

House, was responsible for making sure that the documents presented to the President for review had been properly vetted and were in good form. That is the responsibility—not to provide input in terms of the policy or the content of those documents. So he really was more or less a traffic cop for the paper flow across the President's desk. As such, those documents would have no bearing whatsoever on the judge's qualifications or experience and are unnecessary to produce for this confirmation process.

Just as with Justice Kagan's confirmation, there was a bipartisan understanding in 2006, during Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation, that certain documents are unnecessary and should be off limits. In 2006, Judge Kavanaugh responded to the standard questionnaire for appellate nominees. Our Democratic colleagues didn't complain about that at the time. In fact, at Judge Kavanaugh's hearing in 2006, Senator FEINSTEIN, the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee, noted that "without a record either as a trial lawyer or as a judge, it's very difficult for some of us to know what kind of judge you would be and whether you can move away from the partisanship and into that arena of objectivity and fairness." But now our friend from California has 12 years of judicial service and more than 300 opinions she and others—all of us—can review to answer the very questions she said she needed to answer.

So my question is, why are our colleagues across the aisle suddenly claiming they need every email, every memo, and every Post-it note that went across the nominee's desk? Well, we know the reason is because they cannot attack Judge Kavanaugh's judicial record of objectivity and fairness on the DC Circuit. Instead, they are trying to dig through other people's emails and documents and conduct a government-sponsored, taxpayer-funded fishing expedition through the records of the entire Bush White House. I call this the great paper chase.

You have heard us warn that the Democrats' demands for every document from Judge Kavanaugh's time in the White House is nothing more than a stall tactic. Several media reports over the last few days have now confirmed that this is, in fact, their exact strategy. Here is a statement from the San Francisco Chronicle: "Feinstein, other Senate Dems have plan on Brett Kavanaugh nomination: Stall."

Their broader, coordinated strategy is to delay and stall, not actually vet, the nominee. So for most of them, it really won't matter that Judge Kavanaugh will have more documents produced before his confirmation than any other nominee in American history; it won't matter that some documents have already been released—for example, from his tenure working for the independent counsel; it won't matter that the process is fully transparent and thorough because they have already made up their minds.

To be clear, overwhelmingly, our Democratic colleagues are simply not interested in vetting Judge Kavanaugh because they have already made up their minds to vote against the nomination. I hope the three or four or five Democrats who are still open-minded to confirmation of the judge will encourage their other colleagues to change their approach and to make sure they do what we are required to do under the Constitution once the President has made a nomination like this, and that is to provide advice and consent, not just obstruction and delay and resistance.

Many of the excuses they are now giving, particularly with regard to documents, are merely smokescreens for their true goal, which, as we see here in the San Francisco Chronicle, is simply to stall, stall, stall. They have telegraphed this strategy in the press, and they have made it clear that it is their only shot at blocking this mainstream nominee, because the truth is that Judge Kavanaugh is imminently qualified and well respected by all who know him.

I believe it is our responsibility to continue to vet the nominee and to continue to encourage Members to meet with him and to continue their review of his record—particularly in the last 12 years on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals—because I am convinced that if they do that, they will be willing to support the nominee, if they have an open mind and if they haven't already engaged in the political calculation to oppose the nominee no matter what the reason may be.

I look forward to confirming the judge early this fall. Chairman GRASSLEY has said he hopes to have a hearing on the nomination and then a vote on the Senate floor in advance of the October term of the Supreme Court. I look forward to helping him keep that schedule and confirming this good man and fine judge to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 (Mr. CORKER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the fiscal year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act.

I am very pleased that we were able to pass the conference report with a bipartisan vote of 87 to 10. I think it represents the quality of the work that was done by my colleagues Senator INHOFE, Congressman THORNBERRY, the chairman of the House committee; and

also Ranking Member SMITH. I thank them for their thoughtfulness and cooperation throughout the conference.

The passage in the Senate follows the passage last week by a vote of 359 to 54 in the House of Representatives—another strong bipartisan endorsement of the legislation on behalf of the men and women in uniform and the national security of the United States.

Also, at this point, I would like to take a moment to recognize Senator JOHN MCCAIN. He has been an extraordinary leader throughout my tenure in the Senate, someone who has been committed to the welfare of the men and women of the military, someone who has spent his life in service to the Nation with courage, with valor, and with exceptional self-sacrifice for all of us. I am sure he is very proud today that this legislation, which bears his name, has passed and become law. Senator MCCAIN has also done something that some people would think impossible; that is, to have a West Point graduate admit that, in many cases, he is indispensable to the national security of the United States. I say that with great affection and great sincerity.

Let me highlight several areas that I think are important in this legislation. The bill includes important personnel funding and policy provisions, including a 2.6-percent, across-the-board pay raise for our men and women in uniform. It fully funds the military services' end-strength requests for fiscal year 2019. We are going to bring our troops—particularly, the Army—to the desired strength of our military leaders. It provides \$50 million in impact aid for heavily impacted local school districts all across the country. This is critical of the quality of life for the families who serve us, as well as their servicemembers.

There are a number of provisions updating the Officer Personnel Management System to enhance recruitment, promotion, and retention of highly skilled officers.

With respect to the Army, the bill fully funds a number of critical Army programs, to include the Abrams battle tanks, as well as Apache and Blackhawk helicopters. The bill also makes targeted investments to improve the range and lethality of Army artillery systems, and it supports the fielding of active protection systems on our combat vehicles in order to better protect our soldiers.

With respect to the Navy, the conference agreement provides additional funds for vessels for the Navy, including two more littoral combat ships, three more ship-to-shore connectors, and a cable repair ship. The agreement also provides additional money to help second- and third-tier contractors ramp up production to support our *Columbia*- and *Virginia*-class submarine acquisition programs.

With regard to the Air Force, the bill provides for additional funding to support the light attack aircraft, or the

OA-X. The agreement also ensures the Air Force will maintain the current capability of the JSTARS aircraft fleet while they develop new capabilities to replace, and perhaps even improve, the current ground support capability of the JSTARS fleet.

This bill represents what has been the hallmark of Secretary Mattis's strategic vision. It reflects the strategic shift toward prioritization of the strategic competition between Russia and China. It supports the President's budget request for resources to deter and, if necessary, defend against aggression from near-peer competitors. This includes \$6.3 billion for the European Deterrence Initiative as a continuing demonstration of our commitment to the security of our European allies and the deterrence of Russian expansionism. It also requires a 5-year plan from the Department for the Asia-Pacific Stability Initiative on the necessary resources and activities that counter China's destabilizing behavior in the region.

The bill also includes a provision calling on the administration to urgently complete a comprehensive strategy to counter Russian malign influence below the level of direct military conflict. Russia attacked the heart of our democracy in 2016, and our intelligence experts warn of even more sophisticated Russian attacks targeting this year's midterm elections. Yet the administration has failed to bring together our military and non-military tools of national power to counter this Russian aggression, despite a requirement in last year's NDAA to submit to Congress a whole-of-government strategy to counter Russian malign influence. This bill expresses the sense of the Congress that the administration should complete a counter-Russian influence strategy without delay.

The conference report also includes a provision that authorizes the President to employ Department of Defense cyber forces to take actions to disrupt the operations of Russian actors attempting to penetrate our election systems and campaign organizations and to plant false and divisive information on social media sites.

As I mentioned, the Secretary's national defense policy, which the President endorses, focuses on the shift to the near-peer adversaries of Russia and China. Our legislation reflects that, but we cannot forget the threat from ISIS and extremist organizations. It persists. This bill continues critical programs aimed at countering these groups. Of note, it extends the Iraqi and Syrian train-and-equip programs at the requested funding levels, while requiring appropriate information with respect to the partner forces to be trained and the expected level of engagement with U.S. forces. This is a prudent approach that recognizes the continued threat from ISIS while ensuring appropriate oversight of these authorities in a dynamic environment.

I am also pleased the bill includes provisions designed to incorporate lessons learned from the campaign against ISIS that could be more effectively used to account for and respond to allegations of civilian casualties going forward.

The bill fully funds the request for U.S. Special Operations Command and includes important provisions to enhance the ability of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low-Intensity Conflict to act as the "service secretary-like" civilian responsible for the oversight and advocacy of the Special Operations forces that do so much for us.

As we discussed before the vote, the bill also focuses on the issue of the ZTE-Huawei issue that came before this Congress. The conference agreement includes a provision that prohibits the Federal Government and government contractors—this is governmentwide—from buying or using or providing grants and loans to entities buying or using telecommunications equipment and services provided by Chinese companies ZTE and Huawei due to our serious concerns that these companies represent security risks and have violated U.S. sanctions and export control laws.

The provision also bans the use of video surveillance equipment from several Chinese companies due to concerns about security risks and infringement of intellectual property rights. The conferees recognize the burden this ban will place on some telecommunications providers, particularly in rural areas, and included direction that government agencies shall prioritize available funding to enable these providers to replace the equipment they have procured from Chinese companies.

I am also particularly pleased the conference agreement includes a Senate floor amendment that I authored to ensure that as we proceed to develop new or modified nuclear weapons, the Congress is in a position to provide rigorous oversight to any such request. Given the powerful nature of these weapons, it is essential we maintain our oversight capability on this subject matter.

The conference report also contains important oversight language to ensure our Nation can produce the plutonium pits the Department of Defense requires. Los Alamos is our Nation's center of excellence in research and manufacturing of plutonium, and we need to maintain our focus on this laboratory in order to ensure the Department of Defense meets their stockpile requirements with respect to pit production.

The conference report contains a number of important provisions related to Turkey. I want to acknowledge the valuable leadership of Senators SHAHEEN and TILLIS in this regard. Turkey is an important NATO ally, and the U.S.-Turkey defense cooperation is multifaceted and deep. However, Turkey's announcement of its intent to

buy the Russian S-400 air defense system threatens the integrity of the NATO alliance and would have a significant negative impact on defense cooperation between the United States and Turkey.

In addition, the Turkish Government's unlawful detention of Pastor Brunson and other wrongfully held Americans has raised serious questions and concerns about its commitment to the shared values of the NATO alliance and the rule of law. The NDAA conference report calls for their immediate release and requires the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to report to Congress on the status of the U.S.-Turkey relationship, including the impact of Turkey's potential purchase of the S-400 system on the bilateral relationship.

The report must also assess, should Turkey proceed with the S-400 purchase, what the impact would be of a significant change in Turkey's participation in the F-35 aircraft program, including reduction or elimination of Turkey's participation. The assessment must include the steps required to mitigate the negative impact of such a change on the United States and other international partners in the F-35 program. The provision also prohibits the Department of Defense from delivering any F-35 aircraft to Turkey until the required report is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees.

One issue in this year's NDAA conference negotiations related to Russia sanctions is the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, or CAATSA. CAATSA was an excellent piece of legislation, and the Presiding Officer knows very well because he was the chief author and architect of this bill.

I want to take a moment to explain exactly what the conference report does with respect to CAATSA and how the Defense Department intends to use the limited waiver for secondary sanctions provided in this year's NDAA.

As I said, I strongly support CAATSA. It was a remarkable piece of work, passing this Senate by 98 to 2. Again, it is a tribute to the leadership not only of the Presiding Officer but Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey and all of our colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Its sanctions are powerful tools for holding Russia accountable for its interference in our elections and its aggression in Ukraine and elsewhere. As I said, the Senate passed it overwhelmingly, 98 to 2. We have found that the Trump administration has been resisting fully implementing the tough sanctions against Russia that are found in CAATSA, and I urge those sanctions be vigorously enforced.

During Senate consideration of the fiscal year 2019 defense budget request, Defense Secretary Mattis raised a concern about one aspect of CAATSA, relating to the secondary sanctions in section 231 on countries or entities

that do business with the Russian intelligence or defense sectors. These mandatory sanctions restrict U.S. arms sales and certain financial dealings with countries or entities that engage in a significant transaction to purchase major Russian weapons systems.

As Secretary Mattis testified, these secondary sanctions can, however, have the unintended consequence of punishing certain strategic partners that have legacy Russian weapons systems but are looking to transition away from Russia and toward increased purchases of U.S. major defense equipment. Because these countries may buy Russian systems to maintain current capabilities, section 231 sanctions would block U.S. arms sales to them, effectively pushing these countries closer to Russia and making them more dependent on Russian weapons systems. This is the opposite effect of what CAATSA is intended to achieve and undermines our efforts to isolate Russia globally.

To address these concerns, Secretary Mattis requested a straight national security waiver to section 231 mandatory sanctions. While CAATSA, as enacted, does include a broad national security waiver, the waiver is subject to CAATSA's expedited review procedures, which provides Congress between 30 and 60 days to review the waiver request. If Congress objects, Congress can try to pass a joint resolution of disapproval under the expedited procedures. If Congress fails to enact a resolution of disapproval within the review period, then the waiver takes effect.

The administration contended that CAATSA's national security waiver, subject to the expedited review procedures, was unworkable. They claimed that because the mandatory sanctions that would kick in while Congress reviewed the waiver request for up to 60 days or more—this would cause significant harm to our defense partnerships with these countries and drive them away from purchasing major U.S. defense equipment.

In response, the House bill included authority for the President to waive section 231's mandatory sanctions on countries or entities buying major Russian defense equipment if the President makes certain certifications, primarily that the purchaser is reducing its reliance on the Russian defense sector.

The House bill was a very wide-open waiver. The only representation of certification the President would make is that the Nation was attempting to move away from Russian influence and Russian supplies.

We worked very closely with House colleagues. The Senate version of the NDAA did not have any language with CAATSA, but we had to respond to the House because it was a legitimate issue in conference. Indeed, one of the reasons we avoided any sort of discussion with respect to CAATSA in the Senate was the feeling that there might be a

negative impact on the ongoing bilateral relationship with Turkey to persuade the Turkish Government to reverse its decision to buy the Russian S-400 air defense system. Turkey's purchase of the S-400 would almost trigger mandatory sanctions under section 231 and put our defense cooperation with Turkey at risk, including on the F-35 aircraft.

The final conference outcome, after discussions back and forth, in a very serious and very thoughtful way, was a very narrow waiver for section 231 sanctions only and reflects a number of important changes to the House provision that raised the bar for the President even to be able to invoke this waiver.

First, the conference outcome preserves all existing CAATSA sanctions currently in effect against Russia, including sanctions for Russia's election interference and aggression against Ukraine.

Second, the waiver is not available for any transactions with entities in the Russian defense and intelligence sectors that were directly involved in Russian cyber intrusions, including the Russian military intelligence, or GRU. This preserves the purpose of section 231 sanctions, which is to impose costs on the Russian defense and intelligence sectors for cyber intrusions.

Third, the waiver is limited in order to keep the pressure on Turkey to reverse its decision to purchase the Russian S-400 air defense system. The waiver is not available for any deals to purchase Russian weapons systems that would harm the integrity of NATO or other alliances in which the United States participates or that would adversely affect ongoing U.S. or coalition operations or that would harm U.S. defense cooperation with the country involved or that would significantly increase the risk of compromising U.S. defense systems or operational capabilities, including through the diversion of sensitive U.S. defense technology.

These restrictions are intended to let the Government of Turkey know that the waiver is not a get-of-jail-free card for section 231's mandatory sanctions if Turkey goes ahead and purchases the S-400.

Fourth, the conference outcome allows for continued defense cooperation with countries transitioning away from Russia. Secondary sanctions may be waived only if the country is reducing its dependence on Russian major weapons systems or is cooperating with the United States on security matters critical to our strategic interests.

This restriction should be narrowly understood to mean that the country involved is cooperating with the United States in the strategic competition with Russia or China, consistent with the administration's national defense strategy authored by Secretary Mattis. As set in the national defense strategy, the central challenge to U.S. security today is the "re-emergence of long-

term strategic competition" by revisionist powers—specifically Russia and China.

Fifth, the conference outcome provides for congressional review under a 30-day notice-and-wait period as an alternative to expedited congressional review procedures provided under CAATSA. Congress would still have 30 days to review the President's certifications with regard to any sanctionable activity and to weigh in with its concerns.

Sixth, the conference outcome also enhances congressional oversight of CAATSA's secondary sanctions by adding a report. This report will provide an important baseline for measuring the extent to which countries are reducing their reliance on Russia and requires updated information for the next 5 years on which countries are reducing their transactions with the Russian defense sector.

Some of my colleagues have expressed concern that the conference report's waiver for section 231 sanctions is delinked from CAATSA's expedited review procedures. They are concerned that Congress may be giving up its ability to conduct oversight on administrative attempts to invoke waivers.

First, let me try to clear up one thing. The authority under CAATSA, as enacted, for a broad national security waiver—subject to an expedited congressional review process—remains unchanged under the conference report and continues to apply to the vast majority of sanctions against Russia under CAATSA.

More importantly, we should keep in mind how the Department of Defense intends to use the limited waiver to section 231 provided in the NDAA. As Secretary Mattis wrote to Chairman McCain on July 24, the Department seeks a "limited exception" that would "allow the United States to sell military equipment and enable countries pulling away from the Russian orbit." Secretary Mattis further noted that U.S. arms sales are subject to congressional notification in advance. In other words, Secretary Mattis is seeking to avoid the disruption to U.S. arms sales to key strategic partners that would result under section 231 sanctions and to prevent the negative impact such sanctions would have on our strategic relationships with these countries as they transition away from Russia.

Even with the limited exception provided under this bill, Congress will still have significant oversight of any U.S. arms sales to countries being exempted from section 231 sanctions. Any sale of U.S. major defense equipment to these transitioning countries—like India, for example—will continue to be subject to congressional review under the well-established requirements of the Arms Export Control Act.

That means that Congress typically will have at least 30 days, and often more, to review and approve any foreign military sale for major defense

equipment to a country that has received the waiver to secondary sanctions under section 231. Large arms sales are likely to be subject to the FMS review process, but significant direct commercial sales must also be notified to the Foreign Relations Committee 30 days in advance of the export license being issued. The result is that Congress has the ability to conduct oversight of these transactions.

Furthermore, under the Arms Export Control Act, Congress has procedures for pursuing a resolution of disapproval prohibiting or modifying the proposed arms sales. Congress's oversight of any major U.S. arms sales that might flow from a waiver of secondary sanctions under section 231 provides us an additional ability to revise and supervise the administration's implementation of this waiver authority.

There are specific cases that one could talk about in terms of countries that we are actually trying to engage, such as India, Indonesia, and other countries, but I think what we have tried to do is to structure a very discrete and, in the terms the Secretary of Defense has used, very stringent conditions to the exercise of the sanctions.

Let me conclude by again thanking Senator INHOFE, Chairman THORNBERRY, Ranking Member SMITH, and all of the conferees for their bipartisan support throughout the process. This process has been collegial, and this is an example of a strong piece of legislation that addresses concerns of Members on both sides of the aisle.

I would also like to thank the staff of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee for all of their hard work on drafting a thoughtful and comprehensive bill. Their diligent work is a tribute to us all.

I would be remiss if I didn't single out these extraordinary individuals. I thank Senator MCCAIN's staff director, Chris Brose, who did a superb job; Senator INHOFE's staff director, Luke Holland, Tony McLain; on my staff, Jody Bennett, Jon Clark, Gary Leeling, Creighton Greene, Jonathan Epstein, Ozge Guzelsu, Jon Green, Kirk McConnell, John Quirk, Arun Seraphin, Carolyn Chuhta, Maggie McNamara, Mike Noblet, Jorie Feldman, Bill Monahan, and my staff director, Elizabeth King. I also want to thank Jen Stewart and Paul Arcangeli. They are the staff directors for Chairman THORNBERRY and Ranking Member SMITH, respectfully. They did a superb job.

With their work and with the inspiration of Senator MCCAIN, we were able to pass an extraordinary and I think very effective piece of legislation.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. REED. I will be happy to.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES— H.R. 2

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair appoints the following as conferees on the part of the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to H.R. 2.

The Presiding Officer appointed Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. ERNST, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. HEITKAMP conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

FARM BILL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to talk for a few minutes about our farm bill. As you know, our farm bill is the primary agricultural and food policy tool of the United States. We pass it every 5 years. We just passed it this year. The bill is going to conference. As you know, the Senate passed its own farm bill and the House passed its farm bill, so we will go to conference and try to work it out. The bill was a 5-year bill, but it spends \$860 billion in taxpayer money. Let me say that figure again—\$860 billion in taxpayer money.

We throw a billion around these days in Washington as if it were a nickel. A billion is a lot. If I started counting to a billion right now and counted one numeral a second, I would finish in 2050. I probably wouldn't finish; I would probably die first. That is how much a billion is. This bill is about \$860 billion. Seventy-five percent of it deals with our food stamp program.

In the House version of the farm bill, there is a work requirement for food stamps, and this is what it says: The American taxpayer will happily give you his or her hard-earned money to help you get back on your feet. We don't want you to be hungry. But if you are between the ages of 18 and 59, the House bill says, and you are not disabled and you don't have a child under 6, then in return for those food stamps, we are going to require you to get a job. You don't have to work a full week; you just have to work 20 hours a week. And if you don't want to work, you can go to job training for 20 hours a week.

That is what the House bill says. The Senate bill is silent on that—crickets. It doesn't even address it.

I am speaking today to try to encourage our friends in the House to stand firm and insist that their work requirement for food stamps remain in the

bill. I would like to spend a few minutes to explain why.

I get a little tired of politicians and others saying: Oh, the American people—they are stingy. They don't help their neighbor.

That is not true. The American people are the most generous people in the world. They are the most generous people in the history of the world. Think about it. First, we spend about \$1 trillion a year—\$1 trillion a year—in State and local programs that are funded by people's money. The money to fund those programs didn't fall from Heaven. We thank Heaven for it, but it came out of people's pockets, and we spend \$1 trillion a year—State and local tax money—helping our neighbors who are less fortunate than we are.

In our country—and I am very proud of this—if you are homeless, we will house you; if you are too poor to be sick, we will pay for your doctor; and if you are hungry, we will feed you. That separates this country from just about every other country in the world, and it is one of the reasons that so many people across the world want to come to America—because our people are so generous. I mean, when is the last time you heard of somebody trying to sneak into Russia? When is the last time you heard of somebody trying to sneak into North Korea? When is the last time you heard of somebody trying to sneak into China? I mean, we should be complimented, and it is because of our giving spirit. But it doesn't do any good, in my judgment, to be generous with people who need our help without also helping them get out of the circumstances for which we need to be generous.

Let me put it another way. By suggesting we need a work requirement for food stamps, I am not trying to take away food stamps from people in need. I do not want to take away food stamps from people in need, but I do want fewer people to need food stamps. The best way we can do that for those who are able to work is to help them get a job.

The Brookings Institution, as the Presiding Officer knows, is hardly a bastion of liberalism. They recently did a study. The Brookings Institute said: If you do these four things, you have only a 2-percent chance of living in poverty in America. This is Brookings, now.

The Brookings Institution says that if you do these four things you have only a 2-percent chance of living in poverty: No. 1, get a job—any job—even if it is minimum wage; No. 2, don't get married until you are 21; No. 3, don't have a child before you get married.

I said four, but I will say that, even if you do these three things—get any job, don't get married before you are 21, and don't have a child before you get married—you only have a 2-percent chance in this country of living in poverty. Obviously, a job is a critical part of that.

This is what the House bill does. I hope we in the Senate will join with