

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-Qaida 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 understatement. The threats we confront today have evolved since 2001.

As this administration seeks to link al-Qaida 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 Bulletproof 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

longtime friend. His father was one of my favorite professors in college, and I remember John as a child. He was seriously wounded. In fact, at that time, then-FBI Director Louis Freeh and his family were staying with us at our home in Vermont.

We visited Officer Pfeifer, who was a U.S. Border Patrol agent, in the hospital. He was grievously wounded, but he survived and later became the Chief Patrol Agent of the sector. I have always feared—and I believe he agrees—that had it not been for his bulletproof vest, the outcome for John and his family may have been much worse.

Some of the state and local officers involved were not that fortunate. Two New Hampshire state troopers were killed. They were not wearing bulletproof vests. I don't know whether vests would have saved their lives. Let us hope they would have.

One thing I do know is that no officer should have to serve without having the benefit of wearing a bulletproof vest. That is what this is all about. I am immensely proud of this program. It is the most tangible support that all of us in Congress—both parties—can provide to our Nation's law enforcement officers.

To this day, for far too many jurisdictions, especially rural and smaller agencies, vests cost too much, and they wear out too soon. This program fills in the gap. It has provided more than 13,000 law enforcement agencies with 1.35 million vests. It has saved the lives of countless officers, several of whom have shared their stories with the Judiciary Committee, here in the Senate, during previous years. In fact, according to the Government Accountability Office, more than 3,000 officers' lives have been saved by vests since 1987. It makes me very proud to know these officers can still be with their families and their departments.

Just yesterday, my office received a call from the Union City Police Department in Georgia. Last month, one of its officers, Jerome Turner, Jr.—shown in this photograph—was shot multiple times when he responded to a call. One round hit him directly in the chest, but it did not get through his bulletproof vest. When backup arrived, Officer Turner was lying on the ground from his other injuries. He went through 6 hours of surgery, but he lived. His department called yesterday to tell me that the vest that saved his life was purchased through this program. Everybody in my office and I just applauded at that news.

My staff also had a chance to talk with Officer Turner. He is still recovering, but he said he is happy to be home with his family—his family he might never have seen again. He also said what we all know to be true—the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program is critical to ensuring officers around the country can return home to their families after their shifts.

Officer Turner knows a lot about this program. It turns out that he pre-

viously served as the chief of police in a small town in Florida, which is the Presiding Officer's State. He used this program to outfit his officers with protective vests in order to keep his officers safe while they were protecting us.

This week is National Police Week. It is a time for the Nation to honor the many brave men and women in law enforcement who have lost their lives while having served their communities. That includes the 163 officers who were lost last year—52 of them killed by gunfire. The fact that Congress has now passed legislation to permanently reauthorize this program places real meaning behind our words of tribute. The legislation also increases the funding for vests as, year after year, only a fraction of the need is met.

This program is not new, and never has been, partisan. When we started, I said that I and Ben Nighthorse Campbell, of Colorado—a Republican—started it. I am especially grateful to Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM for being the lead cosponsor of both this and the last reauthorization.

Last week, our bill was being considered by the Judiciary Committee. I have to admit I was a bit surprised and very humbled when Chairman GRAHAM called up an amendment to name the program after me and when it then got a unanimous vote from Republicans and Democrats. I am always going to be thankful, for the program is personal to me, and it is personal, certainly, to the officers who wear these vests.

I thank my many staff who have worked on this program for 22 years, including Dave Pendle, Erica Chabot, Ed Pagano, Bruce Cohen, Matt Virkstis, Kristine Lucius, Chan Park, David Carle, Jessica Berry, and many others.

I am also thankful to the entire law enforcement community, which has spoken with a single voice on this issue—a single voice. In particular I would like to thank Chuck Canterbury, Jim Pasco, and Tim Richardson with the Fraternal Order of Police—all friends of mine. The FOP has strongly supported this program from the beginning, and has been there for each of the six reauthorizations.

I would also like to thank for their support the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the National Association of Police Organizations, the National Sheriffs' Association, the Major County Sheriffs' Association, the Major Cities Chiefs Association, the Federal Law Enforcement Officers Association, the National Tactical Officers Association, and the Sergeants Benevolent Association. Last, I would like to thank the sponsors of the House companion which the Senate just passed, Congressmen BILL PASCRELL and PETER KING.

Without this legislation, the Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program would expire next year. Once this legislation is signed into law, it will never expire. It has already saved the lives of

so many, and placed vests on the backs of well over one million officers. Now we know that millions more officers will be protected, and millions of officers like Officer Turner will be able to go home to their families.

I wonder if the Senate would allow me to tell a story.

When we were doing the reauthorization, I had asked a police officer from Pennsylvania to come and testify. He came. His parents, his wife, and his children sat behind him. He gave very moving testimony. He said the two most important things to him in life were his family and law enforcement. He told us about how, a short while before, he stopped a car at a routine traffic stop. He got out of his police car, and the person in the other car stepped out and fired four shots at him—point blank. He fell over. Others caught the person.

He said: As I was falling, I thought I would never see my family again. I had a couple of cracked ribs. They came to visit me in the hospital. I went back home with them to their love and care. Then I went back to work. This is what saved me.

He reached under the table and held up a bulletproof vest, and you could still see three large caliber slugs embedded in it.

He said: Those would have been in my heart. I never would have seen my family, and I never would have gone back to law enforcement.

At that time, I was the chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee. After his testimony, I asked if we could have a unanimous vote to reauthorize. It was the fastest unanimous vote I can remember in that committee.

As I said then and as I say now, this is the least Congress can do on behalf of our Nation's law enforcement officers. Obviously, I am proud to have had the legislation named after me, but I am proud of all of the Senators over the last 20-plus years—Republicans and Democrats—who have supported it. I am glad we have done it. Now it will head to the President for his signature, and I am sure the President will sign it without delay.

I see nobody else who seeks recognition.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

VOTE ON VITTER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Vitter nomination?

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 114 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	Jones	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Hassan	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Gillibrand	Harris
--------	------------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

VOTE ON BULATAO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary of State (Management).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bulatao nomination?

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Ex.]

YEAS—92

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

NAYS—5

Blumenthal	Markey	Warren
Hirono	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Gillibrand	Harris
--------	------------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I am on the floor to talk about the men and women in uniform, our police officers who protect us every day. They are here in the Capitol protecting us in the Chamber. They are in Ohio protecting the citizens of Ohio, and they do it every day. They put their lives on the line for us in many cases.

This is National Police Week, a week when tens of thousands of police officers come to Washington, DC. They come to the police memorial. It has been a wonderful week because I had the opportunity to meet with law enforcement officers from Ohio, today, yesterday, and the day before. We have seen them on the streets. We have seen them in uniform. Their opportunity to come here is to talk about the important issues that relate to our law en-

forcement but also to pay tribute to their fallen colleagues.

Sadly, Ohio has lost its share of officers recently. Officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty include two so far this year and four last year.

On February 2, Clermont County Detective Bill Brewer was shot and killed after responding to a call from a suicidal man who was armed at an apartment complex just east of Cincinnati, in Clermont County. Detective Brewer served at the sheriff's department for 20 years, and was widely respected.

The funeral was amazing. There was an overwhelming number of people. Grateful citizens showed up and law enforcement from our entire region and, in fact, law enforcement from even other States. At his service I had the honor of presenting his widow and young son with a flag that had flown over the U.S. Capitol, in honor of him and in gratitude to his family.

On that day, County Sheriff Steve Leahy said of Detective Brewer:

He was an outstanding man. He was a good father, a good husband, a good friend, a good employee. He's what this country needs more of.

I agree with Sheriff Leahy.

On January 4, Colerain Township Police Officer Dale Woods was hit by a vehicle while working at the scene of an automobile accident, and he passed away 3 days later as a result of his injuries. Police Chief Mark Denney remembered Woods as a hero who once saved a baby inside a hot car and also ran into a burning building to save a blind woman. That is the type of selfless and courageous officer he was. He represented the best.

Last July, Cleveland Patrol Officer Vu Nguyen, a 25-year veteran of the department, collapsed while taking part in police training exercises. Vu was known as a people person, someone who cared a lot for his fellow citizens and always went the extra mile to help anyone who asked. His family said that was the reason he became a police officer, because he wanted a job where he could help people. That is what police officers do.

In June of last year, Mentor Police Officer Matthew Mazany was struck and killed by a hit-and-run driver while assisting another officer during a traffic stop. Officer Mazany had served with the Mentor Police Department for 14 years. He was beloved by his fellow officers, by his family and friends, and by his entire community.

This morning I had the opportunity to visit the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, here in Washington, DC. I was able to see the inscribed names on the wall there of thousands of law enforcement officers we have lost over the years. If you haven't been down there, it is a powerful experience.

There were also beautiful memorials set up around those walls with wreaths, flowers, photographs, magazine articles, newspaper articles, and other information about officers whom we lost in the last year, including these two officers from Westerville, OH, who were