

Smith Act. It is named after 18-year-old Kelsey Smith, who was abducted and murdered in 2007. This bill strengthens the ability of law enforcement to get the information they need, quick access to someone's cell phone to get the information of where they might still be or where they last were when they separated from that phone, if that is what happened.

Senator STABENOW and I are continuing to work on the Mental Health and Addiction Treatment Act, something that every time we have support testimony on that act, it always involves law enforcement, which wants more focus on mental health courts and more focus on drug courts but particularly more focus on the ability of officers to deal with the situation in the best possible way when they come upon it. Remembering those who have fallen and continuing to work for those who stand up for us and run to the side of danger as they shield us from danger is important.

I am glad to be joined today by my good friend Senator COONS from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, it is an honor and a joy for me to come to the floor today not just as the Senator representing Delaware but as the cochair of the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus, which I am very proud to have a chance to lead with my friend and colleague Senator BLUNT from Missouri.

As you just heard, he recited some of the many ways in which we have been able to work together. Senator BLUNT, as a seasoned senior appropriator, someone who has experience in the House of Representatives and in the private sector at home, leading an educational institution, and has worked in State and local government, along with my experience in local government and the private sector—I think that has allowed us to do really good and positive things for the men and women of law enforcement.

This is National Police Week. It is an opportunity for us—not just here in the Senate but all over the country—to thank the hundreds of thousands of men and women in State and local law enforcement, as well as in Federal law enforcement agencies, who make possible the opportunity we have to enjoy our freedoms. Our basic safety, our ability to travel far and wide, to speak and live, and to praise and believe as we hope—all of this is made possible because of the ways in which our law enforcement officers guarantee those freedoms by literally putting their lives on the line for us each and every day. For that, we are eternally grateful.

The Law Enforcement Caucus, which Senator BLUNT and I founded, has held a number of engaging and important bipartisan sessions. You heard the Senator reference things like the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program and RISS, the Regional Intel-

ligence Sharing System that helps to connect resources between Federal and State and local law enforcement. We also recently had a session on sharing relationship-building models where we had folks in from Delaware and Missouri to talk about how law enforcement serves as positive role models and mentors in the community through terrific programs.

I look forward to continuing to work with my friend and colleague Senator BLUNT on these issues in the year ahead in the Law Enforcement Caucus and to talking briefly here on the floor today about how we should not just give great speeches but actually take important actions to demonstrate to the families and to the men and women of law enforcement that we care deeply about their service and about whether they come home at the end of their shift.

I serve on the Senate Judiciary Committee. On a unanimous basis, we recently advanced a series of bills that will help advance officer safety, not the least of which is making permanent the Federal Bulletproof Vest Partnership Program that has literally saved lives across the country. The capitol police—the police who protect Delaware's capitol and our courthouse—had a dramatic and personal experience with that when two law enforcement officers' lives were saved when they were shot in the line of duty, and it was only because they were wearing vests made possible by this Federal-State partnership that they survived.

I will also continue to work to support the COPS Program, which ensures that we have officers on the ground in communities large and small in Delaware, such as Cheswold, Delmar, Laurel, Ocean View, Smyrna, and my home city of Wilmington. They all have been able to hire new officers in recent years because of the COPS Program.

We are also working together on reforms to the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Program to ensure that families of officers who are permanently disabled or lose their lives in the line of duty receive the benefits they richly deserve.

Let me conclude by thanking and honoring a few specific officers from Delaware's law enforcement community for their service this past year. We have not had any Delawareans' names added to the Wall of Honor referenced by the Senator from Missouri, but all of us who have affection for and support the law enforcement community in Delaware know that we are simply blessed this year to have not joined that terrible roll of great honor of those who have given their lives in the line of duty.

Let me briefly thank Sergeant Paul Doherty of the Delaware State Police, who was awarded the Robert J. Seinsoth Memorial Award as the 2018 Delaware Crime Stoppers Law Enforcement Officer of the Year. His investigation work following up on a robbery

led to the apprehension of a serial, dangerous criminal who harmed other Delawareans.

Let me honor Detective Jonathan Moyer, who led the investigation of fraud and theft at Beebee Hospital in Lewes, DE.

Let me honor Detective Ryan Schmid from the Dover Police Department. He is a 6-year veteran of that department and maintained an amazing clearance rate of 84 percent in investigated burglaries, robberies, and attempted murder and solved homicide.

Lastly, let me recognize Detective Brad Cordrey, who is Delaware's Child Welfare Professional of the Year and has served under Georgetown chief of police R.L. Hughes, who said that "Brad's dedication, compassion, and tenacity to solve serious cases are unmatched."

There is so much more I could say, but given the number of my colleagues who have also come to the floor to speak, let me conclude by simply saying how grateful all of us are to the men and women of law enforcement.

During this National Police Week, let me say what a great blessing it is to be able to continue to work with my colleague Senator BLUNT of Missouri in cochairing the Law Enforcement Caucus in this Congress and hopefully for many years to come.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

IRAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Senate's failure to meet its constitutional obligation and conduct effective oversight of what seems to me and many others to be this administration's inexorable march toward war with Iran.

This week, the New York Times reported that the Trump administration is making plans to deploy 120,000 American troops to the Middle East in anticipation of a confrontation with Iran. It is no secret that some of the President's closest advisers are focused on regime change and possibly military engagement with Iran.

I was encouraged by a story in the Washington Post that was posted last night. The headline of that story read as follows: "Trump, frustrated by advisers, is not convinced the time is right to attack Iran." That was the headline in the version of the story reported by four Washington Post reporters. In pertinent part, the story indicated that the President thinks his advisers "could rush the U.S. into a military confrontation with Iran." Then it goes on to further state that "Trump prefers a diplomatic approach to resolving tensions." I am encouraged by that, but we have to be vigilant when it comes to this issue and the broader issue of the use of force.

The plans that I mentioned before referred to by the New York Times apparently were submitted by Acting Defense Secretary Shanahan. These are

the most recent in a string of actions this administration has taken, from withdrawing from the 2015 Iran nuclear agreement, to designating the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps—the so-called IRGC—as a foreign terrorist organization, to suspending waivers that allow partner countries to continue importing Iranian oil.

I have a long record of working to fight against Iranian aggression. We all know—and we have said it often, and we should say it again—Iran is and has been the leading state sponsor of terrorism. For years, many of us, in a bipartisan way, have led efforts to confront Iran, to sanction Iran, to hold Iran accountable for its malign activity and actions in the Middle East and its actions to support terrorist organizations, whether it is Hezbollah or any other terrorist organization. We will continue that regardless of this debate.

But when the New York Times talked about that military plan, they referred to a prior engagement, a prior military conflict—the conflict in Iraq. “Echoes of Iraq War” was what the Times said. These “echoes” trigger memories and reflections of a misguided period of this body’s history in which Congress approved a U.S. invasion of Iraq based upon faulty intelligence. By the end of that long war, thousands of Americans had been killed, and many more Americans had been wounded.

In Pennsylvania alone, 197 Pennsylvanians were killed in action in the Iraq war and more than 1,200 were wounded. I haven’t even talked about the conflict in Afghanistan, where Pennsylvania lost more than 90. The last number I saw was 91 Pennsylvanians were killed in action in Afghanistan. Pennsylvania is well familiar with contributing fighting men and women to conflicts from the beginning of our Republic until this very day.

The administration’s actions on Iran also “echo” our ongoing stalemate—“stalemate” might be an understatement—regarding the authorization for use of military force—the so-called AUMF—against ISIS, for example.

If we don’t debate and vote on an AUMF as it relates to Iran or any other country or any other conflict, we are not doing our job.

For 6 years, the United States has been engaged in the fight against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. For many years, the executive branch has relied on the 2001 authorization for use of military force to justify its fight against ISIS, as well as to justify other military engagements.

I ask Majority Leader McCONNELL to set aside time for sustained debate and votes on a new authorization for use of military force.

Last month, Secretary of State Pompeo implied during testimony in front of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate that the 2001 AUMF to go after al-Qaeda and its affiliates authorizes war with Iran. A lot of people would disagree with that. I believe that an 18-year-old authoriza-

tion needs an update—another under-statement. The threats we confront today have evolved since 2001.

As this administration seeks to link al-Qaeda and Iran in anticipation of a military confrontation, I am concerned over the bipartisan failure to hold both this and the prior administration to account for their constitutional overreach over congressional authority.

I commend Senator Kaine and other Senators from both parties for efforts over the last number of years to force a debate on congressional oversight over this issue.

The majority leader should allow floor time and a robust debate on congressional war powers and oversight over the Executive’s unilateral actions that send American troops overseas. The debate on the Yemen resolution and the vote—several votes, actually, on that—demonstrated that there is bipartisan concern over the use of force, but we need a broader debate than we had in the debate on the Yemen resolution.

As this administration pursues a reckless strategy with Iran, it is time for a sustained debate and vote on a new authorization for use of military force that allows our Nation to, in fact, destroy terrorists and fight threats to U.S. national security but doesn’t result in endless war. The 2001 and 2002 authorizations for use of military force authorizing military action in Iraq and Afghanistan are outdated and must be replaced.

I will conclude with some words from Abraham Lincoln in that now-famous letter to Mrs. Bixby in which he talked about the loss of her sons’ lives in the Civil War. When they did the checks on it, it turned out to be two sons. When the President was writing, he thought she had lost five sons. But we still have families who suffer the loss of a son or a daughter in conflict—we hope not as many as two or more.

In this case, in the second paragraph, President Lincoln said “the grief of a loss so overwhelming.” He then went on to say to this grieving mother:

But I cannot refrain from tendering you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save.

I pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

So said President Lincoln at that time.

The words still ring true today—“the grief of a loss so overwhelming,” the memory of “the loved and lost.” It goes on to read “so costly a sacrifice.”

Every President should read this letter as he or she deliberates about the use of force that commits our sons and daughters to fight and risk their lives. When we talk about so costly a sacrifice, we all know what happened in our State. Military families in Pennsylvania, in the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, endured so costly a sacrifice.

I hope President Trump will reread this letter as he deliberates our next steps with regard to Iran and our next steps with regard to the authorization for the use of military force.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

REAUTHORIZING THE BULLET-PROOF VEST PARTNERSHIP GRANT PROGRAM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2379.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2379) to reauthorize the Bullet-proof Vest Partnership Grant Program.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LEAHY. 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. LEAHY. 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. 2379) was passed.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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.

H.R. 2379

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this may seem like just a perfunctory thing, but I want to speak about what we just did.

The Senate passed legislation to permanently reauthorize the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program. This is the sixth time I have worked to reauthorize this lifesaving program since I and my Republican partner, Senator Ben Nighthorse Campbell, of Colorado, authored the legislation to establish it more than 20 years ago.

My role in authoring this program—and my commitment to it ever since as we have reauthorized it and reauthorized it—was, in part, motivated by a horrific incident the year before Senator Nighthorse Campbell and I created it.

On August 19, 1997, a man named Carl Drega went on a killing spree along the Vermont and New Hampshire border. After hours of pursuit, Federal, State, and local law enforcement authorities in Vermont and New Hampshire cornered Drega, and in an ensuing exchange of gunfire, he was killed.

During the shoot-out, all of the Federal law enforcement officers involved were wearing bulletproof vests. This includes John Pfeifer, a Vermonter and a