

these decisions for themselves and their families without the government looking over their shoulders.

Whole Woman's Health struck down some of the most egregious burdens on women's rights to access reproductive healthcare. But the fight to protect women's rights to accessible, safe, and reliable reproductive health is far from over. Despite this ruling, some States have continued their attempts to undermine women's constitutional rights.

In fact, in the 2 years since Whole Woman's Health was decided, States have proposed over 1,000 new restrictions on abortion, and 180 of those have become law. Many of these restrictions are aimed at shutting down clinics or criminalizing providers. Make no mistake. This is not about protecting women's health. This is about influencing women's choices, and it is wrong.

I believe strongly that the government has no business interfering in a woman's medical decisions. These decisions should be made by a woman, her family, and her healthcare provider. I trust women to make these decisions that are best for themselves and their own situations. This is why I am proud to cosponsor the Women's Health Protection Act, which would protect women's access to safe and legal healthcare services, regardless of where they live.

The bill would prohibit States from imposing restrictions on abortion services that do not promote women's health or safety. For example, laws that target providers with unnecessary and burdensome building codes or those that force women to undergo medically unnecessary testing and procedures would be prohibited.

This bill would codify the standards set in Whole Woman's Health and authorize the Department of Justice to protect women's constitutional rights by going after these unconstitutional laws.

I stand with women, and I invite my colleagues to do the same by cosponsoring the Women's Health Protection Act.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

FARM BILL

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I would like to spend a few minutes on a major piece of business this week, our 2018 farm bill.

Unlike so much of what comes to this floor—or never comes to this floor, never makes it to the floor—this is not a 5-month bill or a 5-week bill or a 5-hour extension; this is an honest to goodness 5-year farm bill. That is 5 years of certainty and predictability for our farmers and ranchers. It is a testament to the great work of the Senate Agriculture Committee, and I want to thank Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW for leading yet another bipartisan, consensus-driven process.

When Democrats were in charge way back in 2014, we passed a bipartisan farm bill then. Now we are doing it again, only this time the Republicans are in charge. That is how this place should work. We have set aside the political antics and focused on our farmers and ranchers and rural communities, especially when they have all faced more uncertainty than they have in years.

In Colorado we have dealt with years of persistent drought. In the southern part of my State, waterflows in the Gunnison and Animas Rivers are at less than half of their average levels. Feed shortages are even forcing ranchers in Southwest Colorado to sell off their cattle. Besides drought, our farmers and ranchers are contending with erratic commodity prices, a broken immigration system that is actually putting some of them out of business because they can't find workers, and uncertainty over trade because of the administration's unusual approach to foreign policy. All of this has made it harder for them to plan for the next 5 months, let alone the next 5 years. This farm bill cannot come soon enough.

The Agriculture Committee has put together an excellent piece of legislation. For the first time in 80 years, this bill legalizes hemp. We forget, but hemp was widely grown in the United States throughout the mid-1800s. Americans used hemp in fabrics, wine, and paper. Our government treated industrial hemp like any other farm commodity until the early 20th century, when a 1937 law defined it as a narcotic drug, dramatically limiting its growth. This became even worse in 1970 when hemp became a schedule I controlled substance.

In Colorado, as is true across the country—I have talked to a lot of colleagues about this—we see hemp as a great opportunity to diversify our farms and manufacture high-margin products for the American people. That could help drive incomes in rural parts of my State, like Montrose County, CO.

Let me tell my colleagues about Montrose. It is a rural mountain area on Colorado's West Slope. It flattens out to the west. I managed to win 29 percent of the vote there in 2016, and I managed to win 29 percent the first time I ran as well. I can't seem to improve my position.

I want to show my colleagues a picture from there. This is from Montrose. Here is their Republican State senator, my friend Don Coram, who is standing right here, standing in front of a hemp plant. This is his greenhouse. He was kind enough to let me visit this past March. He told me that hemp growers operate under a shadow of uncertainty, worried that at any moment somebody in the Justice Department is going to wake up one morning and decide to cripple their operations by targeting their access to water or labor.

When we passed the last farm bill in 2014, Colorado farmers harvested

around 200 acres of hemp. Last year, we harvested 9,000 acres, and that is despite the uncertainty around hemp's legal status. Our farm bill eliminates that uncertainty by legalizing hemp.

If this farm bill passes, our growers are going to have a much easier time opening a bank account, buying and selling seeds, transporting their goods, and accessing water.

This bill also gives hemp growers access to important risk management tools, like crop insurance.

That is hemp that Don Coram, my Republican politician friend, is standing in front of at his greenhouse. This means dollars for rural Colorado and rural America, where the ingenuity and the creativity of people is already being unleashed on a crop that, until this farm bill was written, we could not grow in our country in a meaningful way and whose byproducts—the things that will create margins for our farmers—were imported from Canada.

Go into stores in the United States today and you will see hemp byproducts, hemp products, but they are grown in Canada. That doesn't make any sense. I am glad this farm bill fixes it, and I am glad the majority leader was the one who led the way on that.

Looking ahead in the West, we know that the risks of drought and wildfire are only going to grow worse. That calls on us to make sure that risk management tools are using the best available data. Over the past year, we have worked with Colorado's ranchers to make sure the USDA has good drought and market data for livestock disaster assistance.

In uncertain times, these programs are critical to sustaining our farms and working lands, which are fundamental to our heritage in the West and the legacy we hope to leave the next generation.

The same is true of our vast grasslands, healthy forests, and abundant wildlife. They are also fundamental to what it means to be in the West, which is why we made sure this farm bill emphasizes conservation and responsible management of our natural resources.

In this bill, we increase funding for conservation easements. We also make the EQIP Program easier to access for small farmers and ranchers. That idea came directly from Mike Nolan, a vegetable grower in Mancos, CO, who was having trouble accessing conservation tools designed more for big farms than for his 7-acre operation.

We reward farmers in this bill for improving soil health. We strengthen the Regional Conservation Partnership Program and reduce redtape for projects that improve drought resilience.

We increase funding for voluntary wildlife habitat improvements on working lands—an approach in Colorado that has helped us protect habitat for iconic species like the Greater sage-grouse but to do it on our own and in collaboration on the ground.

In Colorado, forests are one of our most important natural resources. The

health of our forests affects the strength of our outdoor economy, the quality of our water, and the safety of our communities from wildfire. This bill doubles funding for collaborative forest projects that promote forest health and reduce wildfire risk. It creates a new water source protection program to bring utilities and upstream communities together around forest health. It also requires the Forest Service to evaluate the health of our watersheds and monitor the effectiveness of treatments, and it provides new authority for the Forest Service to work with local communities on housing and infrastructure—a major issue in our mountain communities.

Finally, this bill makes new investments in our rural communities by expanding access to high-speed internet and encouraging projects to improve energy efficiency, energy storage, and cyber security.

Working with Senator DAINES, we also maintain funding for the Voluntary Public Access Program to increase opportunities for hunting and fishing, which are so important to our outdoor recreation economy.

All in all, this is a good bill. It would materially improve the lives in communities in Colorado and across America—something I don't get to say a lot about our work around here.

It is even more impressive because the farm bill is not some tiny piece of inconsequential legislation. It is among the most complex things we do as a Congress. It touches every region of our country—urban and rural—and involves thousands of different, often competing, interests. It affects the lives of every single American—whether they know it or not—through its investment in our food, forests, water, and wildlife.

We passed this bill 20 to 1 in the Agriculture Committee. I told the majority leader the other day, when he came for our markup in the committee, that I wish he would send everything through the Agriculture Committee. Then we might actually get something done for the American people around here.

We might fix our broken immigration system to make sure our farmers have access to the labor they need. We might address the threat of climate change and the strain it will put on our food systems. We might address the backlog of infrastructure projects in rural Colorado and all across the West, where some of our pipes and dams date back to the 1950s. We might push for coherent trade policies that increase market access for our farmers and ranchers, instead of subjecting them to retaliation and uncertainty.

There is a lot we could do if we took a page from the Senate Agriculture Committee and approached our work not oriented toward a political fight for the benefit of cable news but oriented toward a solution for the benefit of the American people. We need to get back to that kind of work around here.

We can start by passing this bill and giving our farmers and ranchers the

certainty they deserve from our government. Given all they do for us—providing the food, fuel, and fiber we rely on every single day—that is the least we can do for them.

I thank my colleague from Arkansas, who has joined me on the floor and has been such a great member of the Ag Committee as we brought this bill forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I also thank my colleague, the Senator from Colorado, for his efforts in getting this done. It has been a real bipartisan effort. We hear so much about all the infighting that goes on here, and this is certainly one of the underpinnings of our country. Again, we are working very hard to get it across the finish line. So I thank him very much.

The majority leader recently announced his intention to keep the Senate in session through the majority of August. It is the right thing to do. We have a lot of work to complete ahead of us, and our to-do list just got a little bit longer with today's excellent news. The 12 appropriations bills are at the top of that list. We have been busy clearing these bills at the committee level and now on the Senate floor. I am particularly pleased that Military Construction-VA appropriations bill was part of the first group of appropriations bills that received bipartisan approval here on the Senate floor.

While we work to ensure passage of bills that fund vital Federal programs, we must also continue to pass the important bills that authorize them. We have a chance this week to add to our list of bipartisan achievements by passing the farm bill, which was recently approved by the Ag Committee with overwhelming support from both sides of the aisle.

If you have ever been to Arkansas, I don't need to tell you how important the farm bill is to our State. You have seen it. You have seen the cotton fields, the rice silos, the chicken farms, the cattle ranches. We have it all in the Natural State. In fact, 95 percent of the land resources of Arkansas are devoted to agriculture and forestry. While there is variety in what our farmers grow or raise on their land, the family farm is a way of life shared by thousands of Arkansans.

Agriculture is a driving force of the Natural State's economy, adding \$16 billion to our economy every year and accounting for approximately one in every six jobs. But the farm economy is in a much different place than the last time this Chamber debated a farm bill. That is the case not just in my home State of Arkansas; it is an issue nationwide. If you look at the numbers across the Nation, farm income is approximately half of what it was then. Farm bankruptcies are up by 39 percent since 2014; financing is becoming more expensive; input costs are rising; and the trade outlook is volatile and uncertain.

Farmers across the country, regardless of where they call home or which crops they grow, are hurting. They are experiencing the most fragile farm economy since the 1980s farm crisis. With the current farm bill set to expire at the end of September, we must pass a new one in a timely manner to provide certainty and predictability to the folks who feed and clothe our Nation and the world.

Programs authorized by the farm bill are vital to making sure that as a nation we do not become dependent on other countries for our food supply. Along with providing key risk management tools for our farmers, the farm bill also helps our rural communities by authorizing key economic development and job creation programs. It helps rural Arkansans with everything from home financing to internet access to small business loans.

The Agriculture Committee, under the leadership of Chairman ROBERTS and Ranking Member STABENOW, approved a fair and equitable farm bill with overwhelming bipartisan support. I was particularly pleased to see that the committee-passed mark maintained strong farm policy for producers of all stripes. These programs allow our Nation's family farms to compete in a high-risk, heavily subsidized global marketplace. As we debate amendments on the floor, we must defeat amendments that would harm the farm safety net for our producers.

Ensuring that producers across the Nation have options that meet their specific needs when those needs are so varied is a delicate balance to strive for, but the chairman and ranking member have achieved it. I appreciate what a heavy lift it is and what it took to get to this point, and I hope the Senate as a whole does as well.

I do have very deep concerns about provisions included in the substitute amendment that undermine this delicate balance. One provision in particular, aimed at bolstering small family farms, will, in fact, hurt family farms across the country. Unfortunately, we do not know exactly how deep this cut will be. The provision was not filed as an amendment, and Senators were not given time to properly read it. But I do know one thing: This will hurt farmers and the rural communities where they live. USDA estimates that my home State of Arkansas will be the third most impacted State, behind Texas and Illinois. Iowa will be the fourth most impacted State.

This provision does not discriminate against regions. It discriminates against farmers and those who feed and clothe this Nation. I am very much opposed to this language, but I am thankful that the House did not take this tack in crafting its farm policy.

I am committed to working to remove this provision before we enact a final farm bill this Congress. We must provide a farm bill that gives producers certainty and predictability without further exacerbating the difficult farm economy they are facing.

If we can commit to continuing to follow the fair and equitable approach that was exhibited when we fashioned the bill in committee, we can pass a farm bill that has a chance to become law. Let's not squander this opportunity.

Our farmers in rural America need this bill. Let's get it passed so that we can provide our farmers and ranchers with the certainty and predictability they need to succeed.

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.

FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about the immigration crisis that this President has generated.

The Nation has seen images of children trapped behind wire fencing and children sleeping on concrete floors. We have seen the tents hurriedly set up to house children separated from their parents. We have seen the video of Jessica, who doesn't know where her mother is and wants to talk to her. We have heard the audio of young children crying out for their mothers and fathers. We have heard the audio of a detention facility staff person telling the kids not to talk to the press, claiming it will hurt their immigration case.

As of June 12, on American soil, over 100 babies under the age of 1 year are being held in detention by the American Government. We think this can't be happening in the United States of America, but it is.

Last Friday, Senators HEINRICH, BLUMENTHAL, and I visited President Trump's tent city in Tornillo, TX, and we toured a Border Patrol station in Clint and El Paso and a port of entry in El Paso. We were turned away from Tornillo on Friday, so I went back Saturday and got inside to see the children. We all went to these government facilities to get answers, but we came up short.

Most pressing, we still don't know when or how all the thousands of children taken from their parents will be reunited. We don't know how children whose parents have already been deported will be reunited. We have parents scared that they will never see their children again.

The confusion, chaos, and incompetence with which the President's zero tolerance policy was executed is only outmatched by the confusion, chaos, and incompetence with which reunification is being handled.

The immediate priority must be to get these children back to their parents as soon as possible. We know we are doing damage to these children

every day that they are not with their families. We know this. Pediatric and mental health professionals all agree. The American Academy of Pediatrics condemned the administration because those doctors know that separating families can result in "irreparable harm." That is a quote from the American Academy of Pediatrics—"irreparable harm" to separated children.

Last weekend, I saw children detained in the tents in Tornillo who were able to talk to their parents only twice a week for 10 minutes. I saw astounding young children—children 3 to 10 years old—who had crossed the border without their parents. I saw families from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador, fleeing violence and persecution, locked in detention at Border Patrol. I met Jade Gabriela, who is not even 2, and her father, detained in El Paso, both of them trying to escape the brutality and gangs in Honduras.

President Trump claims there is a border crisis, but communities on the border dispute this. I am a Senator from a border State, and I dispute this. I represent border communities, and I have been to the border many, many times recently and over the years. President Trump has not. He should come see for himself and see the humanitarian crisis he has created.

Detention facilities for children are overwhelmed. We have heard from a whistleblower in New York that there is not enough staffing at her facility because of all the young children coming in. These internment camp-like facilities—as former First Lady Laura Bush has compared them to—are costing Americans and American taxpayers millions of dollars. The Tornillo tent city costs \$400,000 every day. The President's poorly conceived Executive order directs the Department of Homeland Security Secretary to set up even more family detention facilities on military bases.

Zero tolerance has overwhelmed the U.S. attorney's offices on the border. Now, instead of prosecuting violent criminals for serious crimes, Federal prosecutors are wasting resources, focusing instead on criminally prosecuting mothers and fathers for misdemeanor improper-entry violations. There is a call to take military JAG lawyers away from their more important duties to handle the flood of immigration cases and recall prosecutors from their posts in Indian Country, where they are so sorely needed. All systems are bursting at the seams thanks to the President's made-up crisis, cruelty, and bureaucratic incompetence.

As of today, there is no clear path forward to reunite families. There is no timeline. Tuesday, Secretary Azar of Health and Human Services admitted in his testimony before the Senate Finance Committee that there is no timeline. The Department of Health and Human Services is prohibited under the Flores case from reuniting children with parents who are in detention.

The President wants to keep zero tolerance in place and continue to prosecute and keep parents in detention with their children. Not only is this cruel and un-American, but I think the Federal judge in Flores is going to reject the President's request to allow children to be jailed with their parents longer than 20 days.

The President has doubled down on zero tolerance. Like many of his policies that are hastily implemented and borne of his divisive agenda, there is no plan B if the court refuses, as it should, to allow children to be jailed with their parents.

There is an obvious solution. Successful alternatives to detention have demonstrated compliance rates of 99 percent with court appearances and ICE appointments. These programs are both effective and cost a fraction of what it takes to detain families. Why doesn't the President use these programs and save taxpayers millions of dollars? Because he thinks it doesn't appear tough and takes away his bargaining chip of detained children that he thinks he can use to get his wall.

In the President's rush to gain political traction, he has created a humanitarian and moral crisis within our own borders, the likes of which we have not seen since we interned families of Japanese heritage during World War II.

I can tell you that I will not back down from this fight. More importantly, I can tell you that the American people and New Mexicans are with me. It is the voices of the American people that forced the President to retreat from his brutal family separation policy, and it is those voices that will prevail in the end.

The administration is trying its hardest to hide what is going on from the American people, but the American people are demanding answers. We all must continue to speak out until we have policies in place that make sure families stay together, lawfully and humanely. We need alternatives to detention, and we need to stand up for due process.

As Americans see images of separated children and family detention camps, they turn to Congress, and they turn to the judicial system as well. A Federal judge recently issued a ruling barring family detention and ordering reunification within 30 days, but the Trump administration may fight this ruling—just like they are fighting to overturn Flores, which came out of a Supreme Court case.

RETIREMENT OF JUSTICE ANTHONY KENNEDY

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today, Justice Kennedy has announced he is retiring. I had some very strong disagreements with his rulings, especially on campaign finance reform, but I thank him for his service. He was a thoughtful Justice. I am very concerned with the process to replace him.