements on farmers and ranchers.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the Senate and the House of Representatives of the 66th Montana Legislature urges Congress to pass a federal COOL law

for beef and pork products that meets World Trade Organization requirements; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the individual members of the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

POM-98. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana memorializing its opposition to the bison grazing proposal by the American Prairie Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 28

Whereas, the American Prairie Reserve (APR) controls private properties tied to 18 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) grazing allotments in Fergus, Petroleum, Phillips, and Valley counties; and

Whereas, the APR has requested that the SLM fundamentally shift long-established grazing practices on the 18 BLM allotments, which encompass 250,000 acres of public property; and

Whereas, APR has petitioned to change the allotments from seasonal or rotational grazing to year-round grazing and remove the interior fencing on those allotments; and

Whereas, the APR proposes to allow the year-round, continuous grazing of public land by bison, which would impact the future grazing viability of the allotments; and

Whereas, the existing BLM designation for managed grazing is what science dictates the rangeland can support; and

Whereas, it is the responsibility of the BLM to ensure the future vitality of these public parcels is protected; and

Whereas, the removal of interior fences will eliminate the ability of BLM to control the access of bison to certain parcels to shorten grazing permits in response to drought or fire to protect the rangeland.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

(1) That it is essential for the preservation of the future viability of Montana's rangeland that the BLM deny the petition by the APR to alter grazing permits on the 18 allotments under the control of APR.

(2) That the denial of the proposed APR grazing permit change is critical for the health of Montana's livestock and wildlife.

(3) That private landowners and communities should not bear the cost of damages incurred by the lack of integrated bison management in the APR's grazing proposal.

(4) That the denial of the APR grazing proposal would protect Montana farmers, ranchers, and communities.

(5) That the BLM should deny the APR bison grazing proposal.

(6) That the Secretary of State send a copy of this resolution to the United States Congress, the Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of Land Management.

POM-99. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana memorializing its support of the ratification of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement; to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas, the United States and Canada have one of the largest trading relationships in the world, and Canada is the United States' largest export market, valued at \$320 billion (\$411 billion Canadian) in goods and services in 2017 and the United States is Canada's largest export market, valued at \$308 billion (\$396 billion Canadian) in 2017 goods and services; and

Whereas, this trade supports 9 million jobs in the United States and 2.1 million jobs in Canada; and

Whereas, in the more than 20 years since the United States, Canada, and Mexico entered into the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), trade among these countries tripled from \$340 billion in 1993 to \$1.2 trillion in 2016; and

Whereas, North American integration of trade under NAFTA has helped to make the region more competitive in the world economy by providing highly integrated and valuable supply chains, as well as common rules and harmonized regulations that increase the speed and global competitiveness of one another's businesses, and by driving investment and imbedding value in each others' economic success, including by providing jobs in North American communities; and

Whereas, Canada and Mexico are the first-ranked and third-ranked markets, respectively, for agriculture exports from the United States at an estimated \$20.6 billion sent to Canada and \$18.6 billion sent to Mexico, up from \$8.7 billion in 1992, the year that NAFTA was signed; and

Whereas, of particular interest to Montana because Canada is its largest trade partner, Canada has agreed to grade imports of wheat from the United States in a manner no less favorable than that accorded to wheat in its own country and not to require a country of origin statement on its quality grade or inspection certificate; and

Whereas, in signing the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, the three countries have agreed to make targeted improvements to NAFTA and build on the successful partnership and a shared competitiveness in the global marketplace in which free, fair, open, and mutually beneficial trade helps to strengthen the economies of all countries.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:

That the Montana Legislature supports the ratification of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement on trade by all countries as soon as possible; and be it further

Resolved, That the Montana Secretary of State send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate, the Consulate of Canada in Colorado, the Consulate of Mexico in Colorado, each member of the United States Senate Finance Committee, the United States House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee, the United States Senate Advisory Group on Negotiations, and the United States House of Representatives Advisory Group on Negotiations, the United States Trade Representative, the United States Secretary of Commerce, the United States Secretary of State, the United States Secretary of Labor, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Intellectual Property Enforcement Coordinator.

POM-100. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to the naturalization procedures of non-American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 580. A bill to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-53).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Mark Lee Greenblatt, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Department of the Interior.

*Daniel Habib Jorjani, of Kentucky, to be Solicitor of the Department of the Interior.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Peter Joseph Phipps, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Charles R. Eskridge III, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

William Shaw Stickman IV, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Jennifer Philpott Wilson, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Wilmer Ocasio, of Puerto Rico, to be United States Marshal for the District of Puerto Rico for the term of four years.

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 1999. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide transitional coverage and retroactive Medicare part D coverage for certain low-income beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2000. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to remove an institutional bias by making permanent the protection for recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 2001. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Willie O'Ree, in recognition of his extraordinary contributions and commitment to hockey, inclusion, and recreational opportunity; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ISAKSON, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 2002. A bill to require that any debt limit increase or suspension be balanced by equal spending cuts over the next decade; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2003. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to designate a 3-digit dialing code for veterans in crisis; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2004. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish insulin assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2005. A bill to establish the IMPACT for Energy Foundation; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2006. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit certain conduct relating to the use of horses for human consumption; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2007. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development from implementing a proposed rule regarding requirements under Community Planning and Development housing programs; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2008. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GARDNER, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2009. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the establishment of a small business voucher program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2010. A bill to increase research, education, and treatment for cerebral cavernous malformations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2011. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirement for the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BENNET, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2012. A bill to provide that certain regulatory actions by the Federal Communications Commission shall have no force or effect; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. 2013. A bill to protect the right of individuals to bear arms at water resources de-

velopment projects; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MARKEY:

S. 2014. A bill to provide grants to States to encourage the implementation and maintenance of firearms licensing requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2015. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to direct the Secretary of Education to develop a plain language disclosure form for borrowers of Federal student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 2016. A bill to help individuals receiving disability insurance benefits under title II of the Social Security Act obtain rehabilitative services and return to the workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. MCSALLY, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 2017. A bill to amend section 116 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 2018. A bill to provide Federal matching funding for State-level broadband programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2019. A bill to ensure Members of Congress have access to Federal facilities in order to exercise their Constitutional oversight responsibilities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2020. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand the use of telehealth services for remote imaging for chronic eye disease; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 2021. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act by striking marijuana use, possession, and distribution as grounds of inadmissibility and removal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 2022. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for improvements to the specially adapted housing program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 2023. A bill to modify the Federal and State Technology Partnership Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

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

S. 2024. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the American History for Freedom grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 2025. A bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to modify

the definition of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2026. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2027. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the scope of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. CARDIN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 2028. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 2029. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the Indian coal production tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 2030. A bill to prevent Federal agencies from interfering with the marijuana policy of States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 2031. A bill to amend the FAST Act to allow States to include information on small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans in reporting under the disadvantaged business enterprises program of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2032. A bill to expand research on the cannabidiol and marihuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2033. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to promulgate standards and regulations requiring all new commercial motor vehicles to be equipped with technology to limit maximum operating speed, to require existing speed-limiting technologies already installed in certain commercial motor vehicles to be used while in operation, and to require that maximum safe operating speed of commercial motor vehicles shall not exceed 65 miles per hour; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2034. A bill to authorize small business development centers to provide cybersecurity assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2035. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to develop a strategic plan to expand eligibility for the PreCheck Program to individuals with Transportation Worker Identification Credentials or Hazardous Materials Endorsements; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 2036. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 2037. A bill to amend the STEM education program for American Indian, Alaska Native, and Native Hawaiian students under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2038. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the credit for alternative fuel vehicle refueling property, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2039. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the issuance of exempt facility bonds for zero-emission vehicle infrastructure; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2040. A bill to establish a working group on electric vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2041. A bill to establish the Green Spaces, Green Vehicles Initiative to facilitate the installation of zero-emissions vehicle infrastructure on National Forest System land, National Park System land, and certain related land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2042. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2043. A bill to provide incentives for hate crime reporting, provide grants for State-run hate crime hotlines, and establish alternative sentencing for individuals convicted under the Matthew Shephard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 2044. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to establish an Aging Infrastructure Account, to amend the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 to provide additional funds under that Act, to establish a review of flood control rule curves pilot project within the Bureau of Reclamation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2045. A bill to reauthorize the SBIR and STTR programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 2046. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to protect the health care benefits of retired public safety officers, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2047. A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 267. A resolution recognizing the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway all individuals should enjoy in honor of the heroes of September 11th; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. Res. 268. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the Federal Government should not bail out any State; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. Res. 269. A resolution commemorating the life of Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor and calling for justice and accountability; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 270. A resolution recognizing the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. Res. 271. A resolution designating July 12, 2019, as "Collector Car Appreciation Day" and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOPE, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Con. Res. 21. A concurrent resolution strongly condemning human rights violations, violence against civilians, and cooperation with Iran by the Houthi movement and its allies in Yemen; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 110

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 110, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a permanent extension of the lower income threshold for the medical expense deduction.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 210, a bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish teacher leader development programs.

S. 239

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 239, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of Christa McAuliffe.

S. 367

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 367, a bill to provide for the administration of certain national monuments, to establish a National Monument Enhancement Fund, and to establish certain wilderness areas in the States of New Mexico and Nevada.

S. 546

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, *supra*.

S. 560

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 668, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of

whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 678

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 678, a bill to declare English as the official language of the United States, to establish a uniform English language rule for naturalization, and to avoid misconstructions of the English language texts of the laws of the United States, pursuant to Congress' powers to provide for the general welfare of the United States and to establish a uniform rule of naturalization under article I, section 8, of the Constitution.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore incentives for investments in qualified improvement property.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to redesign \$20 Federal reserve notes so as to include a likeness of Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes.

S. 876

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 876, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to prepare veterans for careers in the energy industry, including the solar, wind, cybersecurity, and other low-carbon emissions sectors or zero-emissions sectors of the energy industry, and for other purposes.

S. 1071

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1071, a bill to support empowerment, economic security, and educational opportunities for adolescent girls around the world, and for other purposes.

S. 1227

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1227, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes.

S. 1243

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1243, a bill to provide standards for facilities at which aliens in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security are detained, and for other purposes.

S. 1392

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1392, a bill to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct an assessment of the responsibilities, workload, and vacancy rates of suicide prevention coordinators of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1428

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1428, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit treatment of student loan payments as elective deferrals for purposes of employer matching contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 1457

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1457, a bill to provide for interagency coordination on risk mitigation in the communications equipment and services marketplace and the supply chain thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 1488

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1488, a bill to improve the integrity and safety of interstate horseracing, and for other purposes.

S. 1531

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1531, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide protections for health insurance consumers from surprise billing.

S. 1625

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms.

COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1625, a bill to promote the deployment of commercial fifth-generation mobile networks and the sharing of information with communications providers in the United States regarding security risks to the networks of those providers, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

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

S. 1768

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1768, a bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce.

S. 1847

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1847, a bill to require group health plans and group or individual health insurance coverage to provide coverage for over-the-counter contraceptives.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the sites associated with the life and legacy of the noted American philanthropist and business executive Julius Rosenwald, with a special focus on the Rosenwald Schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1986

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1986, a bill to amend the Fair Housing Act to prohibit discrimination based on source of income, veteran status, or military status.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

AMENDMENT NO. 556

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from

Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 556 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 703

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 703 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 742

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 742 intended to be proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 883

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 883 proposed to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 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.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms.

HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 2008. A bill to prohibit, as an unfair or deceptive act or practice, commercial sexual orientation conversion therapy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, half a century ago, members of the LGBTQIA+ community, who were tired of being accosted and abused and assaulted just because of who they were or whom they loved, took a stand to say “enough is enough” and pushed back against the forces of history that said they were anything less than.

Thanks to the sacrifice of freedom fighters like Marsha P. Johnson, Sylvia Rivera, and so many others both named and unnamed who dared that day to live their entire truth, countless others today have been set free. Now, 50 years later, through dogged persistence and sacrifice, we have been able to pass laws and create policies that respect and protect members of the LGBTQIA+ community—from challenging hateful bans against lesbian and gay relationships, to securing landmark civil rights protections against hate crimes, to, finally, making marriage equality the law of our land.

This year, as we commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall protests that sparked the modern movement for LGBTQ equality, I am very proud to stand here on the floor of the Senate as an unapologetic ally for this vibrant community.

As we close out this month’s annual celebration of Pride, I come to the floor today to reintroduce legislation to further protect gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, asexual, and gender nonconforming individuals from the dogma of our Nation’s homophobic and transphobic past because, even as we reflect on the progress we have made, we have a lot more to do to achieve equality.

In the Senate, I have been very proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with the community in Washington State and around the country in order to continue our progress and work to expand protections to help members of the community thrive, from our efforts to reduce bullying and harassment at colleges and universities through legislation named after Tyler Clementi—a student who tragically died by suicide in college—to reducing the epidemic of harassment and discrimination in workplaces through the Be HEARD Act, which is a bill I recently introduced that would hold businesses accountable for harassment and discrimination, give workers the resources and support they need to seek justice, and clarify that discriminating on the basis

of sexual orientation and gender identity are unlawful under the Civil Rights Act.

I am very grateful to my colleague Senator BOOKER and our friend Representative LIEU for joining me today in reintroducing the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act—the first Federal ban on so-called conversion therapy—because, in 2019, we know that being a member of the LGBTQIA+ community isn’t an affliction, a disease, or some chronic condition that requires medical treatment; rather, the politicians who say it is are on the wrong side of history.

In fact, we know that conversion therapy is a painful and discriminatory practice. The American Psychological Association has said it “is unlikely to be successful in changing someone’s sexual orientation” and would “involve some risk of harm” contrary to the claims of practitioners and advocates. It is also a practice that is especially harmful to LGBTQIA+ children, who we already know are vulnerable to increased harassment and discrimination because of who they are.

I am proud that my home State of Washington has already banned conversion therapy, but that is not enough so long as any child or any person in our country can be harmed by this sham practice. That is why I am very proud to be here to reintroduce the Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act and to remind all of our friends that we stand with them throughout history and throughout the future to make sure they are protected with their rights.

The Therapeutic Fraud Prevention Act is legislation that would classify conversion therapy as the fraudulent practice our communities and science know it is. It would clarify in our Nation’s laws that providing or facilitating commercial conversion therapy or facilitating or advertising such services is an unfair and deceptive practice, and it would ensure that Federal regulators and State attorneys general have the ability and authority to enforce this ban.

We have come far in our long battle for LGBTQIA+ equality, and I am ready to get to work to get this important legislation over the finish line because, after 50 years of struggle, as a nation, we have come to know that love is love and that love wins. However, after 50 years, we also know it gets better but only if we work to make it so.

From the horrors of the Pulse massacre, to the ever-climbing number of murdered African-American and Latinx transgender women, to President Trump’s transgender military ban and his administration’s continuous assault on LGBTQIA+ rights, so many of the challenges that face the community today mirror the critical struggles they faced all those years ago at the Stonewall Inn. Like then, too many in the community are still threatened by even greater danger because they are also women, transgender, people of color, poor, and the list goes on.

That is why this legislation and recognitions like Pride Month are so important. All month, I have been thrilled to see the photos from Pride celebrations back in Washington State—from Spokane, to Yakima, to Olympia—filled with so much cheer, resilience, and strength, only to come back here to Washington and argue in this Chamber about why we shouldn't confirm people to judicial or executive posts who don't believe in the full humanity and equality of so many of our family members, friends, neighbors, and coworkers.

It is obvious that this work is still very important, and we have it cut out for us, but I remain hopeful because I have seen how far we have come in just 50 years. By continuing to honor the righteous tradition of Marsha, Sylvia, and so many others by raising our voices against injustice and taking key steps like this legislation to make life easier for the next generation of LGBTQIA+ Americans, I know we will see even more progress in the next 50 years.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. JONES):

S. 2018. A bill to provide Federal matching funding for State-level broadband programs; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the American Broadband Buildout Act of 2019, or ABBA. This legislation would help ensure that rural Americans have access to broadband services at speeds they need to fully participate in the benefits of our modern society and economy regardless of whether they live in the largest cities or the smallest towns. I am delighted to be joined by my friend and colleague Senator DOUG JONES in introducing this bill.

Twenty-five years ago, when the internet was known as the World Wide Web, Americans typically accessed the web using their home phone lines via modems capable of downloading data at just 56 kilobits per second—too slow even to support MP3-quality streaming music. Today, the threshold for broadband service as defined by the FCC allows downloads at speeds nearly 500 times faster—25 megabits per second. At these speeds, Americans not only can watch their favorite movies on demand in the comfort of their very own living rooms but can also participate in the global economy while working from home, upgrade their skills through online education, stay connected to their families as they age in place, and access healthcare through advances in telemedicine.

While the increase in broadband speeds has been dramatic and is encouraging, these numbers mask a disparity between urban and rural Americans. Nearly all Americans living in urban areas have access to the internet at speeds that meet the FCC's broadband threshold, while one in four rural Americans does not.

Similar disparities occur in terms of broadband adoption—the rate at which Americans subscribe to broadband service if they have access to it. According to the Pew Research Center survey last year, 22 percent of rural Americans don't use the internet at home, compared to just 8 percent of urban Americans.

The bipartisan bill that we are introducing would help close the digital divide between urban and rural America by directing the FCC to provide up to \$5 billion in matching grants to assist States and State-approved entities in building “last-mile” infrastructure to bring high-speed broadband directly to homes and businesses in areas that lack it. Let me briefly discuss a few key points about the bill that I would like to highlight.

First, projects that receive funding must be located in unserved areas where broadband is unavailable at speeds that meet the FCC standards. Narrowing the focus to those areas will ensure that the money goes where it is needed most and will also protect against overbuilding where broadband infrastructure is already in place.

Second—and this is important—the bill requires that this Federal funding be matched through public-private partnerships between the broadband service provider and the State in which the last-mile infrastructure project will be built. This means that States and their private sector partners will have “skin in the game” to balance the Federal commitment, ensuring that projects will be well thought out and designed to be sustainable.

Third, the bill requires that projects be designed to be “future proof,” meaning that the infrastructure installed must be capable of delivering higher speeds as broadband accelerates in the future. This will ensure that Federal tax dollars are used to help build a network that serves rural Americans now and in the future without our having to rebuild it every time technology advances.

Furthermore, the bill directs the FCC to prioritize the funding of projects in States that have traditionally lagged behind the national average in terms of broadband subscribers and are at risk of falling further behind as broadband speeds increase.

Finally, the bill provides grants for states and state-designated entities for digital literacy and public awareness campaigns, highlighting the benefits and possibilities of broadband service and helping to attract employers to rural parts of our country in which broadband services are lacking and yet are essential for a business's success. The key reason to do this is to address the disparity in the adoption rates I have already mentioned, which will help drive down the costs of the service and make it more affordable for everyone.

One broadband application that holds special promise for rural America is telemedicine. As a native of Aroostook

County—the largest county by land area east of the Mississippi, with fewer than 70,000 residents—I know how important healthcare is to the vitality and even to the survival of rural communities. Often, these communities struggle to attract and retain the physicians they need to ensure their having access to quality care for their citizens. Broadband can help to bridge this gap by enabling innovative healthcare delivery in these rural communities.

In an example described to me in a recent letter, hospice workers at Northern Light Home Care and Hospice were able to use the internet and video technology to help support a patient who was living on an island off the coast of Maine—not as far as the seagull flies but hours away in travel time. Although the connection was very poor, the video enabled the hospice nurses to monitor the patient's symptoms and provide emotional support to her family. As the author of that letter, Lisa Harvey-McPherson, put it, “Our hospice team could be doing so much more with video and telemonitoring technologies if Maine had better connectivity.”

I ask unanimous consent that immediately following my remarks, this letter from Lisa Harvey-McPherson be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. President, in closing, rural Americans deserve to enjoy the benefits of high-speed internet in the same way that urban Americans do, but a digital divide has arisen due to the simple fact that rural areas are more sparsely populated than urban ones and are therefore more expensive to serve. The bill that Senator JONES and I are introducing today would help to bridge this digital divide by funding future-proof broadband where it is needed most and giving a real boost to job creation in rural America.

I urge my colleagues to support our bill.

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

NORTHERN LIGHT HEALTH,
Brewer, ME, May 13, 2019.

Senator SUSAN COLLINS,
Dirksen Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of Northern Light Health member organizations and the patients we serve, I want to thank you for your support for the need to advance health care technology in Maine. Technology is an essential strategy to increase access to health care services in rural Maine. Northern Light Health is a technology leader in Maine providing a variety of telehealth services including cardiology, stroke, psychiatry, trauma, pediatric intensive care and in-home telemonitoring services state wide. As we work to expand opportunities for patients to receive health care services through technology we consistently encounter the challenge of inadequate (or absent) broadband capacity. Northern Light Health member organizations compete nationally to recruit specialists to Maine, technology is often the only option to expand access to specialists in rural Maine.

The following Northern Light Health examples highlight technology opportunities

and the need to increase broadband speed and capacity in rural Maine.

Our hospice program cared for a patient on an island off Hancock County. Staff placed a tablet at the patient's home and one with the hospice nurse. Because of the challenges of Island travel, it took hours to get to the home to manage and support the patient and her family. While the broadband connection was very poor we were able to help with symptoms and emotional support using video technology. Our hospice team could be doing so much more with video and telemonitoring technologies if Maine had better connectivity.

At Northern Light AR Gould in Presque Isle, they are a pilot site for the telehealth virtual walk-in clinic. Those using the system within the pilot are amazed at the ease of access to a provider to ask those easy questions that keep patients out of the ED. If successful, in a broader roll-out, patients in local communities will have access to walk-in level care (colds, rashes, general health questions) without leaving their home via technology. This is important given the average age of the population and the difficulty of traveling roads during the winter months in Aroostook County. The barrier to fully expanding the telehealth virtual clinic is broadband capacity.

Broadband access is also a professional recruitment tool, often provider spouses have difficulty finding meaningful employment. Addressing rural broadband capacity will support remote work.

In Aroostook County we are also evaluating telepsychiatry services for the regional nursing homes. This will significantly increase access to psychiatry services which is in clinical demand. Connectivity is a foundational component of offering this service.

Our electronic health record has expanded access to individualized health information for our patients, connectivity is a barrier to patients accessing this important resource in rural Maine.

As we increase our electronic health record capacity providers are reliant on this technology as much as they are reliant on clinical tools like a stethoscope. In areas with broadband capacity challenges the providers spend time looking at buffering symbols on their screens for long periods of time in the day.

We appreciate the opportunity to share these examples with you and your staff as you explore Congressional solutions to Maine's broadband challenge.

Sincerely,

LISA HARVEY-MCPHERSON
RN, MBA, MPPM,
Vice President Govern-
ment Relations.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2026. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

In 2010, Congress passed the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act, which reauthorized child nutrition programs and made healthy meal choices a reality to children nationwide. Far too many children and adolescents in the United States suffer from obesity, which puts them at risk for developing chronic health conditions later in life. One of the best ways to help students make

healthy choices is to teach them about their food and how it is grown. Making that connection makes a difference. That is why I championed the inclusion of funding for a farm to school grant program, which was included in the Healthy and Hunger-Free Kids Act.

The program has had tremendous success and interest nationwide, and has awarded grants in all 50 states and the District of Columbia to support programs in more than 33,000 schools. Building upon the success of this program, I am glad to be joined today by Senators PERDUE, BROWN, and COLLINS in introducing the Farm to School Act of 2019. In years past, I have championed this important farm to school legislative effort with one of my dearest friends, Thad Cochran, who sadly passed away last month.

We all know that hungry children cannot learn. Studies have shown that healthy nutrition in a young person's diet is crucial to cognitive ability and better health in the long run. Food insecurity and obesity rates are still too high in this country, resulting in poor health, and learning and behavioral difficulties at school. The school meal program has made tremendous strides in recent years to ensure not only that children have access to meals throughout the school day, but that those meals are nutritious. The Farm to School program has given children and schools across the country the tools to craft farm-fresh, healthy, and delicious meals that students enjoy.

The Farm to School grant program offers support to farmers and local economies, while teaching kids about nutritious foods and how they are grown. The program has a strong educational component, making our school cafeterias an extension of the classroom, giving students an opportunity to learn about nutrition, well-balanced meals, and even how to grow the food themselves.

In Vermont, I have seen first-hand how farm to school efforts have better connected children with the food in their cafeteria. Students participate in school gardens, sustainability projects, and taste tests for new school menu items. With the help of a USDA Farm to School grant, the Burlington School Food Project has created a partnership with a local Vermont beef processor and 100 percent of the beef served the last school year was locally sourced, and that will continue next year as well. Organizations in Vermont such as Vermont Food Education Every Day, Shelburne Farms, and the Northeast Organic Farming Association have been able to expand their programs to link more farms to the classroom throughout Vermont.

Farm to school is equally crucial to farmers and ranchers by opening another market to them to sell their locally grown and locally harvested goods. The program links the classroom with the farm to engage students in the importance of farming and contributing to the local economy. Every

dollar spent on local food generates up to an additional \$2.16 in economic activity.

This program is so popular among school and farmers alike that demand for grants far outpaces available funding. Since the program began in 2013, USDA has received more than 1,900 applications, but has only been able to fund 437 projects. The Farm to School Act of 2019 would build upon the success of the program and expand its reach by increasing the funding for the program to \$15 million per year. The bill also recognizes the importance of growing the program to include preschools, summer food service program sites, and after-school programs.

Ensuring children have enough food to eat is an issue that unites us all. There is simply no excuse that in the wealthiest, most powerful Nation on Earth people go hungry. Small changes in eating habits by children will result in lifelong health benefits for generations to come. The Farm to School program empowers children and their families to make healthy choices now and in the future. As the Senate begins considering reauthorizing the child nutrition bill this year, I look forward to including these improvements in the Farm to School program.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KAINE, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2032. A bill to expand research on the cannabidiol and marijuana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Cannabidiol and Marijuana Research Expansion Act with my colleagues.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that marijuana and its derivatives, like cannabidiol, commonly known as CBD, may be helpful in treating serious medical conditions. However, anecdotal evidence alone cannot be the basis for developing new medications. Rather, medication development must be based on science.

Unfortunately, marijuana research is subject to burdensome regulations which may unintentionally inhibit research and medication development.

The Cannabidiol and Marijuana Research Expansion Act will reduce these barriers without sacrificing security or enabling diversion. It will ensure that marijuana-derived medications are developed using strong scientific evidence, and provide a pathway for the manufacture and distribution of FDA-approved drugs that are based on this research.

First, the bill streamlines the regulatory process for marijuana research. Specifically, it requires the Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA) to quickly approve or deny applications to research CBD or marijuana and establishes a process by which applicants may submit supplemental information, if necessary.

It also improves regulations dealing with changes to approved quantities of marijuana needed for research and approved research protocols. These improvements will eliminate lengthy delays that researchers encounter under current regulations.

Second, this legislation seeks to increase medical research on CBD.

It does so by explicitly authorizing medical and osteopathic schools, research universities, practitioners and pharmaceutical companies to produce the marijuana they need for approved medical research. This will ensure that researchers have access to the material they need to develop proven, effective medicines. Once the FDA approves these medications, pharmaceutical companies are permitted to manufacture and distribute them.

Third, the bill fosters increased communication between doctors and patients.

Because it is a Schedule I drug, some doctors are hesitant to talk to their patients about the potential harms and benefits of using marijuana, CBD, or other marijuana derivatives as a treatment, for fear that they will lose their DEA registrations. Yet, if patients are using marijuana or its derivatives without their doctors' knowledge, it could impact the effectiveness of the care they receive. That is why our bill authorizes these discussions to occur.

Finally, because existing Federal research is lacking, the bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to expand and coordinate research to determine the potential medical benefits of CBD or other marijuana-derived medications on serious medical conditions.

I have heard from many parents who have turned to CBD as a last resort to treat their children who have intractable epilepsy. Anecdotally, CBD has produced positive results. I have heard similar stories from people who use marijuana to treat various other medical conditions.

But a common concern echoed in many of these conversations is that there is a lack of understanding about the proper delivery mechanism, dosing, or potential interactions that CBD or marijuana may have with other medications. Some also worry because these products aren't well regulated or factory sealed, and often are labeled incorrectly.

Without additional research, our ability to adequately address these concerns is limited and uninformed.

The need for additional research, along with the need to increase the supply of CBD and marijuana for research purposes, was highlighted in the National Academy of Sciences report, titled "The Health Effects of Cannabis and Cannabinoids: The Current State of Evidence and Recommendations for Research."

I firmly believe that we should reduce the regulatory barriers associated with researching marijuana and CBD. If and when science shows that these

substances are effective in treating serious medical illnesses, we should enable products to be brought to the market with FDA approval. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

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

S. 2036. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide grants to States for summer employment programs for youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to the Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2019 that I am introducing today with my colleague from Maryland, Senator VAN HOLLEN. This legislation authorizes the Department of Labor to award Summer Employment for Youth grants to connect youth with jobs that serve their local communities and private businesses over the summer months.

Since the mid-1990s, my home city of Baltimore has organized the Youth Works program out of the Mayor's Office of Employment Development. The Youth Works program provides individuals between the ages of 14 to 21 with a summer job with employers ranging from private businesses, local community nonprofit organizations, to city and State government agencies throughout the City. At these summer jobs, participants are provided with meaningful work experiences, are able to learn to develop the attitudes and grit necessary to compete in the workforce, gain exposure to a variety of career fields, and have a safe, stable environment over the summer months during the day. For the 2019 Youth Works session that begins next week, Baltimore youth participating in the program will have a job for five days a week, five hours per day from July 1st through August 2nd and be paid a minimum of \$10.10 per hour for their service.

This program has grown to be one of the largest youth summer employment programs in the Nation. After the unrest in my home city in April 2015, the Federal Department of Labor provided the Maryland Department of Labor, Licensing and Regulation and the Baltimore City's Mayor's Office of Employment with a \$5 million grant to develop innovative job training strategies and work opportunities for youth and young adults across Baltimore. This Federal grant increased the number of individuals able to be served by the Youth Works program from an historic average of 5,000 participants to the more than 8,000 served today. Last year, Youth Works provided 8,600 Baltimoreans with jobs at more than 900 different worksites across my home city. I'm proud to say that some of those individuals who participated in the Youth Works program over the course

of multiple summers while in high school have recently graduated and were hired by State agencies such as the Maryland Department of Natural Resources. Baltimore youth and their families clearly see the value of this program, with more than 14,000 individuals applying for Youth Works slots this upcoming summer.

Unfortunately, due to the lack of funding between the partnership between the City, State, private business, and philanthropic ventures, more than 5,000 Baltimore City youth who sought summer employment will be denied the opportunity to gain experience in the workplace, foster confidence that they are capable of being successful in a new environment, and lose the security of a safe environment over the summer. We can and must do more to help individuals willing and eager to start their careers.

The Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act would seek to eliminate the waiting list for Baltimore students seeking to participate in Youth Works or other summer employment programs around the Nation. If enacted, my legislation would allow States to compete for Summer Employment for Youth grants to serve communities like Baltimore that have high concentrations of eligible, low-income youth. The grants would be utilized by local communities to carry out programs like the Youth Works program that provide summer employment opportunities that are directly linked to academic and occupations learning by providing meaningful work experiences. States competing for grants would be required to partner with private businesses to the extent feasible and to prioritize jobs and work opportunities that directly serve their communities, such as through summer employment with local community nonprofit organizations and city and State government agencies. This additional Federal funding can boost existing programs such as Youth Works and allow other communities across Maryland to establish their own programs and develop Maryland's next generation of workforce.

I am proud to lead this Senate effort with my colleague from Maryland and appreciate the work of Representative CEDRIC RICHMOND of Louisiana who initially led this effort in the U.S. House of Representatives and will shortly introduce companion legislation this Congress. I urge my Senate colleagues to join with me in this effort to connect youth with summer employment opportunities and start their journey towards fulfilling, successful careers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objections, so ordered.

S. 2036

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Youth Summer Jobs and Public Service Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH.

Section 129 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3164) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) GRANTS TO STATES FOR SUMMER EMPLOYMENT FOR YOUTH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, from the amount appropriated under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall award grants to States to provide assistance to local areas that have high concentrations of eligible youth to enable such local areas to carry out programs described in subsection (c)(1) that provide summer employment opportunities for eligible youth, which are directly linked to academic and occupational learning, as described in subsection (c)(2)(C). In awarding grants under this subsection, a State shall—

“(A) partner with private businesses to the extent feasible to provide employment opportunities at such businesses; and

“(B) prioritize jobs and work opportunities that directly serve the community.

“(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated \$100,000,000 to carry out this subsection for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 2042. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2042

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “National Purple Heart Hall of Honor Commemorative Coin Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) The mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is—

(A) to commemorate the extraordinary sacrifice of servicemembers of the United States who were killed or wounded by enemy action; and

(B) to collect and preserve the stories of Purple Heart recipients from all branches of service and across generations to ensure that all recipients are represented.

(2) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor first opened its doors on November 10, 2006, in New Windsor, New York.

(3) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is collocated with the New Windsor Cantonment State Historic Site.

(4) The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor is the first to recognize the estimated 1,800,000 servicemembers of the United States wounded or killed in action representing recipients from the Civil War to the present day, serving as a living memorial to their sacrifice by sharing their stories through interviews, exhibits, and the Roll of Honor, an interactive computer database of each recipient enrolled.

SEC. 3. COIN SPECIFICATIONS.

(a) DENOMINATIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the “Secretary”) shall mint and issue the following coins:

(1) \$5 GOLD COINS.—Not more than 50,000 \$5 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 8.359 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 0.850 inches; and

(C) contain 90 percent gold and 10 percent alloy.

(2) \$1 SILVER COINS.—Not more than 400,000 \$1 coins, which shall—

(A) weigh 26.73 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.500 inches; and

(C) contain not less than 90 percent silver.

(3) HALF-DOLLAR CLAD COINS.—Not more than 750,000 half-dollar coins which shall—

(A) weigh 11.34 grams;

(B) have a diameter of 1.205 inches; and

(C) be minted to the specifications for half-dollar coins contained in section 5112(b) of title 31, United States Code.

(b) LEGAL TENDER.—The coins minted under this Act shall be legal tender, as provided in section 5103 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of section 5134 of title 31, United States Code, all coins minted under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

SEC. 4. DESIGN OF COINS.

(a) DESIGN REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The design of the coins minted under this Act shall be emblematic of the mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor.

(2) DESIGNATION AND INSCRIPTIONS.—On each coin minted under this Act there shall be—

(A) a designation of the value of the coin;

(B) an inscription of the year “2021”; and

(C) inscriptions of the words “Liberty”, “In God We Trust”, “United States of America”, and “E Pluribus Unum”.

(b) SELECTION.—The design for the coins minted under this Act shall be—

(1) selected by the Secretary after consultation with the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc.; and

(2) reviewed by the Citizens Coinage Advisory Committee.

SEC. 5. ISSUANCE OF COINS.

(a) QUALITY OF COINS.—Coins minted under this Act shall be issued in uncirculated and proof qualities.

(b) MINT FACILITY.—Only the West Point Mint may be used to strike any particular quality of the coins minted under this Act.

(c) PERIOD FOR ISSUANCE.—The Secretary may issue coins minted under this Act only during the 1-year period beginning on January 1, 2021.

SEC. 6. SALE OF COINS.

(a) SALE PRICE.—The coins issued under this Act shall be sold by the Secretary at a price equal to the sum of—

(1) the face value of the coins;

(2) the surcharge provided in section 7(a) with respect to such coins; and

(3) the cost of designing and issuing the coins (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, marketing, and shipping).

(b) BULK SALES.—The Secretary shall make bulk sales of the coins issued under this Act at a reasonable discount.

(c) PREPAID ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall accept prepaid orders for the coins minted under this Act before the issuance of such coins.

(2) DISCOUNT.—Sale prices with respect to prepaid orders under paragraph (1) shall be at a reasonable discount.

SEC. 7. SURCHARGES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—All sales of coins issued under this Act shall include a surcharge of—

(1) \$35 per coin for the \$5 coin;

(2) \$10 per coin for the \$1 coin; and

(3) \$5 per coin for the half-dollar coin.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to section 5134(f)(1) of title 31, United States Code, all surcharges received by the Secretary from the sale of coins issued under this Act shall be promptly paid by the Secretary to the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc. to support the mission of the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc., including capital improvements to the National Purple Heart Hall of Honor facilities.

(c) AUDITS.—The National Purple Heart Hall of Honor, Inc. shall be subject to the audit requirements of section 5134(f)(2) of title 31, United States Code, with regard to the amounts received under subsection (b).

(d) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), no surcharge may be included with respect to the issuance under this Act of any coin during a calendar year if, as of the time of such issuance, the issuance of such coin would result in the number of commemorative coin programs issued during such year to exceed the annual 2 commemorative coin program issuance limitation under section 5112(m)(1) of title 31, United States Code (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act). The Secretary of the Treasury may issue guidance to carry out this subsection.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 2047. A bill to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2047

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2019” and inserting “July 14, 2019”.

SEC. 2. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1941(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w-1(b)(1)) is amended by striking “\$6,000,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 267—RECOGNIZING THE SEPTEMBER 11TH NATIONAL MEMORIAL TRAIL AS AN IMPORTANT TRAIL AND GREENWAY ALL INDIVIDUALS SHOULD ENJOY IN HONOR OF THE HEROES OF SEPTEMBER 11TH

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 267

Whereas September 11th, 2001, is the date of one of the worst terrorist attacks on United States soil, claiming nearly 3,000 lives at the

World Trade Center in New York City, the Pentagon in Virginia, and the Flight 93 crash site near Shanksville, Pennsylvania;

Whereas the United States came together to honor the loved ones who were victims of the attack and the heroes of September 11th, including the first responders, in the days, weeks, and months after the attack by erecting the National September 11 Memorial and Museum, the Pentagon Memorial, and the Flight 93 National Memorial;

Whereas, as a further tribute to first responders and the individuals who lost their lives, the September 11th National Memorial Trail Alliance, in partnership with State and local governments and other nonprofit organizations, was formed to develop a 1,300-mile trail and greenway to connect the 3 memorials;

Whereas the September 11th National Memorial Trail is a biking, hiking, and driving trail that provides a physical link between the 3 memorials;

Whereas the September 11th National Memorial Trail passes through Virginia, Maryland, West Virginia, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, New York, Delaware, and the District of Columbia;

Whereas the September 11th National Memorial Trail forms an unbroken triangle that links the cities, towns, and communities along the trail that are home to State and local memorials and other significant sites that reflect the spirit of United States patriotism and resilience;

Whereas the September 11th National Memorial Trail—

(1) starts at the Pentagon Memorial in Arlington, Virginia;

(2) follows the Mt. Vernon Trail and then extends north along the 184-mile Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park;

(3) connects at Cumberland, Maryland, with the 150-mile Great Allegheny Passage, which the Trail then follows to Garrett in Somerset County, Pennsylvania;

(4) turns northeast and continues for approximately 21 miles to the Flight 93 National Memorial;

(5) continues east through the communities and historic sights of Pennsylvania until arriving at the 130-mile Liberty Water Gap Trail in New Jersey, which the Trail then follows to New York City;

(6) continues to the National September 11 Memorial and Museum in New York City;

(7) returns south, following important sections of the East Coast Greenway and connecting the 9/11 Memorial Garden of Reflection to the trail;

(8) continues along the National Mall in Washington, D.C.; and

(9) ends at the Pentagon Memorial;

Whereas the September 11th National Memorial Trail serves as an important recreational and transportation venue for promoting tourism, economic development, healthy bodies and minds, and cultural and educational opportunities;

Whereas the September 11th National Memorial Trail has the support of States, local communities, and the private sector;

Whereas recognition by the Senate of the September 11th National Memorial Trail does not confer any affiliation of the Trail with the National Park Service or the National Trails System;

Whereas recognition by the Senate of the September 11th National Memorial Trail does not authorize Federal funds to be expended for any purpose related to the Trail; and

Whereas States, local communities, and the private sector are encouraged to join together to complete the September 11th National Memorial Trail: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the September 11th National Memorial Trail as an important trail and greenway all individ-

uals should enjoy in honor of the heroes of September 11th.

SENATE RESOLUTION 268—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BAIL OUT ANY STATE

Mr. COTTON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 268

Whereas every State in the United States is a sovereign entity with a constitution and the authority to issue sovereign debt;

Whereas the legislature of every State in the United States has the authority to reduce spending or raise taxes to pay the obligations owed by the State;

Whereas officials in every State in the United States have the legal obligation to fully disclose the financial condition of the State to investors who purchase the debt of the State;

Whereas Congress has rejected prior requests from creditors of a State for payment of the defaulted debt of a State; and

Whereas, during the financial crisis in 1842, the Senate requested that the Secretary of the Treasury report to the Senate with respect to any negotiations with any creditor of a State relating to assuming or guaranteeing any debt of the State, to ensure that promises of support by the Federal Government were not proffered: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Federal Government should take no action to redeem, assume, or guarantee any debt, including pension obligations, of a State; and

(2) the Secretary of the Treasury should report to Congress any negotiations to engage in actions that would result in an outlay of Federal funds on behalf of creditors of a State.

SENATE RESOLUTION 269—COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF LUIS ALEJANDRO “ALEX” VILLAMAYOR AND CALLING FOR JUSTICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 269

Whereas United States citizen Luis Alejandro “Alex” Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luk Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland;

Whereas Alex Villamayor is remembered by his family as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor, who was committed to his parents, siblings, and friends;

Whereas Alex Villamayor moved with his family at the age of six to Paraguay, where he was a devoted member of his church and always had attention for those less fortunate;

Whereas Alex Villamayor graduated with honors from Paraguay’s Pan American International School (PAIS) and was accepted to attend Montgomery College in Maryland in the Fall of 2015;

Whereas Alex Villamayor aspired to study business management and return to Paraguay to pursue a career that would help and support the Paraguayan people;

Whereas Alex Villamayor was murdered on June 27, 2015, in the City of Encarnación in Paraguay;

Whereas Alex Villamayor’s death was wrongfully ruled a suicide by Paraguayan authorities before a comprehensive investigation was carried out;

Whereas, in the initial weeks of the investigation, Paraguayan authorities failed to collect blood and DNA samples from individuals present at the scene of the crime, conduct gunshot residue analysis on individuals present at the crime scene, and collect cellular phone records and data from individuals present at the crime scene;

Whereas, in August 2015, Alex Villamayor’s body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death;

Whereas, in August 2015, Paraguayan prosecutor Olga Wilma Araujo Ayala was suspended from the investigation into and legal case related to Alex Villamayor’s death due to mismanagement of the case;

Whereas, in September 2015, Mathias Wilbs, an employee at the property where Alex Villamayor was murdered, admitted in a televised public interview that he had removed the murder weapon from the crime scene and placed another firearm in Alex Villamayor’s hand;

Whereas, in September 2015, Alex Villamayor’s death was ruled a homicide and René Hofstetter and Mathias Wilbs were charged with crimes in relation to Alex Villamayor’s murder;

Whereas, in October 2015, Paraguayan authorities opened a formal investigation of Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya for his role in Alex Villamayor’s murder;

Whereas, in November 2016, Paraguayan authorities dropped the charges against Alain Jacks Díaz de Bedoya related to Alex Villamayor’s murder;

Whereas Members of the United States Congress have urged the Government of Paraguay to invite the United States Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor’s death and the United States Embassy in Asunción, Paraguay has offered such assistance to Paraguayan authorities;

Whereas, to date, the Government of Paraguay has not invited the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance for the investigation into Alex Villamayor’s death;

Whereas the United States embassy in Asunción, Paraguay, and the Department of State have not issued any formal public statements about Alex Villamayor’s murder and the many irregularities in the investigation into his death;

Whereas, in February 2017, outgoing United States Ambassador Leslie A. Basset told media outlets that Alex Villamayor “died under dark circumstances” and that “the investigation and the handling of this case has been worrisome”; and

Whereas, in April 2018, René Hofstetter was convicted of homicide and sentenced to 12 years in prison and Mathias Wilbs was sentenced to two years and 10 months on obstruction of justice;

Whereas, in spite of these convictions, media outlets report that others implicated in the murder and cover-up have not been charged; and

Whereas, members of Alex Villamayor’s immediate family continue to face grave physical threats in Paraguay for their pursuit of justice: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates the life of United States citizen Luis Alejandro “Alex” Villamayor

and offers condolences to his family and friends;

(2) expresses profound concern about the delays in achieving justice in Alex Villamayor's case;

(3) urges Paraguayan authorities to invite the Federal Bureau of Investigation to provide technical assistance to properly investigate the circumstances surrounding Alex Villamayor's death and assess whether other individuals may have had a role in the crime or cover-up;

(4) urges the Government of Paraguay to provide for the physical security of Alex Villamayor's family and others seeking justice in this case and to properly investigate recent threats against their lives, charging those implicated in such threats;

(5) calls on the Department of State to prioritize justice for Alex Villamayor in its diplomatic engagement with the Government of Paraguay; and

(6) calls on the Department of State to review its procedures for providing services to the families of United States citizens slain or assaulted abroad.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, today I rise to pay tribute to an exemplary young Marylander whose life was tragically cut short four years ago today. Senator VAN HOLLEN and I have just introduced a resolution which pays tribute to Alex's life, calls for justice and accountability in his murder, and procedures to ensure other families do not suffer this same tragedy.

Luis Alejandro "Alex" Villamayor was born on July 3, 1998, to parents Puning Luk Villamayor and Luis Felipe Villamayor in Rockville, Maryland. Those who knew him remember him as a smart, loving, and compassionate young man with a good sense of humor. Alex was committed to his parents, siblings, and friends. He was a devoted member of his church and always sought to help those less fortunate.

Alex Villamayor moved with his family to Paraguay at the age of six. He attended high school there and graduated with honors from the Pan American International School and was accepted to attend Montgomery College in Maryland in the fall of 2015 to study business management. He ultimately planned to pursue a career to help and support the Paraguayan people, but was tragically murdered on June 27, 2015, in the city of Encarnación.

Alex's death was wrongfully ruled a suicide by Paraguayan authorities, who had not properly investigated the death at that point and failed to collect blood and DNA samples from individuals present at the scene of the crime, conduct gunshot residue analysis, or collect cellular phone records and data from individuals present at the crime scene.

After Alex's family noted gross inconsistencies in accounts of his death, Alex's body was exhumed for additional forensic examination, which found that he had been raped and physically assaulted prior to his death. Finally, in September 2015, Alex's death was ruled a homicide. René Hofstetter and Mathias Wilbs were charged with crimes in relation to Alex Villamayor's murder and Paraguayan authorities opened a formal investigation of Alain Jacks

Díaz de Bedoya, who was also present at the time of Alex's death. While the charges against Mr. Díaz de Bedoya were eventually dropped, in April 2018 René Hofstetter was convicted of homicide and sentenced to 12 years in prison and Mathias Wilbs was sentenced to two years and 10 months on obstruction of justice.

In spite of these convictions, I remain concerned about the handling of this case. In spite of an offer to assist, the Government of Paraguay never allowed the FBI to provide technical assistance for the investigation. Our Ambassador at the time told media outlets that "the investigation and the handling of this case has been worrisome." Of even greater concern, members of Alex's immediate family continue to face grave physical threats in Paraguay for their pursuit of justice.

Senators VAN HOLLEN and I continue to offer our deepest condolences to the Villamayor family and, through this resolution, call on Paraguayan authorities to finally allow the FBI to assist in this case and provide the necessary protections to Alex's family. We similarly ask the Department of State to prioritize justice for Alex Villamayor in its diplomatic engagement with the Government of Paraguay and to review its procedures for providing services to the families of United States citizens slain or assaulted abroad.

On this sad anniversary, we remain committed to honoring the life of Alex Villamayor and working to ensure this tragic story does not repeat itself.

SENATE RESOLUTION 270—RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CARPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 270

Whereas the Stonewall Inn opened on or around March 18, 1967, at 53 Christopher Street in the Greenwich Village neighborhood of New York City;

Whereas the neighborhood of Greenwich Village, and establishments like the Stonewall Inn, served as a sanctuary for members of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (referred to in this preamble as "LGBTQ") community from persecution by police and society at large;

Whereas during the time around the opening of the Stonewall Inn, many State and local governments, including New York City, criminalized how LGBTQ individuals express their identities and relationships, which resulted in LGBTQ individuals frequently being harassed by law enforcement, including the New York City Police Department (referred to in this preamble as the "NYPD");

Whereas LGBTQ individuals had begun to stand up to such police harassment, including at Cooper Do-nuts in Los Angeles in 1959, Compton's Cafeteria in San Francisco in 1966, and Black Cat Tavern in Los Angeles in 1967;

Whereas, in the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, the NYPD raided the Stonewall Inn and arrested many patrons;

Whereas brave individuals, particularly transgender women of color, stood up to injustice the night of June 28, 1969, which sparked an uprising against the NYPD, with confrontations and protests at the Stonewall Inn and the surrounding area lasting until July 3, 1969;

Whereas the Stonewall uprising empowered thousands of LGBTQ individuals to emerge from the shadows and come out publicly as they stood up for their community the night of June 28, 1969 and beyond, putting their lives and safety at risk;

Whereas, along with public protests in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, D.C., and elsewhere, the Stonewall uprising became a catalyst for the LGBTQ civil rights movement to secure social and political equality and inspired the formation of many advocacy organizations;

Whereas, on June 27-28, 1970, members of the LGBTQ community commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall and reaffirmed the solidarity of the LGBTQ community by organizing the first Pride marches, or gatherings, in New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles;

Whereas the Stonewall uprising is remembered and celebrated every year in June during "LGBTQ Pride Month";

Whereas in June 2016 the Stonewall Inn and its surrounding area was declared a national monument, becoming the first national monument to commemorate the LGBTQ civil rights movement;

Whereas WorldPride will be held in June 2019 for the first time in the United States in New York City to commemorate the Stonewall uprising, bringing representatives of the global LGBTQ community to recognize these historic events;

Whereas on May 30, 2019, New York City announced that it would dedicate a monument honoring pioneering transgender activists and key leaders in the Stonewall uprising, Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera, the first permanent public monument in the world honoring transgender women;

Whereas on June 6, 2019, the NYPD officially apologized for the raid on the Stonewall Inn;

Whereas, despite the progress made since the Stonewall uprising, members of the LGBTQ community have experienced biased policing and are still at significant risk of violence and discrimination;

Whereas, according to the annual hate crimes report published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, LGBTQ individuals, particularly LGBTQ individuals of color, continue to be the target of bias-motivated violence, and efforts to address this violence may be hindered by a continued lack of trust in law enforcement;

Whereas not less than 100 transgender individuals, primarily women of color, have been murdered in the United States since the beginning of 2015; and

Whereas no individual in the United States should have to fear being the target of violence because of who they are or who they love: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 50th Anniversary of the Stonewall uprising;

(2) condemns violence and discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community and recommits itself to securing justice,

equality, and well-being for LGBTQ individuals; and

(3) commends the bravery, solidarity, and resiliency of the LGBTQ community in the face of violence and discrimination, both past and present.

SENATE RESOLUTION 271—DESIGNATING JULY 12, 2019, AS “COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY” AND RECOGNIZING THAT THE COLLECTION AND RESTORATION OF HISTORIC AND CLASSIC CARS IS AN IMPORTANT PART OF PRESERVING THE TECHNOLOGICAL ACHIEVEMENTS AND CULTURAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES

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

S. RES. 271

Whereas many people in the United States maintain classic automobiles as a pastime and do so with great passion and as a means of individual expression;

Whereas the Senate recognizes the effect that the more than 100-year history of the automobile has had on the economic progress of the United States and supports wholeheartedly all activities involved in the restoration and exhibition of classic automobiles;

Whereas the collection, restoration, and preservation of automobiles is an activity shared across generations and across all segments of society;

Whereas thousands of local car clubs and related businesses have been instrumental in preserving a historic part of the heritage of the United States by encouraging the restoration and exhibition of such vintage works of art;

Whereas automotive restoration provides well-paying, high-skilled jobs for people in all 50 States; and

Whereas automobiles have provided the inspiration for music, photography, cinema, fashion, and other artistic pursuits that have become part of the popular culture of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day”;

(2) recognizes that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to engage in events and commemorations of Collector Car Appreciation Day that create opportunities for collector car owners to educate young people about the importance of preserving the cultural heritage of the United States, including through the collection and restoration of collector cars.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 21—STRONGLY CONDEMNING HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS, VIOLENCE AGAINST CIVILIANS, AND COOPERATION WITH IRAN BY THE HOUTHI MOVEMENT AND ITS ALLIES IN YEMEN

Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. INHOFE, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following concurrent

resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 21

Whereas, in 2014 and 2015, the Houthi movement, also known as Ansar Allah, and its allies attacked Yemen's internationally recognized government and seized control of the capital, Sana'a, and the port city of Aden;

Whereas, since 2015, the Houthis have expanded their armed campaign beyond Yemen's borders to target civilian infrastructure in Saudi Arabia and possibly beyond, including hundreds of missile and drone attacks against civilian targets in Saudi Arabia that have killed innocent civilians;

Whereas the Houthi movement's slogan is, “God is great! Death to America! Death to Israel! Curse upon the Jews! Victory to Islam!”;

Whereas al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria—Yemen Province have taken advantage of the Yemeni civil war to expand their territory and resources;

Whereas Iran and its proxies have provided direct financial, material, and logistical support to the Houthis for at least a decade;

Whereas the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen has found that Iran is in violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2216 (2015) for supplying the Houthis with missiles and drones;

Whereas the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait between Yemen, Djibouti, and Eritrea, which connects the Suez Canal and Red Sea to the Indian Ocean, is a strategically important transit point for a significant amount of global trade each year;

Whereas the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait is the world's fourth-largest transit point for oil shipments;

Whereas, in its January 2018 and January 2019 reports, the United Nations Panel of Experts on Yemen expressed concern that Houthi missile attacks and sea mines released in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait threatened commercial shipping and humanitarian aid;

Whereas, in October 2016, the Houthis launched multiple cruise missiles at United States Navy warships while they were in international waters near the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

Whereas, in July 2018, the Houthis attacked two Saudi oil tankers transiting through the Bab-el-Mandeb Strait;

Whereas, on May 23, 2018, a Houthi missile hit a Turkish-flagged ship carrying wheat to a Yemeni port;

Whereas the United Nations warned on February 14, 2019, that approximately 24,000,000 people in Yemen are in need of humanitarian assistance and protection, with most living in territory currently held by the Houthis;

Whereas the United Nations also estimates that 7,400,000 people in Yemen are in need of treatment for malnutrition, including 2,000,000 children under 5 years of age;

Whereas according to Human Rights Watch, the extensive use of land mines by the Houthis has killed and maimed hundreds of civilians and cut off entire communities from their crops, clean water, and humanitarian aid;

Whereas, on June 21, 2019, the World Food Programme announced that it was partially suspending aid to parts of Yemen controlled by the Houthis because of interference with food distribution and aid convoys and the misappropriation of food by Houthi officials;

Whereas Reporters Without Borders estimated that, as of March 2019, at least 16 journalists were being held hostage by the Houthis, with 10 of them facing possible execution following years of torture and starvation;

Whereas, according to Human Rights Watch, the Houthis have undertaken a deliberate campaign of kidnapping, torture, and abuse against students, human rights defenders, political opponents, and religious minorities;

Whereas Houthi missile and drone attacks on June 12, 2019, and June 23, 2019, killed 1 civilian and injured 47 others at Abha International Airport in southern Saudi Arabia;

Whereas, according to United States Central Command, on June 6, 2019, a Houthi surface to air missile shot down a United States MQ-9 Reaper drone over Yemen, demonstrating a new Houthi capability that United States Central Command assessed was enabled by Iranian assistance;

Whereas, on December 18, 2018, a cease-fire took effect in the port of Hodeidah, Yemen, which is the entry point for 70 percent of humanitarian aid in the country;

Whereas the Houthis did not begin removing their forces from Hodeidah and two other ports, part of phase one of the December 2018 ceasefire and withdrawal agreement agreed to in Stockholm, Sweden, until May 2019;

Whereas according to the United Nations monitoring mission in Hodeidah, the Houthis had not removed many of their military installations and equipment from the port city as of June 12, 2019; and

Whereas, on June 24, 2019, the United States, United Kingdom, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates released a joint statement that raised concerns that Iranian activities were destabilizing both Yemen and the broader region, reaffirmed support for the efforts of United Nations Special Envoy Martin Griffiths, and called on all parties in Yemen to accelerate implementation of the Stockholm agreement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) condemns the Houthi movement in Yemen for—

(A) its blatant disregard for human rights and innocent life;

(B) its ideology of hate toward Israel and Jewish people both in Yemen and around the world;

(C) preventing critical humanitarian aid from reaching people in Yemen;

(D) the targeting of international commerce in the Red Sea and Bab-el-Mandeb Strait; and

(E) missile and drone attacks against civilians;

(2) expresses concern about Iran's extensive support for the Houthis and the economic and security consequences for the region of an Iranian foothold on the Arabian Peninsula;

(3) urges the Houthis and other parties in the Yemeni civil war to uphold the terms of the December 2018 ceasefire and withdrawal agreement agreed to in Stockholm, Sweden; and

(4) urges the United States Government to support a peace process to end the civil war and humanitarian crisis in Yemen while preventing Iran and terrorist groups, including al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria—Yemen Province, from gaining a permanent foothold on the Arabian Peninsula.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 904. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional

fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

SA 905. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 212, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 904. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 50, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 3, line 23, strike “such sums as are necessary” and insert “\$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025”.

SA 905. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. HOEVEN) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 212, to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities; as follows:

On page 12, line 16, insert “the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative,” after “development.”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator JACKY ROSEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Troy D. Edgar, of California, to be Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, dated June 27, 2019.

I, Senator JACKY ROSEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Chad F. Wolf, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Strategy, Policy, and Plans, Department of Homeland Security, dated June 27, 2019.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 4 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate

on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Peter Joseph Phipps, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, Charles R. Eskridge III, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, William Shaw Stickman IV, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Jennifer Philpott Wilson, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, and Wilmer Ocasio, to be United States Marshal for the District of Puerto Rico, Department of Justice.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 27, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jake Vance and James Schmidt, legislative correspondents in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

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

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my defense fellow, Joshua Culver, be granted floor privileges for the length of the current debate on the NDAA.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following members of my staff from Ohio and Washington be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day: Diana Baron, Mary Topolinski, Shilesa Bamberg, Alea Brown, John Patterson, Joe Gilligan, Ann Longworth Orr, and John Ryan.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 300 through 325 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force,

Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations, considered and confirmed, are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Gene F. Price

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Shawn E. Duane

Rear Adm. (lh) Scott D. Jones

Rear Adm. (lh) John B. Mustin

Rear Adm. (lh) John A. Schommer

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Alan J. Reyes

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Troy M. McClelland

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Charles A. Flynn

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Mark E. Moritz

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Christopher A. Asselta

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Michael T. Curran

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Leslie E. Reardanz, III

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Kenneth R. Blackmon

Capt. Robert C. Nowakowski

Capt. Thomas S. Wall
Capt. Larry D. Watkins

The following named officers for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Scott K. Fuller
Capt. Michael J. Steffen

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Paula D. Dunn

The following named officer for appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Pamela C. Miller

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Gen. John W. Raymond

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Paul J. LaCamera

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Michael E. Kurilla

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Ricky L. Williamson

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Philip W. Yu

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Arthur P. Wunder

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army as a Chaplain under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 7064:

To be brigadier general

Col. William Green, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Phillip G. Sawyer

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade

indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Eric P. Wendt

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michael R. Berry

The following named officer for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Michel M. Russell, Sr.

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph L. Biehler
Brig. Gen. William B. Blaylock, II
Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Bouchard
Brig. Gen. Paul B. Chauncey, III
Brig. Gen. Johanna P. Clyborne
Brig. Gen. William J. Edwards
Brig. Gen. Lee M. Ellis
Brig. Gen. Pablo Estrada, Jr.
Brig. Gen. Lapthe C. Flora
Brig. Gen. Troy D. Galloway
Brig. Gen. Lee W. Hopkins
Brig. Gen. Marvin T. Hunt
Brig. Gen. Mark C. Jackson
Brig. Gen. Richard F. Johnson
Brig. Gen. Tim C. Lawson
Brig. Gen. Kevin D. Lyons
Brig. Gen. Michael A. Mitchell
Brig. Gen. Michel A. Natali
Brig. Gen. Chad J. Parker
Brig. Gen. Gregory C. Porter
Brig. Gen. Jeffrey D. Smiley
Brig. Gen. David N. Vesper

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Huan T. Nguyen

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN426 AIR FORCE nominations (43) beginning THOMAS JOSEPH ALFORD, and ending GABRIEL MATTHEW YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN651 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning ELBERT R. ALFORD, IV, and ending TRACIE L. SWINGLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN731 AIR FORCE nomination of Catherine M. Tolvo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN732 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning CHRISTIAN F. COOPER, and ending RYAN E. SNYDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN733 AIR FORCE nominations (9) beginning KEITH A. BERRY, and ending STEVEN P. ROGERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN803 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning HASSAN N. BATAYNEH, and ending

ASAD U. QAMAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN842 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning JASON A. KOSKINEN, and ending ROBIN T. BINGHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

IN THE ARMY

PN431 ARMY nominations (15) beginning JASON BULLOCK, and ending DEMETRES WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN432 ARMY nominations (75) beginning JULIE A. AKE, and ending D013176, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 25, 2019.

PN534 ARMY nomination of Shane R. Reeves, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 26, 2019.

PN659 ARMY nominations (19) beginning ALWYNMICHAEL S. ALBANO, and ending STANTON D. TROTTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN663 ARMY nominations (167) beginning JASON B. ALISANGCO, and ending D014026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN664 ARMY nominations (28) beginning MICHAEL M. ARMSTRONG, and ending MIAO X. ZHOU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN734 ARMY nominations (3) beginning GLENN N. JUMAN, and ending RUSSELL T. MCNEAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN736 ARMY nomination of Carmen Y. Salcedo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN737 ARMY nominations (2) beginning RUSSELL F. DUBOSE, and ending TIMOTHY D. FORREST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN804 ARMY nominations (33) beginning MICHAEL J. BALLARD, and ending D015102, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN805 ARMY nomination of Andre L. Thomas, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN806 ARMY nomination of D013839, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN807 ARMY nomination of Christopher B. Nettles, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN808 ARMY nominations (490) beginning EDWARD C. ADAMS, and ending G010558, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN809 ARMY nominations (419) beginning CHARLES M. ABEYAWARDENA, and ending G010449, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN810 ARMY nominations (308) beginning JOHN R. ABELLA, and ending D014810, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN323 MARINE CORPS nomination of Shawn E. McGowan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN324 MARINE CORPS nomination of Michael R. Lukkes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

PN327 MARINE CORPS nomination of James Y. Malone, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 24, 2019.

IN THE NAVY

PN676 NAVY nominations (12) beginning MATTHEW P. BEARE, and ending KEITH A. TUKES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN677 NAVY nominations (27) beginning RICHARD L. BOSWORTH, and ending MATTHEW C. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN678 NAVY nominations (13) beginning LANE C. ASKEW, and ending DONALD V. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN679 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MARK A. ANGELO, and ending GREGORY E. SUTTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN680 NAVY nominations (17) beginning REX A. BOONYOBHAS, and ending SARAH E. ZARRO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN681 NAVY nominations (3) beginning SCOTT DRAYTON, and ending THOMAS R. WAGNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN682 NAVY nominations (11) beginning KEITH ARCHIBALD, and ending DAVID C. WEBBER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN683 NAVY nominations (241) beginning MITCHELL W. ALBIN, and ending TODD D. ZENTNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN684 NAVY nominations (15) beginning ADRIAN Z. BEJAR, and ending ROBERT A. WOODRUFF, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN685 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ERIN E. O. ACOSTA, and ending CHRISTI S. MONTGOMERY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN686 NAVY nominations (10) beginning DERECK C. BROWN, and ending SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN687 NAVY nominations (4) beginning WILLIAM H. CLINTON, and ending SARAH T. SELFKYLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN688 NAVY nominations (6) beginning JAMES M. BELMONT, and ending JON M. HERSEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 29, 2019.

PN738 NAVY nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL R. BRUNEAU, and ending HANS L. HOLKON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN739 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL C. CABASSA, and ending ALLAN J. SANDOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN740 NAVY nominations (14) beginning ERIN G. ADAMS, and ending IAN L. VALERIO, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN741 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MICHAEL E. HALL, and ending DARREN L. STENNETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN742 NAVY nominations (24) beginning LILLIAN A. ABUAN, and ending CHARLES M. TELLIS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN743 NAVY nominations (16) beginning VIRGINIA S. BLACKMAN, and ending ABIGAIL M. YABLONSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN744 NAVY nominations (11) beginning BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR., and ending SYLVAIN W. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN745 NAVY nominations (30) beginning ZIAD T. ABOONA, and ending LISA A. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN746 NAVY nominations (75) beginning RUBEN D. ACOSTA, and ending LUKE A. ZABROCKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN747 NAVY nominations (18) beginning DAVID L. BELL, JR., and ending HAROLD S. ZALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN748 NAVY nominations (8) beginning WILLIAM R. BUTLER, and ending OMARR E. TOBIAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN749 NAVY nominations (5) beginning BRIAN J. HALL, and ending PHILLIP E. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN750 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ESTHER A. BOPP, and ending ROBERTA S. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN751 NAVY nominations (3) beginning FRECHELL I. LEACHMAN, and ending LEE V. K. STUART, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN752 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JEREMY T. CASELLA, and ending JOSEPH M. ZACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN753 NAVY nominations (94) beginning FREDERICK G. ALEGRE, and ending KENNETH B. WOOSTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN754 NAVY nominations (4) beginning MIGUEL A. CASTELLANOS, and ending KEVIN A. SCHNITTKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN755 NAVY nominations (2) beginning CHARLOTTE A. BROWNING, and ending RACHEL H. WADEBROWN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN756 NAVY nominations (16) beginning JULIE M. BARR, and ending JACOB S. WIEMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN757 NAVY nominations (8) beginning LIAM M. APOSTOL, and ending ANN M. VALLANDINGHAM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN758 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ANTHONY L. LACOURSE, and ending SHANNON C. ZAHUMENSKY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN759 NAVY nominations (2) beginning SCOTT A. HIGGINS, and ending PEIHUA KU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN760 NAVY nominations (17) beginning NATHANIEL A. BAILEY, and ending LEONARD N. WALKER, IV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN761 NAVY nominations (8) beginning DAVID K. BOYLAN, and ending NED L. SWANSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN762 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ONOFRIO P. MARGIONI, and ending KURT D. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN763 NAVY nominations (4) beginning DAVID L. BACHELOR, and ending THOMAS J. TAYLOR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN764 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ANDREW M. COOK, and ending DENIZ M. PISKIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN765 NAVY nomination of Christina M. Allee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN766 NAVY nomination of David A. Schubkegel, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN767 NAVY nomination of Jon B. Voigtlander, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN768 NAVY nominations (4) beginning REBEKAH R. JOHNSON, and ending ROBERTS. THOMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN769 NAVY nominations (11) beginning MATTHEW A. BUCH, and ending TROY J. SHERRILL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 13, 2019.

PN811 NAVY nomination of Meger D. Chappell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN812 NAVY nomination of Ryan D. Scully, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN813 NAVY nomination of Brandon T. Bridges, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN814 NAVY nomination of Mark S. Javate, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN815 NAVY nomination of Chandler W. Jones, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN816 NAVY nomination of Justin R. Taylor, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN817 NAVY nominations (12) beginning KRISTINE N. BENCH, and ending DAVID A. ZIEMBA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN818 NAVY nominations (25) beginning DIEGO F. ALVARADO, and ending JARED

M. WILHELM, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN819 NAVY nominations (8) beginning ANTHONY J. FALVO, IV, and ending BRIAN T. WIERZBICKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN820 NAVY nominations (10) beginning BECKY L. BUJAKI, and ending NICHOLAS T. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN821 NAVY nominations (16) beginning ALBERT E. ARNOLD, IV, and ending JAMES F. WRIGHTSON, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN822 NAVY nominations (27) beginning BRIAN J. BANAZWSKI, and ending EVAN B. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN823 NAVY nominations (20) beginning SHANEL BEAVERS, and ending JOHN J. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN824 NAVY nominations (2) beginning LEVI DESJARLAIS, and ending ANTHONY R. MURPHY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN825 NAVY nomination of Meera Cheerharan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN826 NAVY nomination of Selina D. Bandy, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN827 NAVY nominations (45) beginning ROBERT W. BOASE, and ending WALTER J. ZAPP, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN828 NAVY nominations (49) beginning MATE W. AERANDIR, and ending REBECCA L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN829 NAVY nominations (34) beginning HANNAH L. BEALON, and ending BILLY W. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN830 NAVY nominations (34) beginning BRIELLE L. ADAMOVICH, and ending CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN831 NAVY nominations (512) beginning JOHN I. ACTKINSON, and ending GEORGE S. ZINTAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2019.

PN847 NAVY nomination of MARTIN E. ROBERTS, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

PN848 NAVY nominations (3) beginning TODD W. GEYER, and ending ANTHONY J. SMOLA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 5, 2019.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Sen-

ate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 295.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher Scolese, of New York, to be Director of the National Reconnaissance Office. (New Position)

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 330, 331, and 332.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Gary B. Burman, of Kentucky, to be United States Marshal for the Western District of Kentucky for the term of four years; William D. Hyslop, of Washington, to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Washington for the term of four years; Randall P. Huff, of Wyoming, to be United States Marshal for the District of Wyoming for the term of four years.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Burman, Hyslop, and Huff nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 113.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Veronica Daigle, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 342.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Wallace, of Wyoming, to be Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 199.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Aimee Kathryn Jorjani, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for a term expiring January 19, 2021.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

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

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 121.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lane Genatowski, of New York, to be Director of the Advanced Research Projects Agency-Energy, Department of Energy.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 180 and 219.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Ronald Douglas Johnson, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of El Salvador; and David Michael Satterfield, of Missouri, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Turkey.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Johnson and Satterfield nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 109, 110, and 360.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nominations of Aditya Bamzai, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for the remainder of the term expiring January 29, 2020; Travis LeBlanc, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2022; and Edward W. Felten, of New Jersey, to be a Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board for a term expiring January 29, 2025. (Reappointment)

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to be reconsidered be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bamzai, LeBlanc, and Felton nominations?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 343.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Daniel Aaron Bress, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Richard Burr, Richard C. Shelby, Shelley Moore Capito, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, John Thune, Steve Daines, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, John Hoeven, John Barrasso.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 47.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of T. Kent Wetherell II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

Mitch McConnell, Kevin Cramer, Mike Crapo, Marco Rubio, John Kennedy, Thom Tillis, James M. Inhofe, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Boozman, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Richard C. Shelby, at Roberts, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 51.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Damon Ray Leichter, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Damon Ray Leichter, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Johnny Isakson, Tim Scott, Mike Braun, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 52.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of J. Nicholas Ranjan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, Roy Blunt, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, John Cornyn, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Johnny Isakson, Tim Scott, Mike Braun, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 101.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Robert L. King, of Kentucky, to be Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Johnny Isakson, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Steve Daines, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Kevin Cramer, Richard Burr.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 103.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John P. Pallasch, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, David Perdue, James E. Risch, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Johnny Isakson, Richard Burr, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, Steve Daines, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Kevin Cramer, Shelley Moore Capito.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 13.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, Environmental Protection Agency.

Mitch McConnell, Steve Daines, John Thune, John Cornyn, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, Mike Crapo, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

CONFIRMATION OF ROB WALLACE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I would like to say just a few words about Rob Wallace, the newly confirmed Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife, and Parks at the Department of Interior.

I have known Rob for over 35 years. Without question, Rob is the right person for the job. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Rob has struck the proper balance between wildlife management, habitat management, and the use of our public lands.

In terms of wildlife conservation, Rob is way up there in terms of his commitment. Rob's experience and leadership in Wyoming and in our Nation's capital are ideally suited for this critically important position.

Throughout his 45-year career, Rob has served in a variety of jobs that directly relate to the two Federal agencies he has been nominated to oversee. Rob began his career as a seasonal park ranger in Grand Teton National Park. Since then, Rob has served in a number of positions. He has been Assistant Director of the National Park Service, chief of staff for Wyoming Senator Malcolm Wallop, staff director for the U.S. Senate Energy and Natural Re-

source Committee—a committee on which I currently sit. He has been chief of staff for Wyoming Governor Jim Geringer, and manager of U.S. Government Relations for the General Electric Company.

Rob currently serves as the president of the Upper Green River Conservancy. It is the Nation's first cooperative conservation bank. Rob cofounded the Upper Green River Conservancy. It protects core sage grouse habitat in the ecologically rich and the energy rich Upper Green River watershed in Southwest Wyoming.

He built an innovative partnership of ranchers, conservation groups, energy companies, investors, and other stakeholders. Rob is also the founding member of the board of the Grand Teton National Park Foundation, a group of people absolutely working together, committed to the Grand Teton National Park. It promotes the park's cultural, historic, and natural resources. He has also served on the boards of many organizations dedicated to conserving wildlife and enhancing our national parks.

Rob's nomination passed the Environment and Public Works Committee by unanimous vote, and a near-unanimous reported vote in the Committee of Energy and Natural Resources.

Rob Wallace is an outstanding choice for this position of Assistant Secretary for Fish, Wildlife and Parks. He is the right person for the job, and I am so pleased the Senate has now confirmed his nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, the senior Senator from South Carolina, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, and the junior Senator from North Carolina be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions from June 27 through the July 8.

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

IRAN

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I am going to try to do this in about 12 minutes, since I am not sure how many people are left to speak tonight and I know the staff worked hard and we will be up early tomorrow voting on the pending Udall amendment. That is what I want to talk about.

I have watched all week the debate on some of these topics. I think it is a really good debate, actually. In some ways, I am very pleased the amendment has been offered because it has given us an opportunity to talk about a topic I don't think we have talked enough about; that is, foreign policy, the security threats before our country, and, in particular, what the role of Congress is in all of this.

There are a couple of things I want to say at the outset. Here is the first. A lot of people who cover this stuff in the news like very simplistic terms. It makes it easier to write the articles and makes it easier to describe the circumstances. The terms people like to use are "hawk," or "dove," or "war-like." I am not in favor of war. I have actually never advocated for a military attack on Iran, in these circumstances especially. There are a lot of reasons for it, but it will take me more than 15 minutes to explain it all. Suffice it to say, it is certainly not the first or the second.

The policy of the United States in Iran today is the one I support; that is, crippling economic sanctions that deny them the money to do the bad things they do but also a forced posture that we are prepared with enough people there in the military, so if they do attack us, we can defend ourselves.

I want to say at the outset that I am not here today to speak in favor of war or to call for war but to speak about reality and the situation as we face it today.

The second thing I want to point to is there is this notion out there that there is some clear-cut constitutional limitation on the President when it comes to the use of force in virtually every circumstance and that somehow the current President is being enabled by the Members of his party here to do whatever he wants. That is just not true. I will explain why in a moment.

I want to begin with why we are even here. It is one of the topics that has been touched on this week, which I think deserves a direct response. I heard a number of Senators who came to the floor. I watched the debate last night, and there will be another one tonight within the Democratic Party. You almost get a sense that what they are arguing is that Iran was under control and wasn't doing anything wrong until Donald Trump came along and pulled us out of the Iran deal. That is just not true. That is patently false.

The only thing Iran wasn't doing is enriching uranium beyond a certain threshold. That is not necessarily a bad thing that they weren't doing it, but that is the only thing that deal covered.

Here is what Iran was still doing. Iran was still sponsors terrorism. You ask, why is it that they sponsor terrorism? Iran wants to be the dominant power in the Middle East, and one of the ways they seek to achieve it is to find all of these groups—Hezbollah, Shia militias in Iraq and Syria, the Houthis in Yemen—and empower those groups.

They have an organization called the IRGC, which is the real military and the real power in Iran. Underneath the IRGC, there is an organization called the Quds Force, which is their covert operations unit led by a guy named General Soleimani. He goes around the entire region sponsoring these groups—training them and providing weapons.

Here is what they hope to do. If they ever get into a conflict, they will use these groups to attack people. Why do they use those groups? No. 1, because Iran doesn't have the ability to station troops all over the region. No. 2, it gives them deniability. They can say: We didn't attack you. It was the Houthis or Shia militia. It allows them some level of deniability while still inflicting pain.

If you want to know what else Iran has done using that strategy, it has maimed or killed hundreds of American service men and women in Iraq. They didn't buy all those IEDs that were blowing up on Amazon; they didn't order them on eBay. They were built and supplied by the Iranians. That is who did it. There is no dispute about that.

President Obama signed this Iran deal. Iran began to get more money into their treasury because they could now engage in certain economic activity. What did Iran do with that money? Let me tell you what they didn't do. They didn't build schools, roads, and bridges. They didn't reinvest it in their economy or their education system. Iran took the money they were making from the Iran deal. The Iran deal now allows them to engage in commerce that they weren't allowed to. They took that extra money, and they used it to sponsor terrorism—to sponsor Hezbollah in Lebanon.

Today Hezbollah not only has more missiles than they had 10 or 15 years ago, but their missiles are better than they were. They could now, theoretically, overwhelm Israel's defenses with barrages of attacks. They have guidance systems on those missiles now. In fact, they have gotten so much assistance from Iran, they don't even need to ship these missiles to them anymore. They can make them themselves.

What about the Houthis? The Houthis are a group that already existed, but they were only able to make the gains they made in Yemen with Iranian support. You read in the news every day about these missiles and drones used by the Houthis to attack Saudi Arabia. It doesn't get a lot of coverage, but where do you think they bought these things from? Do you think they made them? We didn't sell them to them. Those are Iranian missiles. All of it is provided by this additional money they got their hands on. They also conduct cyber attacks.

Here is the most dangerous part of the Iran deal. Yes, it dealt with uranium enrichment and supervision, but it did nothing with the missile system. To have a nuclear threat, you have to do three things; No. 1, have a bomb designed, which is the easiest part, believe it or not; No. 2, have the industrial capacity to enrich uranium to weapons grade, and that is just a function of time and willingness. Once you can enrich at any level, you can keep going. That is what the deal dealt with; and the third thing you have to do is deliver it. You have to launch it on something to reach your target.

The deal with Iran did nothing on the missiles. It gave them more money, and they used some of that money to build missiles that now have longer ranges. Where Iran, 5 or 10 years ago, had a more limited range of places to strike, today Iran can strike virtually every capital in the Middle East and every base in the region. That is where they were putting this money.

The Trump administration came in and said: Let me get this straight. We did a deal with Iran. They get a lot more money. They use that money to build better missiles, to sponsor terrorism, to conduct cyber attacks, and the only thing is they can't enrich uranium for a period of time until the deal goes away? That is not a bad deal for Iran because what they were banking on is that in 10 years, we would be focused on something else. The world would forget, and all of a sudden they would be able to enrich.

The deal was a fraud. It did nothing to make Iran less dangerous. The only thing the deal did is slow down their enrichment capability, but at no time are they less than 1½ to 2 years away to breaking out to weapons grade. At some point, they would—at least they retain that very option.

This idea that somehow Iran wasn't doing anything wrong but pulling out of the deal caused all these tensions is just not true. Even with a deal in place, Iran was arming and training and equipping all these groups in the region and conducting cyber attacks and building these missiles unabated. That is what was going on. Now they are feeling it.

By the way, today Iran is generating a lot less revenue than they were when the deal was in place. We are at a point now where even Hezbollah is out there openly saying they have had to cut back. They have budget cuts. They are putting out leaflets and things they posted publicly inside of Lebanon asking people to donate to Hezbollah because Iran can't donate as much as they used to. They have real fiscal constraints. That is not a bad thing. Likewise, with some of these Shia militias and others, it has constrained Iran's ability to operate.

Iran has decided the only way to reverse this is to force us back to some negotiation at some point to either, A, intimidate us back into the deal or, B, force us to the negotiating table to get something like it. How can they do that?

How can Iran position itself with some strength in order to get into that kind of negotiation? They can't sanction us economically. The only thing they can do is these terrorist attacks—these sort of attacks that started to connect. That is what they are in the pattern of doing.

Do you realize, last week, over a period of 7 days, every single day there was a Shia militia attack against a U.S. installation? Luckily, nobody died, but that was happening. That is what they were trying and are trying to do.

They were trying to position themselves and accumulate some strength so they can get into future negotiations from a position of strength. The only way they think they can do that is by threatening to attack us and, most interestingly, to attack us with some level of deniability. You have this tanker out there in the middle of the Gulf, which is a huge ocean, and suddenly some mines blow up, and you have journalists and politicians saying, how do we know it was Iran? Who was it? It wasn't the Swedes. It wasn't the Germans. It wasn't the French. It wasn't Luxembourg. There is only one organization in that part of the world with the capability to do what happened—Iran. Everybody knows it.

The only reason some countries don't admit it is because then they would have to do something about it. If you are a European country and you want the Iran deal to come back in place and you want to save it, you can't say you know Iran put those mines on those ships. If you say that, you have to pull out of the deal. That is why they wouldn't acknowledge it.

We have them on video. I heard people ask how we know those were Iranians. This is ridiculous stuff. By the way, the mines look identical to the ones Iran makes. So they did that. That was their plan, OK? Their plan was to attack us using other forces but to have some level of deniability. "It was not us."

They also know that there are divisions in American politics and that the President is unpopular in many countries. A lot of people around the world and in the United States would love nothing more than to say "Yes, how do we know it was Iran?" for different reasons. That is what they were banking on, but then they shot down an unmanned U.S. vehicle, and they admitted it because that would have been very difficult to deny. That is what really kicked off a lot of this argument that we are now hearing.

I want everybody to remember, if you go back 3 or 4 weeks, that there were people in the building and people on television—I saw them—commentators and others—who were basically implying that this was all not true, that there was no threat emanating from Iran, that it wasn't doing anything unusual. Now they are admitting that Iran is doing something unusual and dangerous, but 3 or 4 weeks ago, they were basically implying that this was all being made up by people who wanted a war.

Think that through logically. That means there would be dozens and dozens of career service men and women in the U.S. Armed Forces and in the Pentagon who would be, basically, lying to us about this. That is absurd.

So we get to the point of how this really got us here. It wasn't the deal with Iran or the pulling out of the deal that caused this. This has always been. This is what Iran has always done, and it has been doing it for two decades

now and longer. To somehow act as if Iran is more belligerent today than it was 6 months ago or 6 years ago is just not true. It is just that the threats have become more imminent directly against us.

When you look at this amendment, the amendment is basically designed to say that the President cannot enter into a war unless Congress approves it, which is an interesting dynamic.

No. 1, when you hear people saying you need authority from Congress, what they are talking about is the War Powers Resolution. In the aftermath of Vietnam and that era, Congress said, from now on, we are not getting into any more of these undeclared wars. If a President is going to commit service men and women for an extended period of time, it has to come through Congress.

No President—no administration—has ever accepted that resolution as being in the Constitution. From that point forward, every single administration—Democrat and Republican—has taken the position that this is an unconstitutional infringement on the power of the Commander in Chief. That has been the official position of every administration, Republican and Democrat, since that passed.

Nonetheless, on various occasions, Presidents have come to Congress for authority, which I think is a smart thing to do, especially for an extended engagement, because we are stronger and our policies are more effective when Congress and the American people are behind you. That is why President George W. Bush sought the authorization for Afghanistan and why he sought it for Iraq. It was the right thing to do, and it made sense. Yet no President has ever admitted that it is constitutional, and I share that view.

For a moment, let's assume that it were. Well, that resolution lays out three things that must happen before a President, a Commander in Chief, can commit U.S. forces to a hostility, to a war, to a fight.

The first thing is that there has to be a declaration of war. That is in the Constitution too. Congress can declare war.

The second is that Congress can authorize the use of force. That is when you hear all of this talk about the authorization for use of military force, the AUMF. That is what we had in Afghanistan, and that is what we had in Iraq. That is what a lot of people around here think we need if we are going to do something with Iraq.

There is a third component they like to ignore, and the third component is that a President can institute U.S. military action if Congress declares war, if Congress authorizes the use of force, or, No. 3, if there is an emergency that causes us to respond to an attack against the United States, our territories, our holdings, or our Armed Forces.

I want to tell you that if a Shia militia attacks a U.S. base in Iraq, this is

a pretty clear attack on the Armed Forces. If it shoots down one of our unmanned, unarmed platforms over international airspace, that is an attack on our Armed Forces. If they try to kidnap or murder an ambassador or a diplomat by attacking our Embassy, that is an attack on a U.S. territory since embassies are sovereign territories.

If you look at what the administration has done, the only thing the administration has done when it has come to the use of force is it has made sure that we have had enough ships and enough airplanes and enough personnel and enough assets in the Middle East so, if we are attacked, we can respond. That is the only thing it has done.

I don't know how you read the plain text of the language that they are wrapping themselves around—those who criticize what the administration has done—and not realize that it is fully authorized. If we are attacked, the President doesn't just have a right to respond—he has an obligation.

Think of the reverse. If the Iranians were to attack a facility in Iraq and murder 100 Americans who would be working at an embassy or diplomats or if they were to kill 200 soldiers, the first questions that every one of the President's critics would be asking on TV would be: Why didn't we have enough forces in the region to protect them? Why didn't we have a plan to save them? There would be congressional hearings, and there would be Members of Congress who would scream at the administration: Why didn't you have people there to save them?

In anticipating that this could happen, our military leaders, in their looking at the threats and understanding the environment, asked the administration to send additional forces so they may be prepared—to be in a position of having enough people and assets to respond in case of an attack.

I will go further than that.

Imagine the President is given verifiable information that an attack is imminent by Iran or one of its proxies and that the only way to save American lives is to wipe out the place from which it is going to launch the attack. Even if you acted first, that is self-defense. You are getting ahead of preventing an attack, not to mention the fact that the best way to respond to an attack is to prevent it from happening in the first place, and having a force posture in the region is one of the best ways to do that. That is the only thing that has been done here.

This amendment is just not necessary because, in assuming they are arguing that the War Powers Resolution makes pretty clear what Congress's power and role are in all of this, in the very text of that resolution, it makes clear that a President has a right to introduce military forces and to use military force to defend Americans, to defend America, and to defend our Armed Forces.

So why do we need language that says that a second time? Some would

say: Well, it is redundant, and it is already the law. Why not just vote for it again?

That is the final and, perhaps, the most important point in all of this—that the timing couldn't really be worse. It is not necessary, but the redundancy here is actually damaging, and here is why.

I think sometimes we make a terrible mistake in American politics. We ascribe our attributes to those of the leaders of other countries. When we hear that the President of Iran said something, we think Iran's President and his system is like ours. They are not. The President of Iran doesn't have one-tenth the power of our President, meaning there is a Supreme Leader, and everything goes to the Supreme Leader, a cleric. That is where the power really resides.

No. 2, we make a terrible mistake of believing that they truly understand us, our systems, and our debates when they don't, especially the Ayatollah. He is not a world traveler nor a constitutional expert nor a consumer of a varied amount of news and information from around the world nor a nuanced person who understands that this amendment, for example, is never going to become law.

Here is what they do believe, and I encourage all Members here to go out and inform themselves as to this. As a Senator, one has the opportunity to do it. They do believe that this President cannot respond. They believe that this President cannot and would not respond. They believe that there is a threshold—that there are x numbers of Americans they can kill and that there are certain types of attacks they can get away with without getting a response back. That is what they believe.

Why do they believe it?

No. 1, it is that our President has talked on various occasions about withdrawing all Americans from the region. So they begin by believing, by and large, that we don't even want to be there.

No. 2, they believe it because they look at our domestic politics, and they say: I have heard the debates, and I watched 5 minutes of CNN or some other network the other night, and I heard people on there who were from Congress or wherever who told the President he can't do this and can't do that. There is no support in America for responding, so the President is constrained in what he is able to do.

Why is that a problem?

It is because that is where you miscalculate. That is where what they think would trigger a response and what will actually trigger a response are two very different things.

If this thing were to pass—and I know there are still a couple of people who are thinking about voting for it—this would not be reported as an amendment that had passed on a bill but that was never going to become law because it was never going to get signed with that in there. That is not

how it would be reported. In fact, if there were a close vote on it, as I anticipate there will be, the way it would be reported would be as “even a handful of Republicans and virtually every Democrat voted to send the President a message of ‘we don’t want you using Armed Forces in wars against Iran.’” That is how it would be reported. That is how they would read it. It would only reinforce this belief among some in that regime that they can go further than they actually can.

I don’t mean to say this to argue that there are Members of this body here who are deliberately putting the men and women of our Armed Forces in danger. I am telling them I don’t know if they have thought through that part of it. What we do here and how it is perceived in other parts of the world, especially in a reclusive organization such as the regime in Iran, are often two very different things.

The danger with this amendment is that it is going to confirm to several hard-liners in that regime that the President is constrained, that America’s President will not be able to respond, and that they will be able to get away with more than they actually will get away with.

In some ways, ironically, I believe that even a big vote on this—but, certainly, the passage of it—increases the chance of war. I say that because, if they miscalculate and they read into this an opportunity to attack at a higher level without taking a retaliatory response, they are going to do it. Then they are going to be wrong, and then the retaliation will come. Then it is on. Then we can’t predict what will happen next.

What happens next is terrifying to even contemplate because what happens next could be a Hezbollah strike against Israel and Israel’s responding 10 times stronger. It could be Hezbollah’s moving to abduct, kill, murder American diplomats or personnel inside of Lebanon; it could be Shia militias throughout Iraq and Syria attacking U.S. personnel; it could be increased Houthi attacks not just into Saudi Arabia but potentially even hitting civilian populations and Saudi Arabia’s responding back. What could come next is a spiraling series of events that could lead to a dangerous regional war. That is not an exaggeration. Neither is it an exaggeration to believe that a miscalculation on the part of Iran and what it can get away with would trigger that.

This is an unnecessary amendment because, if you accept the War Powers Resolution as valid under our Constitution—I do not—it already reads that the President has a right to respond in self-defense. The administration has made it very clear that this is the only way it intends to use it. It has made it abundantly clear. In fact, its force posture proves it. If you look at what we have in the region—the number of ships and the number of people—we are not postured for an invasion or an all-

out war. We are postured for defensive operations and retaliatory strikes to an attack, and that is what the administration says it intends to do.

What it intends to do is to continue forward, strangling the sources of financing that the Iranian regime is using to sponsor terrorism and its ballistic missile program and having enough force in the region to protect our men and women who serve us if they were to come under attack. The President is allowed to do that in the Constitution and in the War Powers Resolution.

All this amendment does is create a dangerous opportunity to be misread and to cause Iran to do something, and that will trigger a response. Then we will have a war. For those who are considering still voting for this because they want to reassert Congress’s role, this is the wrong time and place in which to do it.

I will close with this. I don’t agree with all of the President’s foreign policy views. I can tell you, for example, that I do believe that openly talking about getting out of the Middle East as soon as possible has emboldened some of this thinking that America is constrained and that we really don’t have the dedication or the commitment to see this through if we are attacked. Yet, in fairness, this President is far less likely to get into a war or to start one than was his predecessor—or his two predecessors, actually. He showed great restraint the other day.

It strikes me that not only is this unnecessary from a policy perspective, it is also unnecessary from a personality perspective. This is not a President who is looking to start wars. This is a President who is looking to get out of the ones we are already in. Again, I just don’t know why we would run the risk of putting something out there that could be misconstrued and lead to an attack when we have a President who has no intention of starting a war, when we have a military posture in the region that would not support an offensive military operation or anything close to what Afghanistan or Iraq was like, and when we have this danger of miscalculation.

The amendment has been filed, and there will be a vote on it tomorrow. I just hope that the handful of people still thinking about it will consider all of these points.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

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

standing the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Senate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to Commissions, Committees, Boards, Conferences, or Interparliamentary Conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two houses, or by order of the Senate.

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

EXTENDING THE PROGRAM OF BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES FOR TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES AND RELATED PROGRAMS THROUGH SEPTEMBER 30, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2940.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2940) to extend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs through September 30, 2019.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2940) was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

PROVIDING FOR A 2-WEEK EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2047, submitted today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2047) to provide for a 2-week extension of the Medicaid community mental health services demonstration program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (S. 2047) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:
S. 2047

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

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF THE MEDICAID COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended by striking “June 30, 2019” and inserting “July 14, 2019”.

SEC. 2. MEDICAID IMPROVEMENT FUND.

Section 1941(b)(1) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396w-1(b)(1)) is amended by striking “\$6,000,000” and inserting “\$1,000,000”.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 270, submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 270) recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 270) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

COLLECTOR CAR APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 271, submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 271) designating July 12, 2019, as “Collector Car Appreciation Day” and recognizing that the collection and restoration of historic and classic cars is an important part of preserving the technological achievements and cultural heritage of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed

to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 271) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

COLUMBIA RIVER IN-LIEU AND TREATY FISHING ACCESS SITES IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 38, S. 50.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 50) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to assess sanitation and safety conditions at Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities that were constructed to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds and expend funds on construction of facilities and structures to improve those conditions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Hoeven amendment at the desk be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The amendment (No. 904) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the authorization amount)

On page 3, line 23, strike “such sums as are necessary” and insert “\$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025”.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 50), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 50

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Columbia River In-Lieu and Treaty Fishing Access Sites Improvement Act”.

SEC. 2. SANITATION AND SAFETY CONDITIONS AT CERTAIN BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS FACILITIES.

(a) ASSESSMENT OF CONDITIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, in consultation with the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes, may assess current sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States for the benefit of the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes, including all permanent Federal structures and improvements

on those lands, that were set aside to provide affected Columbia River Treaty tribes access to traditional fishing grounds—

(1) in accordance with the Act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 10, chapter 19) (commonly known as the “River and Harbor Act of 1945”); or

(2) in accordance with title IV of Public Law 100–581 (102 Stat. 2944).

(b) EXCLUSIVE AUTHORIZATION; CONTRACTS.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Bureau of Indian Affairs—

(1) subject to paragraph (2)(B), shall be the only Federal agency authorized to carry out the activities described in this section; and

(2) may delegate the authority to carry out activities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (d)—

(A) through one or more contracts entered into with an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.); or

(B) to include other Federal agencies that have relevant expertise.

(c) DEFINITION OF AFFECTED COLUMBIA RIVER TREATY TRIBES.—In this section, the term “affected Columbia River Treaty tribes” means the Nez Perce Tribe, the Confederated Tribes of Umatilla Indian Reservation, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon, and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior \$11,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2020 through 2025, to remain available until expended—

(1) for improvements to existing structures and infrastructure to improve sanitation and safety conditions assessed under subsection (a); and

(2) to improve access to electricity, sewer, and water infrastructure, where feasible, to reflect needs for sanitary and safe use of facilities referred to in subsection (a).

SEC. 3. STUDY OF ASSESSMENT AND IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.

The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate, shall—

(1) conduct a study to evaluate whether the sanitation and safety conditions on lands held by the United States for the benefit of the affected Columbia River Treaty tribes (as defined in section 2(c)) have improved as a result of the activities authorized in section 2; and

(2) prepare and submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report containing the results of that study.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

INDIAN COMMUNITY ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 63, S. 212.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 212) to amend the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000, the Buy Indian Act, and the Native American Programs

Act of 1974 to provide industry and economic development opportunities to Indian communities.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Hoeven amendment at the desk be agreed to and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The amendment (No. 905) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the Indian Economic Development Feasibility Study)

On page 12, line 16, insert "the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative," after "development,".

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 212), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 212

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Indian Community Economic Enhancement Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1)(A) to bring industry and economic development to Indian communities, Indian Tribes must overcome a number of barriers, including—

- (i) geographical location;
- (ii) lack of infrastructure or capacity;
- (iii) lack of sufficient collateral and capital; and
- (iv) regulatory bureaucracy relating to—
 - (I) development; and
 - (II) access to services provided by the Federal Government; and

(B) the barriers described in subparagraph (A) often add to the cost of doing business in Indian communities;

(2) Indian Tribes—

(A) enact laws and exercise sovereign governmental powers;

(B) determine policy for the benefit of Tribal members; and

(C) produce goods and services for consumers;

(3) the Federal Government has—

(A) an important government-to-government relationship with Indian Tribes; and

(B) a role in facilitating healthy and sustainable Tribal economies;

(4) the input of Indian Tribes in developing Federal policy and programs leads to more meaningful and effective measures to assist Indian Tribes and Indian entrepreneurs in building Tribal economies;

(5)(A) many components of Tribal infrastructure need significant repair or replacement; and

(B) access to private capital for projects in Indian communities—

- (i) may not be available; or
- (ii) may come at a higher cost than such access for other projects;

(6)(A) Federal capital improvement programs, such as those that facilitate tax-ex-

empt bond financing and loan guarantees, are tools that help improve or replace crumbling infrastructure;

(B) lack of parity in treatment of an Indian Tribe as a governmental entity under Federal tax and certain other regulatory laws impedes, in part, the ability of Indian Tribes to raise capital through issuance of tax exempt debt, invest as an accredited investor, and benefit from other investment incentives accorded to State and local governmental entities; and

(C) as a result of the disparity in treatment of Indian Tribes described in subparagraph (B), investors may avoid financing, or demand a premium to finance, projects in Indian communities, making the projects more costly or inaccessible;

(7) there are a number of Federal loan guarantee programs available to facilitate financing of business, energy, economic, housing, and community development projects in Indian communities, and those programs may support public-private partnerships for infrastructure development, but improvements and support are needed for those programs specific to Indian communities to facilitate more effectively private financing for infrastructure and other urgent development needs; and

(8)(A) most real property held by Indian Tribes is trust or restricted land that essentially cannot be held as collateral; and

(B) while creative solutions, such as leasehold mortgages, have been developed in response to the problem identified in subparagraph (A), some solutions remain subject to review and approval by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, adding additional costs and delay to Tribal projects.

SEC. 3. NATIVE AMERICAN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT, TRADE PROMOTION, AND TOURISM ACT OF 2000.

(a) FINDINGS; PURPOSES.—Section 2 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(c) APPLICABILITY TO INDIAN-OWNED BUSINESSES.—The findings and purposes in subsections (a) and (b) shall apply to any Indian-owned business governed—

"(1) by Tribal laws regulating trade or commerce on Indian lands; or

"(2) pursuant to section 5 of the Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 200, chapter 289; 25 U.S.C. 261)."

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4302) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (6) and paragraphs (7) through (9), as paragraphs (2) through (7) and paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively;

(2) by inserting before paragraph (2) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

"(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of Native American Business Development appointed pursuant to section 4(a)(2)."; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

"(8) OFFICE.—The term 'Office' means the Office of Native American Business Development established by section 4(a)(1)."

(c) OFFICE OF NATIVE AMERICAN BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT.—Section 4 of the Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4303) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "Department of Commerce" and inserting "Office of the Secretary"; and

(ii) by striking "(referred to in this Act as the 'Office')"; and

(B) in paragraph (2), in the first sentence, by striking "(referred to in this Act as the 'Director')"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall serve as—

"(A) the program and policy advisor to the Secretary with respect to the trust and governmental relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes; and

"(B) the point of contact for Indian Tribes, Tribal organizations, and Indians regarding—

"(i) policies and programs of the Department of Commerce; and

"(ii) other matters relating to economic development and doing business in Indian lands.

"(2) DEPARTMENTAL COORDINATION.—The Director shall coordinate with all offices and agencies within the Department of Commerce to ensure that each office and agency has an accountable process to ensure—

"(A) meaningful and timely coordination and assistance, as required by this Act; and

"(B) consultation with Indian Tribes regarding the policies, programs, assistance, and activities of the offices and agencies.

"(3) OFFICE OPERATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section not more than \$2,000,000 for each fiscal year."

(d) INDIAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES.—The Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 8 (25 U.S.C. 4307) as section 10; and

(2) by inserting after section 7 (25 U.S.C. 4306) the following:

"SEC. 8. INDIAN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES.

"(a) INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.—Not later than 1 year after the enactment of this section, the Secretary, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Treasury shall coordinate—

"(1) to develop initiatives that—

"(A) encourage, promote, and provide education regarding investments in Indian communities through—

"(i) the loan guarantee program of Bureau of Indian Affairs under section 201 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1481);

"(ii) programs carried out using amounts in the Community Development Financial Institutions Fund established under section 104(a) of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4703(a)); and

"(iii) other capital development programs;

"(B) examine and develop alternatives that would qualify as collateral for financing in Indian communities; and

"(C) provide entrepreneur and other training relating to economic development through tribally controlled colleges and universities and other Indian organizations with experience in providing such training;

"(2) to consult with Indian Tribes and with the Securities and Exchange Commission to study, and collaborate to establish, regulatory changes necessary to qualify an Indian Tribe as an accredited investor for the purposes of sections 230.508 through 230.508 of title 17, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), consistent with the goals of promoting capital formation and ensuring qualifying Indian Tribes have the ability to withstand investment loss, on a basis comparable to other legal entities that qualify as accredited investors who are not natural persons;

"(3) to identify regulatory, legal, or other barriers to increasing investment, business, and economic development, including qualifying or approving collateral structures,

measurements of economic strength, and contributions of Indian economies in Indian communities through the Authority established under section 4 of the Indian Tribal Regulatory Reform and Business Development Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301 note);

“(4) to ensure consultation with Indian Tribes regarding increasing investment in Indian communities and the development of the report required in paragraph (5); and

“(5) not less than once every 2 years, to provide a report to Congress regarding—

“(A) improvements to Indian communities resulting from such initiatives and recommendations for promoting sustained growth of the Tribal economies;

“(B) results of the study and collaboration regarding the necessary changes referenced in paragraph (2) and the impact of allowing Indian Tribes to qualify as an accredited investor; and

“(C) the identified regulatory, legal, and other barriers referenced in paragraph (3).

“(b) **WAIVER.**—For assistance provided pursuant to section 108 of the Community Development Banking and Financial Institutions Act of 1994 (12 U.S.C. 4707) to benefit Native Community Development Financial Institutions, as defined by the Secretary of the Treasury, section 108(e) of such Act shall not apply.

“(c) **INDIAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY STUDY.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Government Accountability Office shall conduct a study and, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subsection, submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study and recommendations.

“(2) **CONTENTS.**—The study shall include an assessment of each of the following:

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The study shall assess current Federal capitalization and related programs and services that are available to assist Indian communities with business and economic development, including manufacturing, physical infrastructure (such as telecommunications and broadband), community development, and facilities construction for such purposes. For each of the Federal programs and services identified, the study shall assess the current use and demand by Indian Tribes, individuals, businesses, and communities of the programs, the capital needs of Indian Tribes, businesses, and communities related to economic development, the extent to which the programs and services overlap or are duplicative, and the extent that similar programs have been used to assist non-Indian communities compared to the extent used for Indian communities.

“(B) **FINANCING ASSISTANCE.**—The study shall assess and quantify the extent of assistance provided to non-Indian borrowers and to Indian (both Tribal and individual) borrowers (including information about such assistance as a percentage of need for Indian borrowers and for non-Indian borrowers, assistance to Indian borrowers and to non-Indian borrowers as a percentage of total applicants, and such assistance to Indian borrowers as individuals as compared to such assistance to Indian Tribes) through the loan programs, the loan guarantee programs, or bond guarantee programs of the—

“(i) Department of the Interior;

“(ii) Department of Agriculture;

“(iii) Department of Housing and Urban Development;

“(iv) Department of Energy;

“(v) Small Business Administration; and

“(vi) Community Development Financial Institutions Fund of the Department of the Treasury.

“(C) **TAX INCENTIVES.**—The study shall assess and quantify the extent of the assistance and allocations afforded for non-Indian projects and for Indian projects pursuant to each of the following tax incentive programs:

“(i) New market tax credit.

“(ii) Low income housing tax credit.

“(iii) Investment tax credit.

“(iv) Renewable energy tax incentives.

“(v) Accelerated depreciation.

“(D) **TRIBAL INVESTMENT INCENTIVE.**—The study shall assess various alternative incentives that could be provided to enable and encourage Tribal governments to invest in an Indian community development investment fund or bank.”.

(e) **CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—The Native American Business Development, Trade Promotion, and Tourism Act of 2000 (25 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 3—

(A) in each of paragraphs (1), (4), and (8), by striking “tribe” and inserting “Tribe”; and

(B) in paragraph (6), by striking “The term ‘Indian tribe’ has the meaning given that term” and inserting “The term ‘Indian Tribe’ has the meaning given the term ‘Indian tribe’”;

(2) by striking “tribes” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribes”; and

(3) by striking “tribal” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribal”.

SEC. 4. BUY INDIAN ACT.

Section 23 of the Act of June 25, 1910 (commonly known as the “Buy Indian Act”) (36 Stat. 861, chapter 431; 25 U.S.C. 47), is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 23. EMPLOYMENT OF INDIAN LABOR AND PURCHASE OF PRODUCTS OF INDIAN INDUSTRY; PARTICIPATION IN MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **INDIAN ECONOMIC ENTERPRISE.**—The term ‘Indian economic enterprise’ has the meaning given the term in section 1480.201 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations).

“(2) **MENTOR FIRM; PROTEGE FIRM.**—The terms ‘mentor firm’ and ‘protege firm’ have the meanings given those terms in section 831(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note; Public Law 101-510).

“(3) **SECRETARIES.**—The term ‘Secretaries’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of the Interior; and

“(B) the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

“(b) **ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless determined by one of the Secretaries to be impracticable and unreasonable—

“(A) Indian labor shall be employed; and

“(B) purchases of Indian industry products (including printing and facilities construction, notwithstanding any other provision of law) may be made in open market by the Secretaries.

“(2) **MENTOR-PROTEGE PROGRAM.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Participation in the Mentor-Protege Program established under section 831(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note; Public Law 101-510) or receipt of assistance under a developmental assistance agreement under that program shall not render any individual or entity involved in the provision of Indian labor or an Indian industry product ineligible to receive assistance under this section.

“(B) **TREATMENT.**—For purposes of this section, no determination of affiliation or control (whether direct or indirect) may be found between a protege firm and a mentor firm on the basis that the mentor firm has provided, or agreed to provide, to the protege

firm, pursuant to a mentor-protege agreement, any form of developmental assistance described in section 831(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (10 U.S.C. 2302 note; Public Law 101-510).

“(c) **IMPLEMENTATION.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretaries shall—

“(1) conduct outreach to Indian industrial entities;

“(2) provide training;

“(3) promulgate regulations in accordance with this section and with the regulations under part 1480 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), to harmonize the procurement procedures of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Health and Human Services, to the maximum extent practicable;

“(4) require regional offices of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service to aggregate data regarding compliance with this section;

“(5) require procurement management reviews by their respective Departments to include a review of the implementation of this section; and

“(6) consult with Indian Tribes, Indian industrial entities, and other stakeholders regarding methods to facilitate compliance with—

“(A) this section; and

“(B) other small business or procurement goals.

“(d) **REPORT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, each of the Secretaries shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report describing, during the period covered by the report, the implementation of this section by each of the respective Secretaries.

“(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each report under this subsection shall include, for each fiscal year during the period covered by the report—

“(A) the names of each agency under the respective jurisdiction of each of the Secretaries to which this section has been applied, and efforts made by additional agencies within the Secretaries’ respective Departments to use the procurement procedures under this Act;

“(B) a summary of the types of purchases made from, and contracts (including any relevant modifications, extensions, or renewals) awarded to, Indian economic enterprises, expressed by agency region;

“(C) a description of the percentage increase or decrease in total dollar value and number of purchases and awards made within each agency region, as compared to the totals of the region for the preceding fiscal year;

“(D) a description of the methods used by applicable contracting officers and employees to conduct market searches to identify qualified Indian economic enterprises;

“(E) a summary of all deviations granted under section 1480.403 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), including a description of—

“(i) the types of alternative procurement methods used, including any Indian owned businesses reported under other procurement goals; and

“(ii) the dollar value of any awards made pursuant to those deviations;

“(F) a summary of all determinations made to provide awards to Indian economic enterprises, including a description of the dollar value of the awards;

“(G) a description or summary of the total number and value of all purchases of, and contracts awarded for, supplies, services, and

construction (including the percentage increase or decrease, as compared to the preceding fiscal year) from—

“(i) Indian economic enterprises; and
“(ii) non-Indian economic enterprises;
“(H) any administrative, procedural, legal, or other barriers to achieving the purposes of this section, together with recommendations for legislative or administrative actions to address those barriers; and
“(I) for each agency region—

“(i) the total amount spent on purchases made from, and contracts awarded to, Indian economic enterprises; and

“(ii) a comparison of the amount described in clause (i) to the total amount that the agency region would likely have spent on the same purchases made from a non-Indian economic enterprise or contracts awarded to a non-Indian economic enterprise.

“(e) GOALS.—Each agency shall establish an annual minimum percentage goal for procurement in compliance with this section.”.

SEC. 5. NATIVE AMERICAN PROGRAMS ACT OF 1974.

(a) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR NATIVE AMERICAN PROJECTS.—Section 803 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) through (d) as subsections (c) through (e), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner may provide assistance under subsection (a) for projects relating to the purposes of this title to a Native community development financial institution, as defined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(2) PRIORITY.—With regard to not less than 50 percent of the total amount available for assistance under this section, the Commissioner shall give priority to any application seeking assistance for—

“(A) the development of a Tribal code or court system for purposes of economic development, including commercial codes, training for court personnel, regulation pursuant to section 5 of the Act of August 15, 1876 (19 Stat. 200, chapter 289; 25 U.S.C. 261), and the development of nonprofit subsidiaries or other Tribal business structures;

“(B) the development of a community development financial institution, including training and administrative expenses; or

“(C) the development of a Tribal master plan for community and economic development and infrastructure.”.

(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING.—Section 804 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991c) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “The Commissioner” and inserting the following:

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commissioner”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) PRIORITY.—In providing assistance under subsection (a), the Commissioner shall give priority to any application described in section 803(b)(2).”.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended—

(1) by striking “803(d)” each place it appears and inserting “803(e)”; and

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “such sums as may be necessary” and inserting “\$34,000,000”; and

(B) by striking “1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002” and inserting “2020 through 2024”.

(d) CONFORMING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—The Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by striking “tribe” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribe”;

(2) by striking “tribes” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribes”; and

(3) by striking “tribal” each place the term appears and inserting “Tribal”.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the following Calendar items, en bloc: Calendar Nos. 110, 41, 73, 42, 64, 49, 34, 37, and 33.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bills, en bloc.

NULLIFYING THE SUPPLEMENTAL TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CONFEDERATED TRIBES AND BANDS OF INDIANS OF MIDDLE OREGON

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 832) to nullify the Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865.

PROVIDING FOR THE CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE TANANA TRIBAL COUNCIL LOCATED IN TANANA, ALASKA, AND TO THE BRISTOL BAY AREA HEALTH CORPORATION LOCATED IN DILLINGHAM, ALASKA

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 224) to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska, and to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska, and for other purposes.

PROGRESS FOR INDIAN TRIBES ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 209) to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide further self-governance by Indian Tribes, and for other purposes.

ESTHER MARTINEZ NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES PROGRAMS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 256) to amend the Native American Programs Act of 1974 to provide flexibility and reauthorization to ensure the survival and continuing vitality of Native American languages.

NATIVE AMERICAN BUSINESS INCUBATORS PROGRAM ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 294) to establish a business incubators program within the Department of

the Interior to promote economic development in Indian reservation communities.

TRIBAL HUD-VASH ACT OF 2019

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 257) to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans, and for other purposes.

SPOKANE TRIBE OF INDIANS OF THE SPOKANE RESERVATION EQUITABLE COMPENSATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 216) to provide for equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation for the use of tribal land for the production of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam, and for other purposes.

KLAMATH TRIBE JUDGMENT FUND REPEAL ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 46) to repeal the Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act.

LEECH LAKE BAND OF OJIBWE RESERVATION RESTORATION ACT

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 199) to provide for the transfer of certain Federal land in the State of Minnesota for the benefit of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bills, en bloc, be considered read a third time.

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

The bills were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and were read the third time, en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bills, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bills having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bills pass, en bloc?

The bills (S. 832, S. 224, S. 209, S. 256, S. 294, S. 257, S. 216, S. 46, S. 199) were passed, en bloc, as follows:

S. 832

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

SECTION 1. NULLIFICATION OF TREATY.

The Supplemental Treaty Between the United States of America and the Confederated Tribes and Bands of Indians of Middle Oregon, concluded on November 15, 1865, and entered into pursuant to the Senate resolution of ratification dated March 2, 1867 (14 Stat. 751), shall have no force or effect.

S. 224

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

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE TANANA TRIBAL COUNCIL.

(a) CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in

this Act as the “Secretary”) shall convey to the Tanana Tribal Council located in Tanana, Alaska (referred to in this section as the “Council”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b) for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(2) **EFFECT ON ANY QUITCLAIM DEED.**—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this subsection shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no future effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in subsection (b) executed by the Secretary and the Council.

(3) **CONDITIONS.**—The conveyance of the property under this section—

(A) shall be made by warranty deed; and

(B) shall not—

(i) require any consideration from the Council for the property;

(ii) impose any obligation, term, or condition on the Council; or

(iii) allow for any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.

(b) **PROPERTY DESCRIBED.**—The property, including all land, improvements, and appurtenances, described in this subsection is the property included in U.S. Survey No. 5958, Lot 12, in the village of Tanana, Alaska, within surveyed Township 4N, Range 22W, Fairbanks Meridian, Alaska, containing 11.25 acres.

(c) **ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.**—

(1) **LIABILITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Council shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from the disposal, release, or presence of any environmental contamination on any portion of the property described in subsection (b) on or before the date on which the property is conveyed to the Council.

(B) **ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION.**—An environmental contamination described in subparagraph (A) includes any oil or petroleum products, hazardous substances, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State of Alaska law.

(2) **EASEMENT.**—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this section as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(3) **NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY TO THE BRISTOL BAY AREA HEALTH CORPORATION.

(a) **CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the Bristol Bay Area Health Corporation located in Dillingham, Alaska (referred to in this section as the “Corporation”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in subsection (b) for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(2) **EFFECT ON ANY QUITCLAIM DEED.**—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this subsection shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no future effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in sub-

section (b) executed by the Secretary and the Corporation.

(3) **CONDITIONS.**—The conveyance of the property under this section—

(A) shall be made by warranty deed; and

(B) shall not—

(i) require any consideration from the Corporation for the property;

(ii) impose any obligation, term, or condition on the Corporation; or

(iii) allow for any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.

(b) **PROPERTY DESCRIBED.**—The property, including all land, improvements, and appurtenances, described in this subsection is the property included in Dental Annex Subdivision, creating tract 1, a subdivision of Lot 2 of U.S. Survey No. 2013, located in Section 36, Township 13 South, Range 56 West, Seward Meridian, Bristol Bay Recording District, Dillingham, Alaska, according to Plat No. 2015-8, recorded on May 28, 2015, in the Bristol Bay Recording District, Dillingham, Alaska, containing 1.474 acres more or less.

(c) **ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.**—

(1) **LIABILITY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Corporation shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from the disposal, release, or presence of any environmental contamination on any portion of the property described in subsection (b) on or before the date on which the property is conveyed to the Corporation.

(B) **ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION.**—An environmental contamination described in subparagraph (A) includes any oil or petroleum products, hazardous substances, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State of Alaska law.

(2) **EASEMENT.**—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this section as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(3) **NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.**—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

S. 209

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This Act may be cited as the “Practical Reforms and Other Goals To Reinforce the Effectiveness of Self-Governance and Self-Determination for Indian Tribes Act of 2019” or the “PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act”.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE

Sec. 101. Tribal self-governance.

TITLE II—INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION

Sec. 201. Definitions; reporting and audit requirements; application of provisions.

Sec. 202. Contracts by Secretary of the Interior.

Sec. 203. Administrative provisions.

Sec. 204. Contract funding and indirect costs.

Sec. 205. Contract or grant specifications.

TITLE I—TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE

SEC. 101. TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE.

(a) **EFFECT OF PROVISIONS.**—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, shall be construed—

(1) to modify, limit, expand, or otherwise affect—

(A) the authority of the Secretary of the Interior, as provided for under the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act), regarding—

(i) the inclusion of any non-BIA program (as defined in section 401 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act) in a self-determination contract or funding agreement under section 403(c) of such Act (as so in effect); or

(ii) the implementation of any contract or agreement described in clause (i) that is in effect on the day described in subparagraph (A);

(B) the meaning, application, or effect of any Tribal water rights settlement, including the performance required of a party thereto or any payment or funding obligation thereunder;

(C) the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of a State to manage, control, or regulate fish and wildlife under State law (including regulations) on land or water in the State, including Federal public land;

(D) except for the authority provided to the Secretary as described in subparagraph (A), the applicability or effect of any Federal law related to the protection or management of fish or wildlife; or

(E) any treaty-reserved right or other right of any Indian Tribe as recognized by any other means, including treaties or agreements with the United States, Executive orders, statutes, regulations, or case law; or

(2) to authorize any provision of a contract or agreement that is not consistent with the terms of a Tribal water rights settlement.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 401 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5361) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) **COMPACT.**—The term ‘compact’ means a self-governance compact entered into under section 404.

“(2) **CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM; CONSTRUCTION PROJECT.**—The term ‘construction program’ or ‘construction project’ means a Tribal undertaking relating to the administration, planning, environmental determination, design, construction, repair, improvement, or expansion of roads, bridges, buildings, structures, systems, or other facilities for purposes of housing, law enforcement, detention, sanitation, water supply, education, administration, community, health, irrigation, agriculture, conservation, flood control, transportation, or port facilities, or for other Tribal purposes.

“(3) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term ‘Department’ means the Department of the Interior.

“(4) **FUNDING AGREEMENT.**—The term ‘funding agreement’ means a funding agreement entered into under section 403.

“(5) **GROSS MISMANAGEMENT.**—The term ‘gross mismanagement’ means a significant violation, shown by a preponderance of the evidence, of a compact, funding agreement, or statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to Federal funds for a program administered by an Indian Tribe under a compact or funding agreement.

“(6) **INHERENT FEDERAL FUNCTION.**—The term ‘inherent Federal function’ means a Federal function that may not legally be delegated to an Indian Tribe.

“(7) **NON-BIA PROGRAM.**—The term ‘non-BIA program’ means all or a portion of a program, function, service, or activity that is administered by any bureau, service, office, or agency of the Department of the Interior other than—

“(A) the Bureau of Indian Affairs;

“(B) the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs; or

“(C) the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.

“(8) PROGRAM.—The term ‘program’ means any program, function, service, or activity (or portion thereof) within the Department that is included in a funding agreement.

“(9) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of the Interior.

“(10) SELF-DETERMINATION CONTRACT.—The term ‘self-determination contract’ means a self-determination contract entered into under section 102.

“(11) SELF-GOVERNANCE.—The term ‘self-governance’ means the Tribal Self-Governance Program established under section 402.

“(12) TRIBAL SHARE.—The term ‘tribal share’ means the portion of all funds and resources of an Indian Tribe that—

“(A) support any program within the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, or the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs; and

“(B) are not required by the Secretary for the performance of an inherent Federal function.

“(13) TRIBAL WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT.—The term ‘tribal water rights settlement’ means any settlement, compact, or other agreement expressly ratified or approved by an Act of Congress that—

“(A) includes an Indian Tribe and the United States as parties; and

“(B) quantifies or otherwise defines any water right of the Indian Tribe.”

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 402 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5362) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 402. TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE PROGRAM.

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish and carry out a program within the Department to be known as the ‘Tribal Self-Governance Program’.

“(b) SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING INDIAN TRIBES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—

“(A) ELIGIBILITY.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Office of Self-Governance, may select not more than 50 new Indian Tribes per year from those tribes eligible under subsection (c) to participate in self-governance.

“(B) JOINT PARTICIPATION.—On the request of each participating Indian Tribe, 2 or more otherwise eligible Indian Tribes may be treated as a single Indian Tribe for the purpose of participating in self-governance.

“(2) OTHER AUTHORIZED INDIAN TRIBE OR TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—If an Indian Tribe authorizes another Indian Tribe or a Tribal organization to plan for or carry out a program on its behalf under this title, the authorized Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall have the rights and responsibilities of the authorizing Indian Tribe (except as otherwise provided in the authorizing resolution).

“(3) JOINT PARTICIPATION AS ORGANIZATION.—Two or more Indian Tribes that are not otherwise eligible under subsection (c) may be treated as a single Indian Tribe for the purpose of participating in self-governance as a Tribal organization if—

“(A) each Indian Tribe so requests; and

“(B) the Tribal organization itself, or at least one of the Indian Tribes participating in the Tribal organization, is eligible under subsection (c).

“(4) TRIBAL WITHDRAWAL FROM A TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe that withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, in whole or in part, shall be entitled to participate in self-governance if the Indian Tribe is eligible under subsection (c).

“(B) EFFECT OF WITHDRAWAL.—If an Indian Tribe withdraws from participation in a Tribal organization, the Indian Tribe shall be entitled to its Tribal share of funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe is entitled to carry out under the compact and funding agreement of the Indian Tribe.

“(C) PARTICIPATION IN SELF-GOVERNANCE.—The withdrawal of an Indian Tribe from a Tribal organization shall not affect the eligibility of the Tribal organization to participate in self-governance on behalf of one or more other Indian Tribes, if the Tribal organization still qualifies under subsection (c).

“(D) WITHDRAWAL PROCESS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may, by Tribal resolution, fully or partially withdraw its Tribal share of any program in a funding agreement from a participating Tribal organization.

“(ii) NOTIFICATION.—The Indian Tribe shall provide a copy of the Tribal resolution described in clause (i) to the Secretary.

“(iii) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—A withdrawal under clause (i) shall become effective on the date that is specified in the Tribal resolution and mutually agreed upon by the Secretary, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, and the Tribal organization that signed the compact and funding agreement on behalf of the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

“(II) NO SPECIFIED DATE.—In the absence of a date specified in the resolution, the withdrawal shall become effective on—

“(aa) the earlier of—

“(AA) 1 year after the date of submission of the request; and

“(BB) the date on which the funding agreement expires; or

“(bb) such date as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary, the withdrawing Indian Tribe, and the Tribal organization that signed the compact and funding agreement on behalf of the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization.

“(E) DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.—If an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization eligible to enter into a self-determination contract or a compact or funding agreement fully or partially withdraws from a participating Tribal organization, the withdrawing Indian Tribe—

“(i) may elect to enter into a self-determination contract or compact, in which case—

“(I) the withdrawing Indian Tribe or Tribal organization shall be entitled to its Tribal share of unexpended funds and resources supporting the programs that the Indian Tribe will be carrying out under its own self-determination contract or compact and funding agreement (calculated on the same basis as the funds were initially allocated to the funding agreement of the Tribal organization); and

“(II) the funds referred to in subclause (I) shall be withdrawn by the Secretary from the funding agreement of the Tribal organization and transferred to the withdrawing Indian Tribe, on the condition that sections 102 and 105(i), as appropriate, shall apply to the withdrawing Indian Tribe; or

“(ii) may elect not to enter into a self-determination contract or compact, in which case all unexpended funds and resources associated with the withdrawing Indian Tribe’s returned programs (calculated on the same basis as the funds were initially allocated to the funding agreement of the Tribal organization) shall be returned by the Tribal organization to the Secretary for operation of the programs included in the withdrawal.

“(F) RETURN TO MATURE CONTRACT STATUS.—If an Indian Tribe elects to operate all or some programs carried out under a compact or funding agreement under this title through a self-determination contract under

title I, at the option of the Indian Tribe, the resulting self-determination contract shall be a mature self-determination contract as long as the Indian Tribe meets the requirements set forth in section 4(h).

“(c) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to participate in self-governance, an Indian Tribe shall—

“(1) successfully complete the planning phase described in subsection (d);

“(2) request participation in self-governance by resolution or other official action by the Tribal governing body; and

“(3) demonstrate, for the 3 fiscal years preceding the date on which the Indian Tribe requests participation, financial stability and financial management capability as evidenced by the Indian Tribe having no uncorrected significant and material audit exceptions in the required annual audit of its self-determination or self-governance agreements with any Federal agency.

“(d) PLANNING PHASE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe seeking to begin participation in self-governance shall complete a planning phase as provided in this subsection.

“(2) ACTIVITIES.—The planning phase shall—

“(A) be conducted to the satisfaction of the Indian Tribe; and

“(B) include—

“(i) legal and budgetary research; and

“(ii) internal Tribal government planning, training, and organizational preparation.

“(e) GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization that meets the requirements of paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c) shall be eligible for grants—

“(A) to plan for participation in self-governance; and

“(B) to negotiate the terms of participation by the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization in self-governance, as set forth in a compact and a funding agreement.

“(2) RECEIPT OF GRANT NOT REQUIRED.—Receipt of a grant under paragraph (1) shall not be a requirement of participation in self-governance.”

(d) FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—Section 403 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5363) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

“(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall, on the request of any Indian Tribe or Tribal organization, negotiate and enter into a written funding agreement with the governing body of the Indian Tribe or the Tribal organization in a manner consistent with—

“(1) the trust responsibility of the Federal Government, treaty obligations, and the government-to-government relationship between Indian Tribes and the United States; and

“(2) subsection (b).”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “without regard to the agency or office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs” and inserting “the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, and the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, without regard to the agency or office of that Bureau or those Offices”;

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and indenting the margins of such clauses accordingly;

(iii) by striking “including any program” and inserting the following: “including—

“(A) any program”;

(iv) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), as redesignated by clause (ii), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(II) in clause (ii), as so redesignated, by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(v) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B);

(vi) in subparagraph (B), as redesignated by clause (v), by striking the semicolon and inserting “; and”; and

(vii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) any other program, service, function, or activity (or portion thereof) that is provided through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, or the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians with respect to which Indian Tribes or Indians are primary or significant beneficiaries;”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “section 405(c)” and inserting “section 412(c)”; and

(ii) by inserting “and” after the semicolon at the end;

(C) in paragraph (3), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(D) by striking paragraphs (4) through (9);

(3) in subsection (f)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking “FOR REVIEW”;

(B) by striking “such agreement to—” and all that follows through “Indian tribe” and inserting “such agreement to each Indian Tribe”;

(C) by striking “agreement;” and inserting “agreement.”; and

(D) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3);

(4) in subsection (k), by striking “section 405(c)(1)” and inserting “section 412(c)”; and

(5) by adding at the end the following:

“(m) OTHER PROVISIONS.—

“(1) EXCLUDED FUNDING.—A funding agreement shall not authorize an Indian Tribe to plan, conduct, administer, or receive Tribal share funding under any program that—

“(A) is provided under the Tribally Controlled Colleges and Universities Assistance Act of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.); or

“(B) is provided for elementary and secondary schools under the formula developed under section 1127 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2007).

“(2) SERVICES, FUNCTIONS, AND RESPONSIBILITIES.—A funding agreement shall specify—

“(A) the services to be provided under the funding agreement;

“(B) the functions to be performed under the funding agreement; and

“(C) the responsibilities of the Indian Tribe and the Secretary under the funding agreement.

“(3) BASE BUDGET.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A funding agreement shall, at the option of the Indian Tribe, provide for a stable base budget specifying the recurring funds (which may include funds available under section 106(a)) to be transferred to the Indian Tribe, for such period as the Indian Tribe specifies in the funding agreement, subject to annual adjustment only to reflect changes in congressional appropriations.

“(B) LIMITATIONS.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a funding agreement shall not specify funding associated with a program described in subsection (b)(2) or (c) unless the Secretary agrees.

“(4) NO WAIVER OF TRUST RESPONSIBILITY.—A funding agreement shall prohibit the Secretary from waiving, modifying, or diminishing in any way the trust responsibility of the United States with respect to Indian Tribes and individual Indians that exists under treaties, Executive orders, court decisions, and other laws.

“(n) AMENDMENT.—The Secretary shall not revise, amend, or require additional terms in a new or subsequent funding agreement

without the consent of the Indian Tribe, unless such terms are required by Federal law.

“(o) EFFECTIVE DATE.—A funding agreement shall become effective on the date specified in the funding agreement.

“(p) EXISTING AND SUBSEQUENT FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—

“(1) SUBSEQUENT FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—Absent notification from an Indian Tribe that the Indian Tribe is withdrawing or retreating the operation of one or more programs identified in a funding agreement, or unless otherwise agreed to by the parties to the funding agreement or by the nature of any noncontinuing program, service, function, or activity contained in a funding agreement—

“(A) a funding agreement shall remain in full force and effect until a subsequent funding agreement is executed, with funding paid annually for each fiscal year the agreement is in effect; and

“(B) the term of the subsequent funding agreement shall be retroactive to the end of the term of the preceding funding agreement for the purposes of calculating the amount of funding to which the Indian Tribe is entitled.

“(2) DISPUTES.—Disputes over the implementation of paragraph (1)(A) shall be subject to section 406(c).

“(3) EXISTING FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—An Indian Tribe that was participating in self-governance under this title on the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act shall have the option at any time after that date—

“(A) to retain its existing funding agreement (in whole or in part) to the extent that the provisions of that funding agreement are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or

“(B) to negotiate a new funding agreement in a manner consistent with this title.

“(4) MULTIYEAR FUNDING AGREEMENTS.—An Indian Tribe may, at the discretion of the Indian Tribe, negotiate with the Secretary for a funding agreement with a term that exceeds 1 year.”.

(e) GENERAL REVISIONS.—Title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5361 et seq.) is amended by striking sections 404 through 408 and inserting the following:

“SEC. 404. COMPACTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall negotiate and enter into a written compact with each Indian Tribe participating in self-governance in a manner consistent with the trust responsibility of the Federal Government, treaty obligations, and the government-to-government relationship between Indian Tribes and the United States.

“(b) CONTENTS.—A compact under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) specify and affirm the general terms of the government-to-government relationship between the Indian Tribe and the Secretary; and

“(2) include such terms as the parties intend shall control during the term of the compact.

“(c) AMENDMENT.—A compact under subsection (a) may be amended only by agreement of the parties.

“(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The effective date of a compact under subsection (a) shall be—

“(1) the date of the execution of the compact by the parties; or

“(2) such date as is mutually agreed upon by the parties.

“(e) DURATION.—A compact under subsection (a) shall remain in effect—

“(1) for so long as permitted by Federal law; or

“(2) until termination by written agreement, retrocession, or reassumption.

“(f) EXISTING COMPACTS.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance under this

title, as in effect on the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, shall have the option at any time after that date—

“(1) to retain its negotiated compact (in whole or in part) to the extent that the provisions of the compact are not directly contrary to any express provision of this title; or

“(2) to negotiate a new compact in a manner consistent with this title.

“SEC. 405. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

“(a) APPLICABILITY.—An Indian Tribe and the Secretary shall include in any compact or funding agreement provisions that reflect the requirements of this title.

“(b) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—An Indian Tribe participating in self-governance shall ensure that internal measures are in place to address, pursuant to Tribal law and procedures, conflicts of interest in the administration of programs.

“(c) AUDITS.—

“(1) SINGLE AGENCY AUDIT ACT.—Chapter 75 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply to a funding agreement under this title.

“(2) COST PRINCIPLES.—An Indian Tribe shall apply cost principles under the applicable Office of Management and Budget circular, except as modified by—

“(A) any provision of law, including section 106; or

“(B) any exemptions to applicable Office of Management and Budget circulars subsequently granted by the Office of Management and Budget.

“(3) FEDERAL CLAIMS.—Any claim by the Federal Government against an Indian Tribe relating to funds received under a funding agreement based on any audit under this subsection shall be subject to section 106(f).

“(d) REDESIGN AND CONSOLIDATION.—Except as provided in section 407, an Indian Tribe may redesign or consolidate programs, or reallocate funds for programs, in a compact or funding agreement in any manner that the Indian Tribe determines to be in the best interest of the Indian community being served—

“(1) so long as the redesign or consolidation does not have the effect of denying eligibility for services to population groups otherwise eligible to be served under applicable Federal law; and

“(2) except that, with respect to the reallocation, consolidation, and redesign of programs described in subsection (b)(2) or (c) of section 403, a joint agreement between the Secretary and the Indian Tribe shall be required.

“(e) RETROCESSION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An Indian Tribe may fully or partially retrocede to the Secretary any program under a compact or funding agreement.

“(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(A) AGREEMENT.—Unless an Indian Tribe rescinds a request for retrocession under paragraph (1), the retrocession shall become effective on the date specified by the parties in the compact or funding agreement.

“(B) NO AGREEMENT.—In the absence of a specification of an effective date in the compact or funding agreement, the retrocession shall become effective on—

“(i) the earlier of—

“(I) 1 year after the date on which the request is submitted; and

“(II) the date on which the funding agreement expires; or

“(ii) such date as may be mutually agreed upon by the Secretary and the Indian Tribe.

“(f) NONDUPLICATION.—A funding agreement shall provide that, for the period for which, and to the extent to which, funding is provided to an Indian Tribe under this title, the Indian Tribe—

“(1) shall not be entitled to contract with the Secretary for funds under section 102, except that the Indian Tribe shall be eligible for new programs on the same basis as other Indian Tribes; and

“(2) shall be responsible for the administration of programs in accordance with the compact or funding agreement.

“(g) RECORDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Unless an Indian Tribe specifies otherwise in the compact or funding agreement, records of an Indian Tribe shall not be considered to be Federal records for purposes of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) RECORDKEEPING SYSTEM.—An Indian Tribe shall—

“(A) maintain a recordkeeping system; and

“(B) on a notice period of not less than 30 days, provide the Secretary with reasonable access to the records to enable the Department to meet the requirements of sections 3101 through 3106 of title 44, United States Code.

“SEC. 406. PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE SECRETARY.

“(a) TRUST EVALUATIONS.—A funding agreement shall include a provision to monitor the performance of trust functions by the Indian Tribe through the annual trust evaluation.

“(b) REASSUMPTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A compact or funding agreement shall include provisions for the Secretary to reassume a program and associated funding if there is a specific finding relating to that program of—

“(A) imminent jeopardy to a trust asset, a natural resource, or public health and safety that—

“(i) is caused by an act or omission of the Indian Tribe; and

“(ii) arises out of a failure to carry out the compact or funding agreement; or

“(B) gross mismanagement with respect to funds transferred to an Indian Tribe under a compact or funding agreement, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Inspector General, as appropriate.

“(2) PROHIBITION.—The Secretary shall not reassume operation of a program, in whole or part, unless—

“(A) the Secretary first provides written notice and a hearing on the record to the Indian Tribe; and

“(B) the Indian Tribe does not take corrective action to remedy the mismanagement of the funds or programs, or the imminent jeopardy to a trust asset, natural resource, or public health and safety.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), the Secretary may, on written notice to the Indian Tribe, immediately reassume operation of a program if—

“(i) the Secretary makes a finding of imminent and substantial jeopardy and irreparable harm to a trust asset, a natural resource, or the public health and safety caused by an act or omission of the Indian Tribe; and

“(ii) the imminent and substantial jeopardy and irreparable harm to the trust asset, natural resource, or public health and safety arises out of a failure by the Indian Tribe to carry out the terms of an applicable compact or funding agreement.

“(B) REASSUMPTION.—If the Secretary reassumes operation of a program under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall provide the Indian Tribe with a hearing on the record not later than 10 days after the date of reassumption.

“(C) INABILITY TO AGREE ON COMPACT OR FUNDING AGREEMENT.—

“(1) FINAL OFFER.—If the Secretary and a participating Indian Tribe are unable to agree, in whole or in part, on the terms of a

compact or funding agreement (including funding levels), the Indian Tribe may submit a final offer to the Secretary.

“(2) DETERMINATION.—Not more than 60 days after the date of receipt of a final offer by one or more of the officials designated pursuant to paragraph (4), the Secretary shall review and make a determination with respect to the final offer, except that the 60-day period may be extended for up to 30 days for circumstances beyond the control of the Secretary, upon written request by the Secretary to the Indian tribe.

“(3) EXTENSIONS.—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

“(4) DESIGNATED OFFICIALS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate one or more appropriate officials in the Department to receive a copy of the final offer described in paragraph (1).

“(B) NO DESIGNATION.—If no official is designated, the Director of the Office of the Executive Secretariat and Regulatory Affairs shall be the designated official.

“(5) NO TIMELY DETERMINATION.—If the Secretary fails to make a determination with respect to a final offer within the period specified in paragraph (2), including any extension agreed to under paragraph (3), the Secretary shall be deemed to have agreed to the offer, except that with respect to any compact or funding agreement provision concerning a program described under section 403(c), the Secretary shall be deemed to have rejected the offer with respect to such provision and the terms of clauses (ii) through (iv) of paragraphs (6)(A) shall apply.

“(6) REJECTION OF FINAL OFFER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary rejects a final offer (or one or more provisions or funding levels in a final offer), the Secretary shall—

“(i) provide timely written notification to the Indian Tribe that contains a specific finding that clearly demonstrates, or that is supported by a controlling legal authority, that—

“(I) the amount of funds proposed in the final offer exceeds the applicable funding level as determined under section 106(a)(1);

“(II) the program that is the subject of the final offer is an inherent Federal function or is subject to the discretion of the Secretary under section 403(c);

“(III) the Indian Tribe cannot carry out the program in a manner that would not result in significant danger or risk to the public health or safety, to natural resources, or to trust resources;

“(IV) the Indian Tribe is not eligible to participate in self-governance under section 402(c);

“(V) the funding agreement would violate a Federal statute or regulation; or

“(VI) with respect to a program or portion of a program included in a final offer pursuant to section 403(b)(2), the program or the portion of the program is not otherwise available to Indian Tribes or Indians under section 102(a)(1)(E);

“(ii) provide technical assistance to overcome the objections stated in the notification required by clause (i);

“(iii) provide the Indian Tribe with a hearing on the record with the right to engage in full discovery relevant to any issue raised in the matter, and the opportunity for appeal on the objections raised, except that the Indian Tribe may, in lieu of filing such appeal, directly proceed to initiate an action in a United States district court under section 110(a); and

“(iv) provide the Indian Tribe the option of entering into the severable portions of a final proposed compact or funding agreement (including a lesser funding amount, if any),

that the Secretary did not reject, subject to any additional alterations necessary to conform the compact or funding agreement to the severed provisions.

“(B) EFFECT OF EXERCISING CERTAIN OPTION.—If an Indian Tribe exercises the option specified in subparagraph (A)(iv)—

“(i) the Indian Tribe shall retain the right to appeal the rejection by the Secretary under this section; and

“(ii) clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of subparagraph (A) shall apply only to the portion of the proposed final compact or funding agreement that was rejected by the Secretary.

“(d) BURDEN OF PROOF.—In any administrative action, hearing, appeal, or civil action brought under this section, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof—

“(1) of demonstrating, by a preponderance of the evidence, the validity of the grounds for a reassumption under subsection (b); and

“(2) of clearly demonstrating the validity of the grounds for rejecting a final offer made under subsection (c).

“(e) GOOD FAITH.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the negotiation of compacts and funding agreements, the Secretary shall at all times negotiate in good faith to maximize implementation of the self-governance policy.

“(2) POLICY.—The Secretary shall carry out this title in a manner that maximizes the policy of Tribal self-governance.

“(f) SAVINGS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent that programs carried out for the benefit of Indian Tribes and Tribal organizations under this title reduce the administrative or other responsibilities of the Secretary with respect to the operation of Indian programs and result in savings that have not otherwise been included in the amount of Tribal shares and other funds determined under section 408(c), except for funding agreements entered into for programs under section 403(c), the Secretary shall make such savings available to the Indian Tribes or Tribal organizations for the provision of additional services to program beneficiaries in a manner equitable to directly served, contracted, and compacted programs.

“(2) DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS OF SPECIAL SIGNIFICANCE.—For any savings generated as a result of the assumption of a program by an Indian Tribe under section 403(c), such savings shall be made available to that Indian Tribe.

“(g) TRUST RESPONSIBILITY.—The Secretary may not waive, modify, or diminish in any way the trust responsibility of the United States with respect to Indian Tribes and individual Indians that exists under treaties, Executive orders, other laws, or court decisions.

“(h) DECISION MAKER.—A decision that constitutes final agency action and relates to an appeal within the Department conducted under subsection (c)(6)(A)(iii) may be made by—

“(1) an official of the Department who holds a position at a higher organizational level within the Department than the level of the departmental agency in which the decision that is the subject of the appeal was made; or

“(2) an administrative law judge.

“(i) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Subject to section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, each provision of this title and each provision of a compact or funding agreement shall be liberally construed for the benefit of the Indian Tribe participating in self-governance, and any ambiguity shall be resolved in favor of the Indian Tribe.

“SEC. 407. CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Indian Tribes participating in Tribal self-governance may carry

out any construction project included in a compact or funding agreement under this title.

“(b) TRIBAL OPTION TO CARRY OUT CERTAIN FEDERAL ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe may, subject to the agreement of the Secretary, elect to assume some Federal responsibilities under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, and related provisions of other law and regulations that would apply if the Secretary were to undertake a construction project, by adopting a resolution—

“(1) designating a certifying Tribal officer to represent the Indian Tribe and to assume the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations; and

“(2) accepting the jurisdiction of the United States courts for the purpose of enforcing the responsibilities of the certifying Tribal officer assuming the status of a responsible Federal official under those Acts, laws, or regulations.

“(c) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Notwithstanding subsection (b), nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary to include in any compact or funding agreement duties of the Secretary under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code, and other related provisions of law that are inherent Federal functions.

“(d) CODES AND STANDARDS.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe shall—

“(1) adhere to applicable Federal, State, local, and Tribal building codes, architectural and engineering standards, and applicable Federal guidelines regarding design, space, and operational standards, appropriate for the particular project; and

“(2) use only architects and engineers who—

“(A) are licensed to practice in the State in which the facility will be built; and

“(B) certify that—

“(i) they are qualified to perform the work required by the specific construction involved; and

“(ii) upon completion of design, the plans and specifications meet or exceed the applicable construction and safety codes.

“(e) TRIBAL ACCOUNTABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out a construction project under this title, an Indian Tribe shall assume responsibility for the successful completion of the construction project and of a facility that is usable for the purpose for which the Indian Tribe received funding.

“(2) REQUIREMENTS.—For each construction project carried out by an Indian Tribe under this title, the Indian Tribe and the Secretary shall negotiate a provision to be included in the funding agreement that identifies—

“(A) the approximate start and completion dates for the project, which may extend over a period of one or more years;

“(B) a general description of the project, including the scope of work, references to design criteria, and other terms and conditions;

“(C) the responsibilities of the Indian Tribe and the Secretary for the project;

“(D) how project-related environmental considerations will be addressed;

“(E) the amount of funds provided for the project;

“(F) the obligations of the Indian Tribe to comply with the codes referenced in subsection (d)(1) and applicable Federal laws and regulations;

“(G) the agreement of the parties over who will bear any additional costs necessary to

meet changes in scope, or errors or omissions in design and construction; and

“(H) the agreement of the Secretary to issue a certificate of occupancy, if requested by the Indian Tribe, based upon the review and verification by the Secretary, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that the Indian Tribe has secured upon completion the review and approval of the plans and specifications, sufficiency of design, life safety, and code compliance by qualified, licensed, and independent architects and engineers.

“(f) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Funding appropriated for construction projects carried out under this title shall be included in funding agreements as annual or semiannual advance payments at the option of the Indian Tribe.

“(2) ADVANCE PAYMENTS.—The Secretary shall include all associated project contingency funds with each advance payment, and the Indian Tribe shall be responsible for the management of such contingency funds.

“(g) NEGOTIATIONS.—At the option of the Indian Tribe, construction project funding proposals shall be negotiated pursuant to the statutory process in section 105, and any resulting construction project agreement shall be incorporated into the funding agreement as addenda.

“(h) FEDERAL REVIEW AND VERIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On a schedule negotiated by the Secretary and the Indian Tribe—

“(A) the Secretary shall review and verify, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that project planning and design documents prepared by the Indian Tribe in advance of initial construction are in conformity with the obligations of the Indian Tribe under subsection (d); and

“(B) before the project planning and design documents are implemented, the Secretary shall review and verify to the satisfaction of the Secretary that subsequent document amendments which result in a significant change in construction are in conformity with the obligations of the Indian Tribe under subsection (d).

“(2) REPORTS.—The Indian Tribe shall provide the Secretary with project progress and financial reports not less than semiannually.

“(3) OVERSIGHT VISITS.—The Secretary may conduct onsite project oversight visits semiannually or on an alternate schedule agreed to by the Secretary and the Indian Tribe.

“(i) APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS.—Unless otherwise agreed to by the Indian Tribe and except as otherwise provided in this Act, no provision of title 41, United States Code, the Federal Acquisition Regulation, or any other law or regulation pertaining to Federal procurement (including Executive orders) shall apply to any construction program or project carried out under this title.

“(j) FUTURE FUNDING.—Upon completion of a facility constructed under this title, the Secretary shall include the facility among those eligible for annual operation and maintenance funding support comparable to that provided for similar facilities funded by the Department as annual appropriations are available and to the extent that the facility size and complexity and other factors do not exceed the funding formula criteria for comparable buildings.

“SEC. 408. PAYMENT.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—At the request of the governing body of an Indian Tribe and under the terms of an applicable funding agreement, the Secretary shall provide funding to the Indian Tribe to carry out the funding agreement.

“(b) ADVANCE ANNUAL PAYMENT.—At the option of the Indian Tribe, a funding agreement shall provide for an advance annual payment to an Indian Tribe.

“(c) AMOUNT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (e) and sections 403 and 405, the Secretary shall provide funds to the Indian Tribe under a funding agreement for programs in an amount that is equal to the amount that the Indian Tribe would have been entitled to receive under contracts and grants under this Act (including amounts for direct program and contract support costs and, in addition, any funds that are specifically or functionally related to the provision by the Secretary of services and benefits to the Indian Tribe or its members) without regard to the organization level within the Department at which the programs are carried out.

“(2) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section reduces programs, services, or funds of, or provided to, another Indian Tribe.

“(d) TIMING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to the terms of any compact or funding agreement entered into under this title, the Secretary shall transfer to the Indian Tribe all funds provided for in the funding agreement, pursuant to subsection (c), and provide funding for periods covered by joint resolution adopted by Congress making continuing appropriations, to the extent permitted by such resolution.

“(2) TRANSFERS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, in any instance in which a funding agreement requires an annual transfer of funding to be made at the beginning of a fiscal year or requires semiannual or other periodic transfers of funding to be made commencing at the beginning of a fiscal year, the first such transfer shall be made not later than 10 days after the apportionment of such funds by the Office of Management and Budget to the Department, unless the funding agreement provides otherwise.

“(e) AVAILABILITY.—Funds for trust services to individual Indians shall be available under a funding agreement only to the extent that the same services that would have been provided by the Secretary are provided to individual Indians by the Indian Tribe.

“(f) MULTIYEAR FUNDING.—A funding agreement may provide for multiyear funding.

“(g) LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall not—

“(1) fail to transfer to an Indian Tribe its full share of any central, headquarters, regional, area, or service unit office or other funds due under this title for programs eligible under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 403(b), except as required by Federal law;

“(2) withhold any portion of such funds for transfer over a period of years; or

“(3) reduce the amount of funds required under this title—

“(A) to make funding available for self-governance monitoring or administration by the Secretary;

“(B) in subsequent years, except as necessary as a result of—

“(i) a reduction in appropriations from the previous fiscal year for the program to be included in a compact or funding agreement;

“(ii) a congressional directive in legislation or an accompanying report;

“(iii) a Tribal authorization;

“(iv) a change in the amount of pass-through funds subject to the terms of the funding agreement; or

“(v) completion of an activity under a program for which the funds were provided;

“(C) to pay for Federal functions, including—

“(i) Federal pay costs;

“(ii) Federal employee retirement benefits;

“(iii) automated data processing;

“(iv) technical assistance; and

“(v) monitoring of activities under this title; or

“(D) to pay for costs of Federal personnel displaced by self-determination contracts

under this Act or self-governance under this title.

“(h) **FEDERAL RESOURCES.**—If an Indian Tribe elects to carry out a compact or funding agreement with the use of Federal personnel, Federal supplies (including supplies available from Federal warehouse facilities), Federal supply sources (including lodging, airline transportation, and other means of transportation, including the use of inter-agency motor pool vehicles), or other Federal resources (including supplies, services, and resources available to the Secretary under any procurement contracts in which the Department is eligible to participate), the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, acquire and transfer such personnel, supplies, or resources to the Indian Tribe under this title.

“(i) **PROMPT PAYMENT ACT.**—Chapter 39 of title 31, United States Code, shall apply to the transfer of funds due under a compact or funding agreement authorized under this title.

“(j) **INTEREST OR OTHER INCOME.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An Indian Tribe may retain interest or income earned on any funds paid under a compact or funding agreement to carry out governmental purposes.

“(2) **NO EFFECT ON OTHER AMOUNTS.**—The retention of interest or income under paragraph (1) shall not diminish the amount of funds an Indian Tribe is entitled to receive under a funding agreement in the year the interest or income is earned or in any subsequent fiscal year.

“(3) **INVESTMENT STANDARD.**—Funds transferred under this title shall be managed by the Indian Tribe using the prudent investment standard, provided that the Secretary shall not be liable for any investment losses of funds managed by the Indian Tribe that are not otherwise guaranteed or insured by the Federal Government.

“(k) **CARRYOVER OF FUNDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any provision of an appropriations Act, all funds paid to an Indian Tribe in accordance with a compact or funding agreement shall remain available until expended.

“(2) **EFFECT OF CARRYOVER.**—If an Indian Tribe elects to carry over funding from one year to the next, the carryover shall not diminish the amount of funds the Indian Tribe is entitled to receive under a funding agreement in that fiscal year or any subsequent fiscal year.

“(l) **LIMITATION OF COSTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An Indian Tribe shall not be obligated to continue performance that requires an expenditure of funds in excess of the amount of funds transferred under a compact or funding agreement.

“(2) **NOTICE OF INSUFFICIENCY.**—If at any time the Indian Tribe has reason to believe that the total amount provided for a specific activity under a compact or funding agreement is insufficient, the Indian Tribe shall provide reasonable notice of such insufficiency to the Secretary.

“(3) **SUSPENSION OF PERFORMANCE.**—If, after notice under paragraph (2), the Secretary does not increase the amount of funds transferred under the funding agreement, the Indian Tribe may suspend performance of the activity until such time as additional funds are transferred.

“(4) **SAVINGS CLAUSE.**—Nothing in this section reduces any programs, services, or funds of, or provided to, another Indian Tribe.

“(m) **DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.**—The Office of Self-Governance shall be responsible for distribution of all Bureau of Indian Affairs funds provided under this title unless otherwise agreed by the parties to an applicable funding agreement.

“(n) **APPLICABILITY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, section 101(a)

of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act applies to subsections (a) through (m).

“**SEC. 409. FACILITATION.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided by law (including section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act), the Secretary shall interpret each Federal law and regulation in a manner that facilitates—

“(1) the inclusion of programs in funding agreements; and

“(2) the implementation of funding agreements.

“(b) **REGULATION WAIVER.**—

“(1) **REQUEST.**—An Indian Tribe may submit to the Secretary a written request for a waiver of applicability of a Federal regulation, including—

“(A) an identification of the specific text in the regulation sought to be waived; and

“(B) the basis for the request.

“(2) **DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.**—Not later than 120 days after receipt by the Secretary and the designated officials under paragraph (4) of a request under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall approve or deny the requested waiver in writing to the Indian Tribe.

“(3) **EXTENSIONS.**—The deadline described in paragraph (2) may be extended for any length of time, as agreed upon by both the Indian Tribe and the Secretary.

“(4) **DESIGNATED OFFICIALS.**—The Secretary shall designate one or more appropriate officials in the Department to receive a copy of the waiver request described in paragraph (1).

“(5) **GROUND FOR DENIAL.**—The Secretary may deny a request under paragraph (1) upon a specific finding by the Secretary that the identified text in the regulation may not be waived because such a waiver is prohibited by Federal law.

“(6) **FAILURE TO MAKE DETERMINATION.**—If the Secretary fails to make a determination with respect to a waiver request within the period specified in paragraph (2) (including any extension agreed to under paragraph (3)), the Secretary shall be deemed to have agreed to the request, except that for a waiver request relating to programs eligible under section 403(b)(2) or section 403(c), the Secretary shall be deemed to have denied the request.

“(7) **FINALITY.**—A decision of the Secretary under this section shall be final for the Department.

“**SEC. 410. DISCRETIONARY APPLICATION OF OTHER SECTIONS.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in section 201(d) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, at the option of a participating Indian Tribe or Indian Tribes, any of the provisions of title I may be incorporated in any compact or funding agreement under this title. The inclusion of any such provision shall be subject to, and shall not conflict with, section 101(a) of such Act.

“(b) **EFFECT.**—Each incorporated provision under subsection (a) shall—

“(1) have the same force and effect as if set out in full in this title;

“(2) supplement or replace any related provision in this title; and

“(3) apply to any agency otherwise governed by this title.

“(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—If an Indian Tribe requests incorporation at the negotiation stage of a compact or funding agreement, the incorporation shall—

“(1) be effective immediately; and

“(2) control the negotiation and resulting compact and funding agreement.

“**SEC. 411. ANNUAL BUDGET LIST.**

“The Secretary shall list, in the annual budget request submitted to Congress under section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, any funds proposed to be included in funding agreements authorized under this title.

“**SEC. 412. REPORTS.**

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—On January 1 of each year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report regarding the administration of this title.

“(2) **ANALYSIS.**—Any Indian Tribe may submit to the Office of Self-Governance and to the appropriate committees of Congress a detailed annual analysis of unmet Tribal needs for funding agreements under this title.

“(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report under subsection (a)(1) shall—

“(1) be compiled from information contained in funding agreements, annual audit reports, and data of the Secretary regarding the disposition of Federal funds;

“(2) identify—

“(A) the relative costs and benefits of self-governance;

“(B) with particularity, all funds that are specifically or functionally related to the provision by the Secretary of services and benefits to self-governance Indian Tribes and members of Indian Tribes;

“(C) the funds transferred to each Indian Tribe and the corresponding reduction in the Federal employees and workload; and

“(D) the funding formula for individual Tribal shares of all Central Office funds, together with the comments of affected Indian Tribes, developed under subsection (d);

“(3) before being submitted to Congress, be distributed to the Indian Tribes for comment (with a comment period of not less than 30 days);

“(4) include the separate views and comments of each Indian Tribe or Tribal organization; and

“(5) include a list of—

“(A) all such programs that the Secretary determines, in consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, are eligible for negotiation to be included in a funding agreement at the request of a participating Indian Tribe; and

“(B) all such programs which Indian Tribes have formally requested to include in a funding agreement under section 403(c) due to the special geographic, historical, or cultural significance of the program to the Indian Tribe, indicating whether each request was granted or denied, and stating the grounds for any denial.

“(c) **REPORT ON NON-BIA PROGRAMS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In order to optimize opportunities for including non-BIA programs in agreements with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance under this title, the Secretary shall review all programs administered by the Department, other than through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, or the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians, without regard to the agency or office concerned.

“(2) **PROGRAMMATIC TARGETS.**—The Secretary shall establish programmatic targets, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, to encourage bureaus of the Department to ensure that an appropriate portion of those programs are available to be included in funding agreements.

“(3) **PUBLICATION.**—The lists under subsection (b)(5) and targets under paragraph (2) shall be published in the Federal Register and made available to any Indian Tribe participating in self-governance.

“(4) **ANNUAL REVIEW.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall annually review and publish in the Federal Register, after consultation with Indian Tribes participating in self-governance, revised lists and programmatic targets.

“(B) **CONTENTS.**—In preparing the revised lists and programmatic targets, the Secretary shall consider all programs that were

eligible for contracting in the original list published in the Federal Register in 1995, except for programs specifically determined not to be contractible as a matter of law.

“(d) **REPORT ON CENTRAL OFFICE FUNDS.**—Not later than January 1, 2020, the Secretary shall, in consultation with Indian Tribes, develop a funding formula to determine the individual Tribal share of funds controlled by the Central Office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Office of the Special Trustee for inclusion in the compacts.

“SEC. 413. REGULATIONS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(1) **PROMULGATION.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, the Secretary shall initiate procedures under subchapter III of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, to negotiate and promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out this title.

“(2) **PUBLICATION OF PROPOSED REGULATIONS.**—Proposed regulations to implement this title shall be published in the Federal Register not later than 21 months after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

“(3) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority to promulgate regulations under paragraph (1) shall expire on the date that is 30 months after the date of enactment of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

“(b) **COMMITTEE.**—

“(1) **MEMBERSHIP.**—A negotiated rule-making committee established pursuant to section 565 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out this section shall have as its members only representatives of the Federal Government and Tribal government.

“(2) **LEAD AGENCY.**—Among the Federal representatives described in paragraph (1), the Office of Self-Governance shall be the lead agency for the Department.

“(c) **ADAPTATION OF PROCEDURES.**—The Secretary shall adapt the negotiated rule-making procedures to the unique context of self-governance and the government-to-government relationship between the United States and Indian Tribes.

“(d) **EFFECT.**—

“(1) **REPEAL.**—The Secretary may repeal any regulation that is inconsistent with this Act.

“(2) **CONFLICTING PROVISIONS.**—Subject to section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act and except with respect to programs described under section 403(c), this title shall supersede any conflicting provision of law (including any conflicting regulations).

“(3) **EFFECTIVENESS WITHOUT REGARD TO REGULATIONS.**—The lack of promulgated regulations on an issue shall not limit the effect or implementation of this title.

“SEC. 414. EFFECT OF CIRCULARS, POLICIES, MANUALS, GUIDANCE, AND RULES.

“Unless expressly agreed to by a participating Indian Tribe in a compact or funding agreement, the participating Indian Tribe shall not be subject to any agency circular, policy, manual, guidance, or rule adopted by the Department, except for—

“(1) the eligibility provisions of section 105(g); and

“(2) regulations promulgated pursuant to section 413.

“SEC. 415. APPEALS.

“Except as provided in section 406(d), in any administrative action, appeal, or civil action for judicial review of any decision made by the Secretary under this title, the Secretary shall have the burden of proof of demonstrating by a preponderance of the evidence—

“(1) the validity of the grounds for the decision; and

“(2) the consistency of the decision with the requirements and policies of this title.

“SEC. 416. APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.

“Section 314 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-512; 104 Stat. 1959), shall apply to compacts and funding agreements entered into under this title.

“SEC. 417. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this title.”

TITLE II—INDIAN SELF-DETERMINATION

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS; REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATION OF PROVISIONS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304) is amended by striking subsection (j) and inserting the following:

“(j) ‘self-determination contract’ means a contract entered into under title I (or a grant or cooperative agreement used under section 9) between a Tribal organization and the appropriate Secretary for the planning, conduct, and administration of programs or services that are otherwise provided to Indian Tribes and members of Indian Tribes pursuant to Federal law, subject to the condition that, except as provided in section 105(a)(3), no contract entered into under title I (or grant or cooperative agreement used under section 9) shall be—

“(1) considered to be a procurement contract; or

“(2) except as provided in section 107(a)(1), subject to any Federal procurement law (including regulations);”.

(2) **TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.**—Section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304), as amended by paragraph (1), is further amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking “‘Indian tribe’ means” and inserting “‘Indian tribe’ or ‘Indian Tribe’ means”; and

(B) in subsection (l), by striking “‘tribal organization’ means” and inserting “‘Tribal organization’ or ‘tribal organization’ means”.

(b) **REPORTING AND AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 5 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5305) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “after completion of the project or undertaking referred to in the preceding subsection of this section” and inserting “after the retention period for the report that is submitted to the Secretary under subsection (a)”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following: “The retention period shall be defined in regulations promulgated by the Secretary pursuant to section 413.”; and

(2) in subsection (f)(1), by inserting “if the Indian Tribal organization expends \$500,000 or more in Federal awards during such fiscal year” after “under this Act.”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (b)(2) shall not take effect until 14 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) **APPLICATION OF OTHER PROVISIONS.**—Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 102(c), 104, 105(a)(1), 105(f), 110, and 111 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304, 5305, 5306, 5307, 5321(c), 5323, 5324(a)(1), 5324(f), 5331, and 5332) and section 314 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-512; 104 Stat. 1959), apply to compacts and funding agreements entered into under title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5361 et seq.).

SEC. 202. CONTRACTS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

Section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5321) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), by striking “economic enterprises” and all that follows through “except that” and inserting “economic enterprises (as defined in section 3 of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1452)), except that”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(f) **GOOD FAITH REQUIREMENT.**—In the negotiation of contracts and funding agreements, the Secretary shall—

“(1) at all times negotiate in good faith to maximize implementation of the self-determination policy; and

“(2) carry out this Act in a manner that maximizes the policy of Tribal self-determination, in a manner consistent with—

“(A) the purposes specified in section 3; and

“(B) the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act.

“(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Subject to section 101(a) of the PROGRESS for Indian Tribes Act, each provision of this Act and each provision of a contract or funding agreement shall be liberally construed for the benefit of the Indian Tribe participating in self-determination, and any ambiguity shall be resolved in favor of the Indian Tribe.”.

SEC. 203. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

Section 105 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5324) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), in the first sentence, by striking “pursuant to” and all that follows through “of this Act” and inserting “pursuant to sections 102 and 103”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(p) **INTERPRETATION BY SECRETARY.**—Except as otherwise provided by law, the Secretary shall interpret all Federal laws (including regulations) and Executive orders in a manner that facilitates, to the maximum extent practicable—

“(1) the inclusion in self-determination contracts and funding agreements of—

“(A) applicable programs, services, functions, and activities (or portions thereof); and

“(B) funds associated with those programs, services, functions, and activities;

“(2) the implementation of self-determination contracts and funding agreements; and

“(3) the achievement of Tribal health objectives.

“(q)(1) **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR INTERNAL CONTROLS.**—In considering proposals for, amendments to, or in the course of, a contract under this title and compacts under titles IV and V of this Act, if the Secretary determines that the Indian Tribe lacks adequate internal controls necessary to manage the contracted program or programs, the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, provide the necessary technical assistance to assist the Indian Tribe in developing adequate internal controls. As part of that technical assistance, the Secretary and the Tribe shall develop a plan for assessing the subsequent effectiveness of such technical assistance. The inability of the Secretary to provide technical assistance or lack of a plan under this subsection shall not result in the re-assumption of an existing agreement, contract, or compact, or declination or rejection of a new agreement, contract, or compact.

“(2) The Secretary shall prepare a report to be included in the information required for the reports under sections 412(b)(2)(A) and 514(b)(2)(A). The Secretary shall include in this report, in the aggregate, a description of the internal controls that were inadequate, the technical assistance provided, and a description of Secretarial actions

taken to address any remaining inadequate internal controls after the provision of technical assistance and implementation of the plan required by paragraph (1)."

SEC. 204. CONTRACT FUNDING AND INDIRECT COSTS.

Section 106(a)(3) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5325(a)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—
(A) in clause (i), by striking “, and” and inserting “; and”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “expense related to the overhead incurred” and inserting “expense incurred by the governing body of the Indian Tribe or Tribal organization and any overhead expense incurred”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

“(B) In calculating the reimbursement rate for expenses described in subparagraph (A)(ii), not less than 50 percent of the expenses described in subparagraph (A)(ii) that are incurred by the governing body of an Indian Tribe or Tribal organization relating to a Federal program, function, service, or activity carried out pursuant to the contract shall be considered to be reasonable and allowable.”.

SEC. 205. CONTRACT OR GRANT SPECIFICATIONS.

Section 108 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5329) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by inserting “subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 102,” before “contain”;

(2) in subsection (f)(2)(A)(ii) of the model agreement contained in subsection (c), by inserting “subject to subsections (a) and (b) of section 102 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5321),” before “such other provisions”; and

(3) in subsection (b)(7)(C) of the model agreement contained in subsection (c), in the second sentence of the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “one performance monitoring visit” and inserting “two performance monitoring visits”.

S. 256

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Esther Martinez Native American Languages Programs Reauthorization Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES GRANT PROGRAM.

Section 803C of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2991b-3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(7)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “10” and inserting “5”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “15” and inserting “10”; and

(2) in subsection (e)(2)—

(A) by striking “or 3-year basis” and inserting “3-year, 4-year, or 5-year basis”; and

(B) by inserting “, 4-year, or 5-year” after “on a 3-year”.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF NATIVE AMERICAN LANGUAGES PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 816(e) of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d(e)) is amended by striking “such sums” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “\$13,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

(b) TECHNICAL CORRECTION.—Section 816 of the Native American Programs Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 2992d) is amended in subsections (a) and (b) by striking “subsection (e)” each place it appears and inserting “subsection (d)”.

S. 294

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Native American Business Incubators Program Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) entrepreneurs face specific challenges when transforming ideas into profitable business enterprises;

(2) entrepreneurs that want to provide products and services in reservation communities face an additional set of challenges that requires special knowledge;

(3) a business incubator is an organization that assists entrepreneurs in navigating obstacles that prevent innovative ideas from becoming viable businesses by providing services that include—

(A) workspace and facilities resources;

(B) access to capital, business education, and counseling;

(C) networking opportunities;

(D) mentorship opportunities; and

(E) an environment intended to help establish and expand business operations;

(4) the business incubator model is suited to accelerating entrepreneurship in reservation communities because the business incubator model promotes collaboration to address shared challenges and provides individually tailored services for the purpose of overcoming obstacles unique to each participating business; and

(5) business incubators will stimulate economic development by providing Native entrepreneurs with the tools necessary to grow businesses that offer products and services to reservation communities.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BUSINESS INCUBATOR.—The term “business incubator” means an organization that—

(A) provides physical workspace and facilities resources to startups and established businesses; and

(B) is designed to accelerate the growth and success of businesses through a variety of business support resources and services, including—

(i) access to capital, business education, and counseling;

(ii) networking opportunities;

(iii) mentorship opportunities; and

(iv) other services intended to aid in developing a business.

(2) ELIGIBLE APPLICANT.—The term “eligible applicant” means an applicant eligible to apply for a grant under section 4(b).

(3) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term “Indian tribe” has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(4) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(5) NATIVE AMERICAN; NATIVE.—The terms “Native American” and “Native” have the meaning given the term “Indian” in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

(6) NATIVE BUSINESS.—The term “Native business” means a business concern that is at least 51-percent owned and controlled by 1 or more Native Americans.

(7) NATIVE ENTREPRENEUR.—The term “Native entrepreneur” means an entrepreneur who is a Native American.

(8) PROGRAM.—The term “program” means the program established under section 4(a).

(9) RESERVATION.—The term “reservation” has the meaning given the term in section 3

of the Indian Financing Act of 1974 (25 U.S.C. 1452).

(10) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(11) TRIBAL COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY.—The term “tribal college or university” has the meaning given the term “Tribal College or University” in section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(b)).

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish a program in the Office of Indian Energy and Economic Development under which the Secretary shall provide financial assistance in the form of competitive grants to eligible applicants for the establishment and operation of business incubators that serve reservation communities by providing business incubation and other business services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs.

(b) ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under the program, an applicant shall—

(A) be—

(i) an Indian tribe;

(ii) a tribal college or university;

(iii) an institution of higher education; or

(iv) a private nonprofit organization or tribal nonprofit organization that—

(I) provides business and financial technical assistance; and

(II) will commit to serving 1 or more reservation communities;

(B) be able to provide the physical workspace, equipment, and connectivity necessary for Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to collaborate and conduct business on a local, regional, national, and international level; and

(C) in the case of an entity described in clauses (ii) through (iv) of subparagraph (A), have been operational for not less than 1 year before receiving a grant under the program.

(2) JOINT PROJECT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Two or more entities may submit a joint application for a project that combines the resources and expertise of those entities at a physical location dedicated to assisting Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs under the program.

(B) CONTENTS.—A joint application submitted under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) contain a certification that each participant of the joint project is one of the eligible entities described in paragraph (1)(A); and

(ii) demonstrate that together the participants meet the requirements of subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1).

(c) APPLICATION AND SELECTION PROCESS.—

(1) APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS.—Each eligible applicant desiring a grant under the program shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including—

(A) a certification that the applicant—

(i) is an eligible applicant;

(ii) will designate an executive director or program manager, if such director or manager has not been designated, to manage the business incubator; and

(iii) agrees—

(I) to a site evaluation by the Secretary as part of the final selection process;

(II) to an annual programmatic and financial examination for the duration of the grant; and

(III) to the maximum extent practicable, to remedy any problems identified pursuant to the site evaluation under subclause (I) or an examination under subclause (II);

(B) a description of the 1 or more reservation communities to be served by the business incubator;

(C) a 3-year plan that describes—

(i) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to be participating in the business incubator;

(ii) whether the business incubator will focus on a particular type of business or industry;

(iii) a detailed breakdown of the services to be offered to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator; and

(iv) a detailed breakdown of the services, if any, to be offered to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs not participating in the business incubator;

(D) information demonstrating the effectiveness and experience of the eligible applicant in—

(i) conducting financial, management, and marketing assistance programs designed to educate or improve the business skills of current or prospective businesses;

(ii) working in and providing services to Native American communities;

(iii) providing assistance to entities conducting business in reservation communities;

(iv) providing technical assistance under Federal business and entrepreneurial development programs for which Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs are eligible; and

(v) managing finances and staff effectively; and

(E) a site description of the location at which the eligible applicant will provide physical workspace, including a description of the technologies, equipment, and other resources that will be available to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator.

(2) EVALUATION CONSIDERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating each application, the Secretary shall consider—

(i) the ability of the eligible applicant—

(I) to operate a business incubator that effectively imparts entrepreneurship and business skills to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs, as demonstrated by the experience and qualifications of the eligible applicant;

(II) to commence providing services within a minimum period of time, to be determined by the Secretary; and

(III) to provide quality incubation services to a significant number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;

(ii) the experience of the eligible applicant in providing services in Native American communities, including in the 1 or more reservation communities described in the application; and

(iii) the proposed location of the business incubator.

(B) PRIORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In evaluating the proposed location of the business incubator under subparagraph (A)(iii), the Secretary shall—

(I) consider the program goal of achieving broad geographic distribution of business incubators; and

(II) except as provided in clause (ii), give priority to eligible applicants that will provide business incubation services on or near the reservation of the 1 or more communities that were described in the application.

(ii) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may give priority to an eligible applicant that is not located on or near the reservation of the 1 or more communities that were described in the application if the Secretary determines that—

(I) the location of the business incubator will not prevent the eligible applicant from providing quality business incubation services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs from the 1 or more reservation communities to be served; and

(II) siting the business incubator in the identified location will serve the interests of the 1 or more reservation communities to be served.

(3) SITE EVALUATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Before making a grant to an eligible applicant, the Secretary shall conduct a site visit, evaluate a video submission, or evaluate a written site proposal (if the applicant is not yet in possession of the site) of the proposed site to ensure the proposed site will permit the eligible applicant to meet the requirements of the program.

(B) WRITTEN SITE PROPOSAL.—A written site proposal shall meet the requirements described in paragraph (1)(E) and contain—

(i) sufficient detail for the Secretary to ensure in the absence of a site visit or video submission that the proposed site will permit the eligible applicant to meet the requirements of the program; and

(ii) a timeline describing when the eligible applicant will be—

(I) in possession of the proposed site; and

(II) operating the business incubator at the proposed site.

(C) FOLLOWUP.—Not later than 1 year after awarding a grant to an eligible applicant that submits an application with a written site proposal, the Secretary shall conduct a site visit or evaluate a video submission of the site to ensure the site is consistent with the written site proposal.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) DURATION.—Each grant awarded under the program shall be for a term of 3 years.

(2) PAYMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall disburse grant funds awarded to an eligible applicant in annual installments.

(B) MORE FREQUENT DISBURSEMENTS.—On request by the applicant, the Secretary may make disbursements of grant funds more frequently than annually, on the condition that disbursements shall be made not more frequently than quarterly.

(3) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INITIAL ASSISTANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an eligible applicant that receives a grant under the program shall provide non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to not less than 25 percent of the grant amount disbursed each year.

(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may waive, in whole or in part, the requirements of subparagraph (A) with respect to an eligible applicant if, after considering the ability of the eligible applicant to provide non-Federal contributions, the Secretary determines that—

(i) the proposed business incubator will provide quality business incubation services; and

(ii) the 1 or more reservation communities to be served are unlikely to receive similar services because of remoteness or other reasons that inhibit the provision of business and entrepreneurial development services.

(4) RENEWALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may renew a grant award under the program for a term not to exceed 3 years.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining whether to renew a grant award, the Secretary shall consider with respect to the eligible applicant—

(i) the results of the annual evaluations of the eligible applicant under subsection (f)(1);

(ii) the performance of the business incubator of the eligible applicant, as compared to the performance of other business incubators receiving assistance under the program;

(iii) whether the eligible applicant continues to be eligible for the program; and

(iv) the evaluation considerations for initial awards under subsection (c)(2).

(C) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS FOR RENEWALS.—An eligible applicant that receives a grant renewal under subparagraph (A) shall provide non-Federal contributions in an amount equal to not less than 33 percent of the total amount of the grant.

(5) NO DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—An eligible applicant shall not be awarded a grant under the program that is duplicative of existing Federal funding from another source.

(e) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible applicant receiving a grant under the program may use grant amounts—

(A) to provide physical workspace and facilities for Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator;

(B) to establish partnerships with other institutions and entities to provide comprehensive business incubation services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in the business incubator; and

(C) for any other uses typically associated with business incubators that the Secretary determines to be appropriate and consistent with the purposes of the program.

(2) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—Each eligible applicant receiving a grant under the program shall—

(A) offer culturally tailored incubation services to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;

(B) use a competitive process for selecting Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to participate in the business incubator;

(C) provide physical workspace that permits Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs to conduct business and collaborate with other Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;

(D) provide entrepreneurship and business skills training and education to Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs including—

(i) financial education, including training and counseling in—

(I) applying for and securing business credit and investment capital;

(II) preparing and presenting financial statements; and

(III) managing cash flow and other financial operations of a business;

(ii) management education, including training and counseling in planning, organization, staffing, directing, and controlling each major activity or function of a business or startup; and

(iii) marketing education, including training and counseling in—

(I) identifying and segmenting domestic and international market opportunities;

(II) preparing and executing marketing plans;

(III) locating contract opportunities;

(IV) negotiating contracts; and

(V) using varying public relations and advertising techniques;

(E) provide direct mentorship or assistance finding mentors in the industry in which the Native business or Native entrepreneur operates or intends to operate; and

(F) provide access to networks of potential investors, professionals in the same or similar fields, and other business owners with similar businesses.

(3) TECHNOLOGY.—Each eligible applicant shall leverage technology to the maximum extent practicable to provide Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs with access to the connectivity tools needed to compete and thrive in 21st-century markets.

(f) OVERSIGHT.—

(1) ANNUAL EVALUATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary awards a grant to an eligible applicant under the program, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, the Secretary shall

conduct an evaluation of, and prepare a report on, the eligible applicant, which shall—

(A) describe the performance of the eligible applicant; and

(B) be used in determining the ongoing eligibility of the eligible applicant.

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary awards a grant to an eligible applicant under the program, and annually thereafter for the duration of the grant, each eligible applicant receiving an award under the program shall submit to the Secretary a report describing the services the eligible applicant provided under the program during the preceding year.

(B) REPORT CONTENT.—The report described in subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) a detailed breakdown of the Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving services from the business incubator, including, for the year covered by the report—

(I) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs participating in or receiving services from the business incubator and the types of services provided to those Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs;

(II) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs established and jobs created or maintained; and

(III) the performance of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs while participating in the business incubator and after graduation or departure from the business incubator; and

(ii) any other information the Secretary may require to evaluate the performance of a business incubator to ensure appropriate implementation of the program.

(C) LIMITATIONS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall not require an eligible applicant to report under subparagraph (A) information provided to the Secretary by the eligible applicant under other programs.

(D) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate with the heads of other Federal agencies to ensure that, to the maximum extent practicable, the report content and form under subparagraphs (A) and (B) are consistent with other reporting requirements for Federal programs that provide business and entrepreneurial assistance.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date on which the Secretary first awards funding under the program, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report on the performance and effectiveness of the program.

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall—

(i) account for each program year; and

(ii) include with respect to each business incubator receiving grant funds under the program—

(I) the number of Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs that received business incubation or other services;

(II) the number of businesses established with the assistance of the business incubator;

(III) the number of jobs established or maintained by Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving business incubation services, including a description of where the jobs are located with respect to reservation communities;

(IV) to the maximum extent practicable, the amount of capital investment and loan financing accessed by Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs receiving business incubation services; and

(V) an evaluation of the overall performance of the business incubator.

SEC. 5. REGULATIONS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to implement the program.

SEC. 6. SCHOOLS TO BUSINESS INCUBATOR PIPELINE.

The Secretary shall facilitate the establishment of relationships between eligible applicants receiving funds through the program and educational institutions serving Native American communities, including tribal colleges and universities.

SEC. 7. AGENCY PARTNERSHIPS.

The Secretary shall coordinate with the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that business incubators receiving grant funds under the program have the information and materials needed to provide Native businesses and Native entrepreneurs with the information and assistance necessary to apply for business and entrepreneurial development programs administered by the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Treasury, and the Small Business Administration.

SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the program \$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.

S. 257

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tribal HUD-VASH Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. RENTAL ASSISTANCE FOR HOMELESS OR AT-RISK INDIAN VETERANS.

Section 8(o)(19) of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S.C. 1437f(o)(19)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(D) INDIAN VETERANS HOUSING RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—

“(I) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph:

“(I) ELIGIBLE INDIAN VETERAN.—The term ‘eligible Indian veteran’ means an Indian veteran who is—

“(aa) homeless or at risk of homelessness; and

“(bb) living—

“(AA) on or near a reservation; or

“(BB) in or near any other Indian area.

“(II) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENT.—The term ‘eligible recipient’ means a recipient eligible to receive a grant under section 101 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4111).

“(III) INDIAN, INDIAN AREA.—The terms ‘Indian’ and ‘Indian area’ have the meanings given those terms in section 4 of the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4103).

“(IV) INDIAN VETERAN.—The term ‘Indian veteran’ means an Indian who is a veteran.

“(V) PROGRAM.—The term ‘Program’ means the Tribal HUD-VASH program carried out under clause (ii).

“(VI) TRIBAL ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘tribal organization’ has the meaning given the term in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304).

“(ii) PROGRAM SPECIFICATIONS.—The Secretary shall use not less than 5 percent of the amounts made available for rental assistance under this paragraph to carry out a rental assistance and supported housing program, to be known as the ‘Tribal HUD-VASH program’, in conjunction with the Secretary

of Veterans Affairs, by awarding grants for the benefit of eligible Indian veterans.

“(iii) MODEL.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), the Secretary shall model the Program on the rental assistance and supported housing program authorized under subparagraph (A) and applicable appropriations Acts, including administration in conjunction with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(II) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(aa) SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.—After consultation with Indian tribes, eligible recipients, and any other appropriate tribal organizations, the Secretary may make necessary and appropriate modifications to facilitate the use of the Program by eligible recipients to serve eligible Indian veterans.

“(bb) SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.—After consultation with Indian tribes, eligible recipients, and any other appropriate tribal organizations, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may make necessary and appropriate modifications to facilitate the use of the Program by eligible recipients to serve eligible Indian veterans.

“(iv) ELIGIBLE RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall make amounts for rental assistance and associated administrative costs under the Program available in the form of grants to eligible recipients.

“(v) FUNDING CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall award grants under the Program based on—

“(I) need;

“(II) administrative capacity; and

“(III) any other funding criteria established by the Secretary in a notice published in the Federal Register after consulting with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

“(vi) ADMINISTRATION.—Grants awarded under the Program shall be administered in accordance with the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996 (25 U.S.C. 4101 et seq.), except that recipients shall—

“(I) submit to the Secretary, in a manner prescribed by the Secretary, reports on the utilization of rental assistance provided under the Program; and

“(II) provide to the Secretary information specified by the Secretary to assess the effectiveness of the Program in serving eligible Indian veterans.

“(vii) CONSULTATION.—

“(I) GRANT RECIPIENTS; TRIBAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, shall consult with eligible recipients and any other appropriate tribal organization on the design of the Program to ensure the effective delivery of rental assistance and supportive services to eligible Indian veterans under the Program.

“(II) INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.—The Director of the Indian Health Service shall provide any assistance requested by the Secretary or the Secretary of Veterans Affairs in carrying out the Program.

“(viii) WAIVER.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subclause (II), the Secretary may waive or specify alternative requirements for any provision of law (including regulations) that the Secretary administers in connection with the use of rental assistance made available under the Program if the Secretary finds that the waiver or alternative requirement is necessary for the effective delivery and administration of rental assistance under the Program to eligible Indian veterans.

“(II) EXCEPTION.—The Secretary may not waive or specify alternative requirements under subclause (I) for any provision of law (including regulations) relating to labor standards or the environment.

“(ix) RENEWAL GRANTS.—The Secretary may—

“(I) set aside, from amounts made available for tenant-based rental assistance under this subsection and without regard to the amounts used for new grants under clause (ii), such amounts as may be necessary to award renewal grants to eligible recipients that received a grant under the Program in a previous year; and

“(II) specify criteria that an eligible recipient must satisfy to receive a renewal grant under subclause (I), including providing data on how the eligible recipient used the amounts of any grant previously received under the Program.

“(x) REPORTING.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Tribal HUD-VASH Act of 2019, and every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary, in coordination with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Director of the Indian Health Service, shall—

“(aa) conduct a review of the implementation of the Program, including any factors that may have limited its success; and

“(bb) submit a report describing the results of the review under item (aa) to—

“(AA) the Committee on Indian Affairs, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

“(BB) the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs of the Committee on Natural Resources, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

“(II) ANALYSIS OF HOUSING STOCK LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall include in the initial report submitted under subclause (I) a description of—

“(aa) any regulations governing the use of formula current assisted stock (as defined in section 1000.314 of title 24, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation)) within the Program; and

“(bb) the number of recipients of grants under the Program that have reported the regulations described in item (aa) as a barrier to implementation of the Program; and

“(cc) proposed alternative legislation or regulations developed by the Secretary in consultation with recipients of grants under the Program to allow the use of formula current assisted stock within the Program.”.

S. 216

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation Equitable Compensation Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) from 1927 to 1931, at the direction of Congress, the Corps of Engineers investigated the Columbia River and its tributaries to determine sites at which power could be produced at low cost;

(2) under section 10(e) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 803(e)), when licenses are issued involving tribal land within an Indian reservation, a reasonable annual charge shall be fixed for the use of the land, subject to the approval of the Indian tribe having jurisdiction over the land;

(3) in August 1933, the Columbia Basin Commission, an agency of the State of Washington, received a preliminary permit from the Federal Power Commission for water power development at the Grand Coulee site;

(4) had the Columbia Basin Commission or a private entity developed the site, the Spo-

kane Tribe would have been entitled to a reasonable annual charge for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe;

(5) in the mid-1930s, the Federal Government, which is not subject to licensing under the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 792 et seq.)—

(A) federalized the Grand Coulee Dam project; and

(B) began construction of the Grand Coulee Dam;

(6) when the Grand Coulee Dam project was federalized, the Federal Government recognized that—

(A) development of the project affected the interests of the Spokane Tribe and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation; and

(B) it would be appropriate for the Spokane and Colville Tribes to receive a share of revenue from the disposition of power produced at Grand Coulee Dam;

(7) in the Act of June 29, 1940 (16 U.S.C. 835d et seq.), Congress—

(A) granted to the United States—

(i) in aid of the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Columbia Basin Project, all the right, title, and interest of the Spokane Tribe and Colville Tribes in and to the tribal and allotted land within the Spokane and Colville Reservations, as designated by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time; and

(ii) other interests in that land as required and as designated by the Secretary for certain construction activities undertaken in connection with the project; and

(B) provided that compensation for the land and other interests was to be determined by the Secretary in such amounts as the Secretary determined to be just and equitable;

(8) pursuant to that Act, the Secretary paid—

(A) to the Spokane Tribe, \$4,700; and

(B) to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation, \$63,000;

(9) in 1994, following litigation under the Act of August 13, 1946 (commonly known as the “Indian Claims Commission Act” (60 Stat. 1049, chapter 959; former 25 U.S.C. 70 et seq.)), Congress ratified the Colville Settlement Agreement, which required—

(A) for past use of the land of the Colville Tribes, a payment of \$53,000,000; and

(B) for continued use of the land of the Colville Tribes, annual payments of \$15,250,000, adjusted annually based on revenues from the sale of electric power from the Grand Coulee Dam project and transmission of that power by the Bonneville Power Administration;

(10) the Spokane Tribe, having suffered harm similar to that suffered by the Colville Tribes, did not file a claim within the 5-year statute of limitations under the Indian Claims Commission Act;

(11) neither the Colville Tribes nor the Spokane Tribe filed claims for compensation for use of the land of the respective tribes with the Commission prior to August 13, 1951, but both tribes filed unrelated land claims prior to August 13, 1951;

(12) in 1976, over objections by the United States, the Colville Tribes were successful in amending the 1951 Claims Commission land claims to add the Grand Coulee claim of the Colville Tribes;

(13) the Spokane Tribe had no such claim to amend, having settled the Claims Commission land claims of the Spokane Tribe with the United States in 1967;

(14) the Spokane Tribe has suffered significant harm from the construction and operation of Grand Coulee Dam;

(15) Spokane tribal acreage taken by the United States for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam equaled approximately 39 per-

cent of Colville tribal acreage taken for construction of the dam;

(16) the payments and delegation made pursuant to this Act constitute fair and equitable compensation for the past and continued use of Spokane tribal land for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam; and

(17) by vote of the Spokane tribal membership, the Spokane Tribe has resolved that the payments and delegation made pursuant to this Act constitute fair and equitable compensation for the past and continued use of Spokane tribal land for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam.

SEC. 3. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to provide fair and equitable compensation to the Spokane Tribe for the use of the land of the Spokane Tribe for the generation of hydropower by the Grand Coulee Dam.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration or the head of any successor agency, corporation, or entity that markets power produced at Grand Coulee Dam.

(2) COLVILLE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.—The term “Colville Settlement Agreement” means the Settlement Agreement entered into between the United States and the Colville Tribes, signed by the United States on April 21, 1994, and by the Colville Tribes on April 16, 1994, to settle the claims of the Colville Tribes in Docket 181-D of the Indian Claims Commission, which docket was transferred to the United States Court of Federal Claims.

(3) COLVILLE TRIBES.—The term “Colville Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation.

(4) COMPUTED ANNUAL PAYMENT.—The term “Computed Annual Payment” means the payment calculated under paragraph 2.b. of the Colville Settlement Agreement, without regard to any increase or decrease in the payment under section 2.d. of the agreement.

(5) CONFEDERATED TRIBES ACT.—The term “Confederated Tribes Act” means the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation Grand Coulee Dam Settlement Act (Public Law 103-436; 108 Stat. 4577).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(7) SPOKANE BUSINESS COUNCIL.—The term “Spokane Business Council” means the governing body of the Spokane Tribe under the constitution of the Spokane Tribe.

(8) SPOKANE TRIBE.—The term “Spokane Tribe” means the Spokane Tribe of Indians of the Spokane Reservation, Washington.

SEC. 5. PAYMENTS BY ADMINISTRATOR.

(a) INITIAL PAYMENT.—On March 1, 2022, the Administrator shall pay to the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for fiscal year 2021.

(b) SUBSEQUENT PAYMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 1, 2023, and March 1 of each year thereafter through March 1, 2029, the Administrator shall pay the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 25 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

(2) MARCH 1, 2030, AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Not later than March 1, 2030, and March 1 of each year thereafter, the Administrator shall pay the Spokane Tribe an amount equal to 32 percent of the Computed Annual Payment for the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 6. TREATMENT AFTER AMOUNTS ARE PAID.

(a) USE OF PAYMENTS.—Payments made to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5 may be used or invested by the Spokane Business Council in

the same manner and for the same purposes as other Spokane Tribe governmental amounts.

(b) **NO TRUST RESPONSIBILITY OF THE SECRETARY.**—Neither the Secretary nor the Administrator shall have any trust responsibility for the investment, supervision, administration, or expenditure of any amounts after the date on which the funds are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5.

(c) **TREATMENT OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES.**—The payments of all amounts to the Spokane Business Council and Spokane Tribe under section 5, and the interest and income generated by those amounts, shall be treated in the same manner as payments under section 6 of the Saginaw Chippewa Indian Tribe of Michigan Distribution of Judgment Funds Act (100 Stat. 677).

(d) **TRIBAL AUDIT.**—After the date on which amounts are paid to the Spokane Business Council or Spokane Tribe under section 5, the amounts shall—

- (1) constitute Spokane Tribe governmental amounts; and
- (2) be subject to an annual tribal government audit.

SEC. 7. REPAYMENT CREDIT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall deduct from the interest payable to the Secretary of the Treasury from net proceeds (as defined in section 13 of the Federal Columbia River Transmission System Act (16 U.S.C. 838k))—

- (1) in fiscal year 2030, \$2,700,000; and
- (2) in each subsequent fiscal year in which the Administrator makes a payment under section 5, \$2,700,000.

(b) **CREDITING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), each deduction made under this section for the fiscal year shall be—

(A) a credit to the interest payments otherwise payable by the Administrator to the Secretary of the Treasury during the fiscal year in which the deduction is made; and

(B) allocated pro rata to all interest payments on debt associated with the generation function of the Federal Columbia River Power System that are due during the fiscal year.

(2) **DEDUCTION GREATER THAN AMOUNT OF INTEREST.**—If, in an applicable fiscal year under paragraph (1), the deduction is greater than the amount of interest due on debt associated with the generation function for the fiscal year, the amount of the deduction that exceeds the interest due on debt associated with the generation function shall be allocated pro rata to all other interest payments due during the fiscal year.

(3) **CREDIT.**—To the extent that a deduction exceeds the total amount of interest described in paragraphs (1) and (2), the deduction shall be applied as a credit against any other payments that the Administrator makes to the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 8. EXTINGUISHMENT OF CLAIMS.

On the date that payment under section 5(a) is made to the Spokane Tribe, all monetary claims that the Spokane Tribe has or may have against the United States to a fair share of the annual hydropower revenues generated by the Grand Coulee Dam project for the past and continued use of land of the Spokane Tribe for the production of hydropower at Grand Coulee Dam shall be extinguished.

SEC. 9. ADMINISTRATION.

Nothing in this Act establishes any precedent or is binding on the Southwestern Power Administration, Western Area Power Administration, or Southeastern Power Administration.

S. 46

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Repeal Act”.

SEC. 2. REPEAL.

Public Law 89-224 (commonly known as the “Klamath Tribe Judgment Fund Act”) (79 Stat. 897) is repealed.

SEC. 3. DISBURSEMENT OF REMAINING FUNDS.

Notwithstanding any provision of Public Law 89-224 (79 Stat. 897) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act) relating to the distribution or use of funds, as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall disburse to the Klamath Tribe the balance of any funds that, on or before the date of enactment of this Act, were appropriated or deposited into the trust accounts for remaining legal fees and administration and per capita trust accounts, as identified by the Secretary of the Interior, under that Act (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act).

S. 199

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe Reservation Restoration Act”.

SEC. 2. LEECH LAKE BAND OF OJIBWE RESERVATION RESTORATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal land described in subsection (b)(1) was taken from members of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe during a period—

- (A) beginning in 1948;
- (B) during which the Bureau of Indian Affairs incorrectly interpreted an order of the Secretary of the Interior to mean that the Department of the Interior had the authority to sell tribal allotments without the consent of a majority of the rightful landowners; and
- (C) ending in 1959, when the Secretary of the Interior was—

- (i) advised that sales described in subparagraph (B) were illegal; and
- (ii) ordered to cease conducting those sales;

(2) as a result of the Federal land described in subsection (b)(1) being taken from members of the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe, the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe hold the smallest percentage of its original reservation lands of any Ojibwe bands in Minnesota;

(3)(A) the applicable statute of limitations prohibits individuals from pursuing through litigation the return of the land taken as described in paragraph (1); but

(B) a Federal judge ruled that the land could be restored to the affected individuals through the legislative process;

(4) a comprehensive review of the Federal land demonstrated that—

(A) a portion of the Federal land is encumbered by—

- (i) utility easements;
- (ii) rights-of-way for roads; and
- (iii) flowage and reservoir rights; and
- (B) there are no known cabins, campgrounds, lodges, or resorts located on any portion of the Federal land; and

(5) on reacquisition by the Tribe of the Federal land, the Tribe—

(A) has pledged to respect the easements, rights-of-way, and other rights described in paragraph (4)(A); and

(B)(i) does not intend immediately to modify the use of the Federal land; but

(ii) will keep the Federal land in tax-exempt fee status as part of the Chippewa Na-

tional Forest until the Tribe develops a plan that allows for a gradual subdivision of some tracts for economic and residential development by the Tribe.

(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **FEDERAL LAND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 11,760 acres of Federal land located in the Chippewa National Forest in Cass County, Minnesota, the boundaries of which shall be depicted on the map, and described in the legal description, submitted under subsection (d)(1)(B).

(B) **INCLUSIONS.**—The term “Federal land” includes—

- (i) any improvement located on the Federal land described in subparagraph (A); and
- (ii) any appurtenance to the Federal land.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) **TRIBE.**—The term “Tribe” means the Leech Lake Band of Ojibwe.

(c) **TRANSFER TO RESERVATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights and paragraph (2), the Secretary shall transfer to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land.

(2) **TREATMENT.**—Effective immediately on the transfer under paragraph (1), the Federal land shall be—

(A) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(B) considered to be a part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(d) **SURVEY, MAP, AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, complete a plan of survey to establish the boundaries of the Federal land; and

(B) as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, submit a map and legal description of the Federal land to—

- (i) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and
- (ii) the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate.

(2) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical error in the map or legal description.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description submitted under paragraph (1)(B) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Secretary.

(e) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise expressly provided in this section, nothing in this section affects any right or claim of the Tribe, as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, to any land or interest in land.

(2) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(A) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Federal land.

(B) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—The Federal land shall not be eligible or used for any gaming activity carried out under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(3) **FOREST MANAGEMENT.**—Any commercial forestry activity carried out on the Federal land shall be managed in accordance with applicable Federal law.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH AND NATIONAL POST-TRAU- MATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 220.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 220) designating the month of June 2019 as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month” and June 27, 2019, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day.”

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 220) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of May 23, 2019, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 28 THROUGH MONDAY, JULY 8, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until 5 a.m., Friday, June 28; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the Senate resume consideration of the Udall amendment No. 883 under the previous order; further, that following disposition of the Udall amendment, the Senate adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only with no business being conducted on the following dates and times and that following each pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until the next pro forma session: Tuesday, July 2, at 4:45 p.m.; Friday, July 5, at 11:45 a.m.

I further ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, July 5, it next convene at 3 p.m., Monday, July 8, and that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bress nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today’s session ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday, July 8.

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

RECESS UNTIL 5 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand in recess under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m., recessed until Friday, June 28, 2019, at 5 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 27, 2019:

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

ADITYA BAMZAI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2020.

TRAVIS LEBLANC, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2022.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

VERONICA DAIGLE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LANE GENATOWSKI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RONALD DOUGLAS JOHNSON, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF EL SALVADOR.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION

AIMEE KATHRYN JORJANI, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 19, 2021.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID MICHAEL SATTERFIELD, OF MISSOURI, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

CHRISTOPHER SCOLESE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) GENE F. PRICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) SHAWN E. DUANE

REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT D. JONES

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN B. MUSTIN

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN A. SCHOMMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ALAN J. REYES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) TROY M. MCCLELLAND

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHARLES A. FLYNN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK E. MORITZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER A. ASSETTA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHAEL T. CURRAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. LESLIE E. REARDANZ III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KENNETH R. BLACKMON

CAPT. ROBERT C. NOWAKOWSKI

CAPT. THOMAS S. WALL

CAPT. LARRY D. WATKINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SCOTT K. FULLER

CAPT. MICHAEL J. STEFFEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PAULA D. DUNN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PAMELA C. MILLER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

GEN. JOHN W. RAYMOND

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. PAUL J. LACAMERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL E. KURILLA

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RICKY L. WILLIAMSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PHILIP W. YU

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. ARTHUR P. WUNDER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM GREEN, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. PHILLIP G. SAWYER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ERIC P. WENDT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL R. BERRY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MICHEL M. RUSSELL, SR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH L. BIEHLER
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM B. BLAYLOCK II
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS R. BOUCHARD
BRIG. GEN. PAUL B. CHAUNCEY III
BRIG. GEN. JOHANNA P. CLYBORNE
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM J. EDWARDS
BRIG. GEN. LEE M. ELLIS
BRIG. GEN. PABLO ESTRADA, JR.
BRIG. GEN. LAPTHE C. FLORA
BRIG. GEN. TROY D. GALLOWAY
BRIG. GEN. LEE W. HOPKINS
BRIG. GEN. MARVIN T. HUNT
BRIG. GEN. MARK C. JACKSON
BRIG. GEN. RICHARD F. JOHNSON
BRIG. GEN. TIM C. LAWSON
BRIG. GEN. KEVIN D. LYONS
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL A. MITCHELL
BRIG. GEN. MICHEL A. NATALI
BRIG. GEN. CHAD J. PARKER
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY C. PORTER
BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY D. SMILEY
BRIG. GEN. DAVID N. VESPER

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. HUAN T. NGUYEN

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

GARY B. BURMAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

WILLIAM D. HYSLOP, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

RANDALL P. HUFF, OF WYOMING, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

ROBERT WALLACE, OF WYOMING, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE.

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

EDWARD W. FELTEN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 29, 2025.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS JOSEPH ALFORD AND ENDING WITH GABRIEL MATTHEW YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELBERT R. ALFORD IV AND ENDING WITH TRACIE L. SWINGLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CATHERINE M. TOLVO, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTIAN F. COOPER AND ENDING WITH RYAN E. SNYDER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEITH A. BERRY AND ENDING WITH STEVEN P. ROGERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HASSAN N. BATAYNH AND ENDING WITH ASAD U. QAMAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON A. KOSKINEN AND ENDING WITH ROBIN T. BINGHAM, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2019.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON BULLOCK AND ENDING WITH DEMETRES WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIE A. AKE AND ENDING WITH D013176, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 25, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF SHANE R. REEVES, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALWYNMICHAEL S. ALBANO AND ENDING WITH STANTON D. TROTTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON B. ALISANGCO AND ENDING WITH D014026, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL M. ARMSTRONG AND ENDING WITH MIAO X. ZHOU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GLENN N. JUMAN AND ENDING WITH RUSSELL T. MCNEAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CARMEN Y. SALCEDO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUSSELL F. DUBOSE AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY D. FORREST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. BALLARD AND ENDING WITH D015102, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ANDRE L. THOMAS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF D013839, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER B. NETTLES, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDWARD C. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH G010558, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES M. ABEYAWARDENA AND ENDING WITH G010449, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN R. ABELLA AND ENDING WITH D014810, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF SHAWN E. MCGOWAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MICHAEL R. LUKKES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JAMES Y. MALONE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW P. BEARE AND ENDING WITH KEITH A. TUKES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD L. BOSWORTH AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW C. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LANE C. ASKEW AND ENDING WITH DONALD V. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK A. ANGELO AND ENDING WITH GREGORY E. SUTTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REX A. BOONYOBHAS AND ENDING WITH SARAH E. ZARRO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT DRAYTON AND ENDING WITH THOMAS R. WAGENER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEITH ARCHIBALD AND ENDING WITH DAVID C. WEBBER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MITCHELL W. ALBIN AND ENDING WITH TODD D. ZENTNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADRIAN Z. BEJAR AND ENDING WITH ROBERT A. WOODRUFF III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE

AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIN E. O. ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH CHRISTI S. MONTGOMERY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DERECK C. BROWN AND ENDING WITH SHERRY W. WANGWHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM H. CLINTON AND ENDING WITH SARAH T. SELFKYLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES M. BELMONT AND ENDING WITH JON M. HERSEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 29, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL R. BRUNEAU AND ENDING WITH HANS L. HOLKON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. CABASSA AND ENDING WITH ALLAN J. SANDOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIN G. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH IAN L. VALERIO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL E. HALL AND ENDING WITH DARREN L. STENNETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LILLIAN A. ABUAN AND ENDING WITH CHARLES M. TELLIS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VIRGINIA S. BLACKMAN AND ENDING WITH ABIGAIL M. YABLONSKY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN J. ELLIS, JR. AND ENDING WITH SYLVAIN W. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ZIAD T. ABOONA AND ENDING WITH LISA A. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUBEN D. ACOSTA AND ENDING WITH LUKE A. ZABROCKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. BELL, JR. AND ENDING WITH HAROLD S. ZALD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM R. BUTLER AND ENDING WITH OMARR E. TOBIAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN J. HALL AND ENDING WITH PHILLIP E. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ESTHER A. BOPP AND ENDING WITH ROBERTA S. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRECHELL I. LEACHMAN AND ENDING WITH LEE V. K. STUART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEREMY T. CASELLA AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH M. ZACK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FREDERICK G. ALEGRE AND ENDING WITH KENNETH B. WOOSTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MIGUEL A. CASTELLANOS AND ENDING WITH KEVIN A. SCHNITTKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLOTTE A. BROWNING AND ENDING WITH RACHEL H. WADBROWN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JULIE M. BARR AND ENDING WITH JACOB S. WIEMANN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LIAM M. APOSTOL AND ENDING WITH ANNY M. VALLANDINGHAM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY L. LACOURSE AND ENDING WITH SHANNON C.

ZAHUMENSKY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT A. HIGGINS AND ENDING WITH PEIHUA KU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATHANIEL A. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH LEONARD N. WALKER IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID K. BOYLAN AND ENDING WITH NED L. SWANSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ONOFRIO P. MARGIONI AND ENDING WITH KURT D. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. BACHELOR AND ENDING WITH THOMAS J. TAYLOR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW M. COOK AND ENDING WITH DENIZ M. PISKIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHRISTINA M. ALLEE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DAVID A. SCHUBKEGEL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JON B. VOIGTLANDER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBEKAH R. JOHNSON AND ENDING WITH ROBERT S. THOMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW A. BUCH AND ENDING WITH TROY J. SHERRILL, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 13, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MEGER D. CHAPPELL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RYAN D. SCULLY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRANDON T. BRIDGES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MARK S. JAVATE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CHANDLER W. JONES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN R. TAYLOR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KRISTINE N. BENCH AND ENDING WITH DAVID A. ZIEMBA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DIEGO F. ALVARADO AND ENDING WITH JARED M. WILHELM, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY J. FALVO IV AND ENDING WITH BRIAN T. WIERZBICKI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BECKY L. BUJAKI AND ENDING WITH NICHOLAS T. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALBERT E. ARNOLD IV AND ENDING WITH JAMES F. WRIGHTSON, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN J. BANAZWSKI AND ENDING WITH EVAN B. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHANE L. BEAVERS AND ENDING WITH JOHN J. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LEVI DESJARLAIS AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY R. MURPHY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MEERA CHEERHARAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SELINA D. BANDY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT W. BOASE AND ENDING WITH WALTER J. ZAPF III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATE W. AERANDIR AND ENDING WITH REBECCA L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HANNAH L. BEALON AND ENDING WITH BILLY W. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIELLE L. ADAMOVICH AND ENDING WITH CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN I. ACTKINSON AND ENDING WITH GEORGE S. ZINTAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2019.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MARTIN E. ROBERTS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TODD W. GEYER AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY J. SMOLA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 5, 2019.