United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2019 No. 104

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Ruler of all, we honor You and bear witness to Your mighty power. Do for our lawmakers more than they can ask or imagine. Let Your holy word be a lamp to their feet and a light for their path. Give them a wisdom that clears a path through complexity.

Lord, sanctify their thoughts, words, and actions until their dominant desire is to please You.

We pray in Your holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NOS. 27 THROUGH 48 EN BLOC—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume the en bloc consideration of following joint resolutions of disapproval, which the clerk will report by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom and Australia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 30) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res 34) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Government of Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed retransfer of certain defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res 45) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services;

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia certain defense articles and services; and

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the United Arab Emirates certain defense articles and services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask to speak as in morning business for 1 minute.

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

''THIS IS IOWA'' CAMPAIGN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, Gov. Kim Reynolds of my State of Iowa has unveiled what she calls the ''This is Iowa'' campaign. That campaign has encouraged people to choose Iowa to live and work.

Iowa has the second lowest unemployment rate in the Nation. As I travel Iowa with my county meetings, I hear from employers across Iowa that have high-paying skilled jobs they cannot fill. That is why Iowa was ranked the No. 1 State to find a job in 2019.

The cost of living is low and the quality of life is second to none. Check out thisisiowa.com to learn more. In the words of Meredith Wilson, of ''76 Trombones'' fame, from Mason City, IA: ''You really ought to give Iowa a try.''

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, by a wide bipartisan margin, the Senate began considering this year's National Defense Authorization Act.

The Senate has passed an NDAA each of the last 58 years. We authorize the resources, the equipment, the support systems, and the pay that keep our All-Volunteer Force the strongest in the world.

From the outside, this process may look routine, but as our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee know best, keeping America safe takes constant hard work and innovation.

We have all seen the recent headlines: ''Russia 'successfully tests' hypersonic intercept missile that can shoot down Western weapons,'' ''China's Military Technology Now Close to Parity With U.S.''

In just the last few hours, Iran shot down an American surveillance aircraft in international airspace over the Strait of Hormuz. Fortunately, the aircraft was unmanned.

Let me say that again. Last night, the Iranians shot down a U.S. aircraft in international airspace.

It could certainly not be clearer that we need to keep modernizing our national defense, continue rebuilding our readiness, and persist with our new national defense strategy.

Fortunately, this legislation includes billions of dollars for modernizing our capabilities, restoring the Navy's fleet strength, and investing in the latest generation of combat aircraft. There are billions more for critical research weapons aimed at keeping U.S. weapons systems on the cutting edge and ensuring American servicemembers never enter a fair fight. It prioritizes greater efficiency and transparency at the Pentagon so we can better support military families through the sacrifices of service.

Again, I would like to thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member JACK REED for guiding the committee process. I hope the Senate can work through this legislation swiftly and give it the overwhelming bipartisan vote it deserves.

ARMS SALES

Mr. President, on a related matter, in addition to completing the NDAA, the Senate will today have to dispense with several more privileged resolutions concerning arms sales to close American partners in a troubled but important region.

These close partners deserve our support. I am glad we secured a bipartisan understanding yesterday to expedite their consideration so the 22 separate resolutions which Members have introduced will not jeopardize the Defense bill or the emergency border funding we must also consider next week.

Today this body, yet again, will debate and cast votes concerning our relationship with Saudi Arabia, just like we did in March and December and the previous March.

I think the vast majority of Senators share serious concerns over some of the policies and actions of our Saudi partners, but rejecting long-planned arms sales strikes me as an overly blunt tool with several unintended consequences.

For example, the arms sales affected by this vote are not just for Saudi Arabia but also for the United Arab Emirates, and they include sales that affect Israel, India, Korea, and Jordan.

Last December, the Senate passed a nuanced resolution that delivered exactly the message we wanted to deliver: our fury over the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, our concerns about the war in Yemen, and our desire for more accountability. That was the right approach.

There is no shortage of tools available to the United States that are more appropriate to communicate frustrations and urge better behavior, whether from the administration or our partners.

Senators could meet with Saudi officials to directly express their concerns. They could travel to the region to see firsthand complicated, fluid situations.

Rapid societal and economic change is providing Saudi citizens with unprecedented political openness but also troubling human rights concerns and erratic policy decisions. The dynamics at play are not black and white.

We can best shape these dynamics by working closely with our partners to encourage them in the right direction, rather than turning our back.

Concerned Members might also begin giving fairer treatment and more prompt consideration to the well-qualified experts who are waiting to contribute to our diplomacy. Recall that the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Near Eastern Affairs just started his job last Monday after he had been held up for more than a year. The top State Department job in the Middle East was held open for more than a year.

The nominees for Ambassador to the UAE, Egypt, and Libya are having hearings today. I hope their confirmations will move more quickly than those of other senior diplomats who languished for months.

So there is no shortage of productive steps at Members' disposal, but recklessly canceling U.S. arms sales to key regional partners is not on the list.

So the question the Senate will soon consider is really this: whether we will lash out at an imperfect partner and undercut our own efforts to build cooperation, check Iran, and achieve other important goals or whether we will keep our imperfect partners close and use our influence; whether we will push Riyadh and Abu Dhabi away from the United States and push them closer to Moscow and Beijing or whether we will stay engaged and help our partners course-correct where we can; whether to signal at this hour of tension that we cannot be relied upon to stand with our friends, sending a message that will embolden Tehran, or whether to find more private, effective ways of encouraging better behavior while sending a message of solidarity in troubled times.

The situation in the Middle East, as we speak, could hardly be more fraught. The timing could not be worse for the Senate to send the wrong signal.

In just the last several hours, we have seen reports that a missile from inside Yemen has struck a utility plant in Saudi Arabia. This is after other attacks—almost certainly from the Iran-backed Houthi forces—on Saudi Arabia and the UAE, including attacks on civilian vessels and on a civilian airport.

Again, just last night, Iran shot down a U.S. intelligence aircraft that was flying in international airspace. So the Senate could hardly pick a worse time for clumsy and ill-considered resolutions that would hurt key relationships in the Middle East.

Let's not cut ourselves off from our partners. Let's not undercut the administration at a time of such delicate diplomacy and tension with Iran. So I ask my colleagues to vote down these resolutions.

NOMINATION OF KELLY KNIGHT CRAFT

Mr. President, on another matter, I had the opportunity to introduce a skillful leader and fellow Kentuckian before the Foreign Relations Committee only just yesterday. Kelly Knight Craft was confirmed by voice vote in 2017 to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to Canada. Now she is the President's choice to serve as Ambassador to the United Nations.

Ambassador Craft's success in representing American interests in Canada certainly rewarded the Senate's vote of confidence. During a dynamic and sometimes challenging period in the U.S.-Canada friendship, she has navigated it with care. She has helped to shepherd the USMCA. She has helped to secure cooperation on sanctioning Russia for its aggression against Ukraine and on pursuing democracy for Venezuela. She has spoken out forcefully, when necessary, against China.

Not surprisingly, this talented diplomat has earned great respect both at home and abroad.

The Premier of Ontario has said:

Every premier I know thinks the world of her. . . . She really proved herself over some tough times.

The former Deputy to Ambassador Nikki Haley has described Ambassador Craft as a worthy successor—''smart, capable, and knowledgeable about the foreign policy challenges facing our country.''

This body confirmed Ambassador Craft to her current post by voice vote. Since then, she has only gained even more experience, further refined her expertise, and demonstrated her talent even more clearly. Her testimony yesterday reinforced these things even further.

President Trump has made an excellent selection to serve our Nation in this critical role at the U.N. She deserves bipartisan support from the Foreign Relations Committee and, when the time comes, a swift confirmation here on the Senate floor.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on a final matter, for nearly 2 months, my Republican colleagues and I have come to the floor constantly to raise the alarm on the humanitarian crisis down at the border. Record numbers of migrants have pressed upon the U.S.-Mexico border, including never-before-seen numbers of families and unaccompanied children. The agencies that care for these individuals and the facilities that house them have been stretched dangerously thin.

We all know this. That is why the administration requested supplemental funds 7 weeks ago. It is why agency heads and law enforcement officials have literally begged Congress to act. Yet, until yesterday, we had not seen progress, which leads one to ask why. It is because—stop me if this sounds familiar—the Democratic House of Representatives has been more interested in denying this White House whatever it asks for, however necessary it might be, simply because it has been this White House that has been asking for it.

My friend the Democratic leader has acknowledged publicly it has been the Democratic-controlled House that has been the hurdle. One House Democrat from a border State has likewise admitted that it has been the left flank of his own conference that has been the stumbling block.

As the press has noted, some leading Democrats have let partisanship so cloud their judgment that they have actually called the humanitarian problem a manufactured crisis or an artificial crisis. Really?

Well, these 7 weeks of wasted time have made two things abundantly clear—that partisanship doesn't change the facts and that ''the resistance'' doesn't pay the bills. The House Democrats have failed to get their act together, so now the Senate is going to move forward.

Yesterday, thanks to the leadership of Chairman SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, the Appropriations Committee approved a significant funding measure by an overwhelming vote of 30 to 1—just the kind of big, bipartisan vote we ought to see in this particular situation for noncontroversial funding for necessary programs to mitigate a national crisis.

The Republicans have been urging this kind of consensus literally for weeks, and now the Senate is finally rising to the occasion. We need to vote on this legislation before we recess at the end of the month.

The Senate should not let even more time slip by without addressing this crisis head-on, and if we receive the same kind of bipartisan cooperation that was signaled in the committee vote yesterday, we will not have to.

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. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, over the past few months, tensions with Iran have escalated. There have been a series of attacks on tankers in the Gulf region, and this morning it was reported that Iran has shot down a U.S. drone.

These events are deeply concerning—all the more so because the Trump administration has not explained to Congress or to the American people how it views these events, how it plans to respond, and, most importantly, what the broader strategy for confronting Iran is.

President Trump left the diplomatic agreement a little more than a year ago. It was obvious to anyone who even had a cursory knowledge of Iran that it would create consequences. With that decision, there is a course set for conflict—conflict whose purpose or strategy has never been articulated to the American people.

The President says on TV: It is a much better Iran than when I took office. Well, they were not building nuclear weapons—and I opposed the Iran agreement, as you know. But they were not building nuclear weapons. They were proceeding along the path of the agreement, and the President, as he seems to, just gets a bug in his head, something he said in the campaign without thinking, and then upends foreign policy—another example of chaos in this administration. But he has done that. He has done that.

So now the issue is what is our strategy to deal with the consequences? The American people have to know this. We have seen too many conflicts in the Middle East escalate into war—escalate into a 10-year war.

The American people are not for spending a fortune and, more importantly, lives of Americans overseas. They want us to focus here at home, but the kind of adventurism—almost unplanned, unthought out, and, certainly, unexplained adventurism—of the President is the wrong way to go and could lead to severe consequences. And, I must say, even in closed-door briefings with Senators, the administration doesn't have a strategy.

This is not how democracy is supposed to work. This is not how the CEO of a major Nation or even a major company should behave, with no articulated strategy. The President needs to explain to the American people why he is driving us toward another endless conflict in the Middle East.

SAUDI ARABIA

Madam President, on Saudi Arabia, another matter concerning the administration's foreign policy, today the Senate will vote on resolutions of disapproval for arms sales to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

These 22 resolutions introduced by Senator MENENDEZ would block billions of dollars in military sales, including the transfer of tens of thousands of precision-guided munitions that the Saudis have previously used to bomb innocent civilians in Yemen.

The timing of these votes is significant. Last night the United Nations issued a report that documented evidence that the Saudis meticulously planned the murder of Jamal Khashoggi and ''forensically''—their words—disposed of the evidence.

According to the report, the Saudis referred to Mr. Khashoggi as a sacrificial animal and that dismembering the body would be easy—how gross, how cruel, how beyond words.

Are we going to blithely go along and let the Saudis continue? They are an ally. Everyone knows that. That doesn't mean you let allies do the most horrible things and just treat it as if nothing happened. But in the wake of such monstrosity, the Trump administration is proposing another round of billions of dollars in arms sales to Saudi Arabia.

Well, we should at least have a debate about whether that is the right course of action. Leader MCCONNELL was on the floor saying: What are the Democrats doing here? We are debating, Mr. Leader. You have one view; I

may have another. But the American people are entitled to a debate on this important issue, and that is what the law provides, and that is the tool we use—one of the few tools we have to actually cause debate in this Chamber, which the leader, with his legislative graveyard, has assiduously avoided. With his reducing the amount of time that we can talk about and vet nominees, he has assiduously avoided that, turning this Chamber into a graveyard that the American people despise. But here we have an opportunity to debate, and even here the leader seems to be decrying that fact, in my view.

The administration is claiming emergency power and trying to circumvent congressional review of these arms sales. That premise must be rejected. It sets a dangerous precedent for congressional oversight of future arms sales, and it can lead to renewed conflicts. We are also discussing that, parenthetically, in relation to Iran. Should Congress have some say there? You will hear more from me later on that.

The very least Congress can do is to debate the merits of sending Saudi Arabia billions of dollars in military technology it may use not to confront Iran but to perpetrate one of the largest humanitarian catastrophes of its generation.

Saudi Arabia, even though it be an ally, must be held accountable for its human rights abuses in Yemen and the grotesque murder of Jamal Khashoggi.

HARRIET TUBMAN

Madam President, now, on the Tubman issue, more than 3 years ago then-Treasury Secretary Jack Lew announced that he had ordered an accelerated redesign of the $20 bill with a new design to feature Harriet Tubman's portrait on the face of the bill. The design was set to be released in 2020, the 100th anniversary of women getting the right to vote—a fitting tribute to an extraordinary American and an extraordinary New Yorker.

There are no women or people of color on our paper currency today, even though they make up a significant majority of our population. There haven't been for more than a century. The plan to put Harriet Tubman on the $20 note was a long overdue way to recognize that disparity and rectify it.

But shortly after the Trump administration took office, all mention of the Tubman $20 bill was deleted from the Treasury Department's website without any explanation. Then, Secretary Mnuchin testified that a decision had been made to delay the release of the $20 note until 2028, and Treasury refused to confirm that Harriet Tubman's image would ever appear on it.

The official word from the White House was that the delay was required to accommodate anti-counterfeiting measures. But if you believe that, I have a bridge that I can sell you. It is simply not credible that with all the resources of the Treasury Department, a decade or more would be required to produce a $20 bill.

A century ago, New Yorkers built the Empire State building in a little over a year. We landed a man on the Moon in what seems to be less time. Surely the 21st century Treasury Department can redesign a bill in a reasonable period of time. The questions as to why the White House, the Treasury, and maybe even the President delayed this are looming and real, given the President's attitude toward women and minorities.

I have asked the Department of Treasury inspector general to launch an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the Treasury's decision. The official reasons given aren't credible. The whole thing smacks of politics. President Trump has referred to efforts to replace Andrew Jackson on the $20 bill as pure political correctness. To recognize more than half the people in our society, to recognize more than 25 percent of Americans who are people of color, all of whom have worked so hard to strive for this great country—is that political correctness? What is wrong with this President? What is wrong with this President, and what instincts is he appealing to? What bad instincts is he appealing to? It seems to be his practice, his way, his MO.

So among the questions the inspector general should examine is what role President Trump played in this apparent effort to renege on Treasury's 2016 commitment to honor Harriet Tubman.

Whatever the President's sentiments toward Jackson are, there is no reason to reverse the original Treasury Department decision to recognize Harriet Tubman's historic legacy on the $20 bill, which would still feature our seventh President on the reverse side.

I hope the inspector general will get to the bottom of this, but in the meantime, I hope President Trump himself is asked to answer for these delays. It would truly be a sordid state of affairs if the President or his team, for political reasons, interfered with and infected the process for designing American currency.

BACKGROUND CHECKS

Madam President, now, finally, on background checks, in the early hours on Monday, a heavily armed man approached the Federal building in downtown Dallas and started shooting. This was a civilian walking into the middle of an American city with military-grade weapons, a mask, and body armor, and he was prepared to inflict the maximum level of damage possible.

It is to the credit of the incredible first responders that this accident did not result in the loss of innocent life, but it is remarkable that events like this now seem all too routine, and so the news cycle barely covers them before moving on.

Barely a week goes by without an incident like this somewhere in America. We are the only Nation in the developed world where these kinds of things—these horrible things—happen with regularity. Virginia Beach, Highland Ranch, Poway, and Aurora, IL, are all examples of shootings that have taken place this year alone.

Later today, I will join several of my colleagues from the House and the Senate, including our former colleague, the great Gabby Giffords, to urge Leader MCCONNELL to bring background check legislation to the floor of the Senate. It has been 114 days since the House passed the measure, which more than 90 percent of Americans support, including more than 80 percent of Republicans and the majority of gun owners. But it seems that Leader MCCONNELL has set aside another plot in his legislative graveyard for this potentially lifesaving bill.

For too long, the gun lobby has reflexively opposed gun safety reforms, even the most obvious and noncontroversial reforms, like closing loopholes in background checks, and, for too long, the Republican majority has marched in lockstep with them.

The American people demand we do these rational acts. The House has passed it overwhelmingly with a bipartisan vote. Where are Republicans? Are they still cowering before the NRA? I remind them, the NRA is a lot weaker today than it was a few years ago. It is time to do the right thing and stop being scared.

Let's move this bill to the floor. Let Leader MCCONNELL finally let us debate an issue long overdue.

ELECTION SECURITY

Madam President, finally, as we continue to debate the NDAA, I urge Leader MCCONNELL once again to allow and support amendments to protect our elections from future attacks.

Election security is a national security issue of the highest urgency. There aren't two sides to this debate. No one can defend doing nothing as the Russians, and maybe the Chinese, the Iranians, and the North Koreans, mess with the wellspring of our democracy—our elections.

As we have seen time and again from reports by the FBI, intelligence agencies, and the Mueller report, our elections came under attack from Russia in the last Presidential election. FBI Director Wray has warned that they are coming for us again, and he thinks it could be worse than in 2016.

Leader MCCONNELL will not deny that this is true. So what are we waiting for? We know the threat is there. We know we can take steps to minimize it. So why won't Leader MCCONNELL let us act?

We have several options for legislative action, many of them bipartisan. People on both sides of the aisle—Democrats and Republicans—care about this issue and have worked on legislation together, something not done frequently enough around here, and Leader MCCONNELL just sits on these bills.

Last week, Senator WARNER asked unanimous consent to simply say the FBI should be informed when a foreign power tries to influence an election. I believe Senator BLUMENTHAL will try

to do the same thing today. Is Leader MCCONNELL going to instruct one of his Republicans to block it again? Will he have the courage to block it himself if he wants it blocked?

The logical solution is to let us debate the bills. If Leader MCCONNELL will not cooperate on this matter, Democrats are going to stand up for our democracy on our own, if we have to. We are going to ask unanimous consent to allow debate on these bills. We will insist on amendments to the NDAA. Leader MCCONNELL has suggested he wants an open amendment process, so let's press the matter, and we will continue to push for more election security funding as part of a deal on budget caps.

There are not two sides on this one; there are just not. There is only one right answer: action to safeguard our election. I urge Leader MCCONNELL to let us move on this issue. Stop stalling, stop obstructing. The legislative graveyard is full enough as it is. Let's come together, Democrats and Republicans, to protect our grand, imperiled democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, we have begun consideration of this year's National Defense Authorization Act, which is annual legislation to authorize funding for our military and national defense.

Like last year's bill, this year's National Defense Authorization Act emphasizes military modernization and readiness and the need to ensure that we are prepared to counter threats from great powers like China and Russia, as well as terrorists and rogue states.

I am offering a handful of amendments to this legislation, including an amendment to address training opportunities for our Nation's military pilots and aircrews.

In my home State of South Dakota, we are privileged to play host to Ellsworth Air Force Base, home of two B–1 bomb squadrons of the 28th Bomb Wing, the airmen who are the backbone of operations, as well as the 89th Attack Squadron and its control stations for MQ–9 Reapers. It is also home to the Powder River Training Complex, training airspace for Ellsworth aircrews and crews from across the United States. In the very near future, Ellsworth will be the home of the forthcoming B–21 bomber.

When I was first elected to the Senate, Ellsworth's future was not looking bright. In fact, in 2005, just a few months into my first term, Ellsworth was targeted for closure by the Base Realignment and Closure Commission. Fortunately, thanks to the efforts of a lot of dedicated people, we managed to demonstrate to the Commission that Ellsworth was a vital national security asset and that closing the base and moving its fleet of B–1s would actually cost money.

Since then, strengthening Ellsworth has been a priority for me and for a lot of other people back home in South Dakota, and Ellsworth has been going from strength to strength.

One of my proudest achievements as a Senator was helping secure the expansion of the Powder River Training Complex, the training airspace over Ellsworth. The expansion quadrupled the size of the airspace. But prior to the expansion, the airspace was only large enough for one B–1 bomber to train at a time, which meant crews had to commute elsewhere to meet their training needs.

Today, the airspace is large enough to hold large-force training exercises, involving a variety of planes from other bases. In fact, the Powder River Training Complex is now the largest training airspace in the continental United States. In addition to the vast space it offers for training exercises, it also provides a valuable opportunity for pilots to train in conditions that resemble combat missions, such as low-altitude flying over mountainous terrain.

Since the Powder River Training Complex was expanded, Ellsworth has hosted a number of successful large-force exercises. This May, Ellsworth hosted its most recent Combat Raider large-force exercise, which featured B–1, B–2, and B–52 bombers, J-STAR and AWACS radar systems, F–16s, and KC–135 tankers. Notably, F–35s from Hill Air Force Base in Utah also participated, marking the first of what I think will be many training opportunities for the F–35 in the Powder River Training Complex.

These Combat Raider exercises highlight the potential of the PRTC for training our military aviators, and I want to make sure that we can meet these training needs as we look to bring the B–21 into the fleet. That is why I filed an amendment, Thune amendment No. 759, to require a strategic airspace review.

My amendment would require a report on how far our current national airspace system meets our national security requirements and how we might improve this system to meet current and future training needs.

The Air Force and the Federal Aviation Administration would be required to consult on this report to develop a full picture of the strategic value of our national airspace.

The report would also analyze whether the current airspace system gives the military sufficient access to the airspace it requires to meet its worldwide operational, training, and testing needs.

In particular, it seeks to determine whether current civil and military cooperation mechanisms are providing for the effective and efficient management of the national airspace system for military training. It also asks whether the current Department of Defense and FAA processes provide sufficient time to plan for large-force exercises.

For example, in the Powder River Training Complex, the Air Force needs to go through a lengthy process to secure altitude waivers from the FAA to fly higher on just a few days a year for just a few hours a day. We absolutely need to have appropriate procedures to ensure safety and coordination with commercial airlines, but the Air Force also needs enough lead time to schedule its aircraft and airmen traveling from other bases. We shouldn't be missing out on critical training opportunities because of a lengthy process that is ripe for expediting.

So my amendment would take a look at this process, including whether FAA air traffic control centers could temporarily or permanently realign their boundaries to streamline their role in military training.

For example, the Powder River Training Complex straddles the convergence of the Minneapolis, Denver, and Salt Lake City air traffic control centers, and coordinating with all three can be cumbersome. This report would explore whether we can make the process more efficient for both the FAA and the military.

It would also review whether the current airspace system is sufficient to prepare military aviators to meet high-end threats, including fifth-generation aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles, and hypersonic weapons.

It is important that we ensure that our airmen can train in realistic conditions so they can deliver when America is counting on them the most. Just as in sports, you play like you practice—although we all know this isn't play, and the stakes for getting it right are very high.

That is why my amendment would investigate whether current civil and military cooperation mechanisms are sufficient for our military to replicate contested combat airspace, denied access airspace, and airspace without the use of GPS—the kinds of conditions aircrews would likely encounter if they got the call to fight tonight.

My amendment also takes a step back to look at the state of our national airspace system. It calls for an audit of special-use airspaces, military operations areas, commercial routes, and other routes, and it asks if parts of underutilized airspaces can be effectively returned to the national airspace to boost commercial route efficiencies in high-traffic areas in exchange for more generous military training flight permissions in low-traffic areas.

Comparatively, we don't get as much commercial airline traffic up in the Powder River Training Complex, creating a great opportunity for fifth-generation aircraft to really stretch their legs and meet their training needs.

I have talked a lot about our military's need to have the best training opportunities available. However, I want to clarify that this is not a one-sided amendment.

Our military goes to great lengths to respect commercial and general aviation needs, and that is reflected in my amendment. First and foremost, the FAA is consulted throughout the entire report process. Additionally, the bill reviews whether commercial and general aviation receive sufficient notice regarding exercises and special-use waivers, and, as I mentioned, it looks for ways to make Department of Defense and FAA interaction more efficient.

As a former chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and a current member of the Commerce Subcommittee on Aviation and Space, I know that the management of the national airspace is complicated. My amendment simply seeks to gather information so that we can take a productive look at our national airspace and make sure our military aviators can get the most out of their training opportunities while respecting the needs of commercial and general aviation.

The Armed Services Committee chairman and ranking member, my colleagues, and staff members have a lot of amendments to consider. Hundreds of amendments have already been filed on the National Defense Authorization Act, and there are more to come. I would ask that my amendment No. 759 be considered for inclusion as we work together to restore and modernize our military and ensure our men and women in uniform have the tools they need to defend our country.

I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ARMS SALES

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, there has been a lot of confusion and outright misinformation about some proposed arms sales to our gulf partners—specifically, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. I am grateful for the opportunity this morning to clear up a few things, especially considering the current high stakes in the region.

As many of you probably have heard, the Islamic Republic of Iran just this morning shot down an American surveillance aircraft over the Strait of Hormuz—yet another act of reckless, unprovoked aggression targeting lawful behavior on the high seas and in the skies. Still, I know that for some of my colleagues here, Iranian acts of violence are always to be excused or somehow always the fault of America and especially of the Trump administration, to which the only appropriate response is to continue to appease the ayatollahs, to send them pallets of cash, as the last administration did, and give them billions of dollars in relief for sanctions—essentially to say: Pretty please, stop your acts of terroristic aggression and imperial ambition throughout the region.

It is my duty to inform all those colleagues that this is dangerous and misguided thinking. Iran, as it did in the mid-1980s, will meet American restraint with continued aggression. It will watch the outcome of today's votes in support for our friends in the gulf for signs of resolve or weakness. I urge my fellow Senators to send the right message to Tehran.

The administration plans to sell roughly $8 billion in arms to our gulf partners so they can defend themselves, as well as the many thousands of Americans within their borders—all from Iranian aggression. Canceling those sales would not only endanger Americans overseas and deprive American industry of billions in exports, it would weaken some of the only countries in a position to effectively resist Iran's violent rampage throughout the Middle East.

We have heard many objections to these arms sales. First and most amazing, given the stakes, some Democrats object for procedural reasons. They are upset that the administration is proceeding over an informal hold placed by the senior Senator from New Jersey. In doing so, they claim that the administration is violating a long tradition of honoring informal holds by the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In effect, they are saying: Let's block arms sales to our allies in an emergency because the Secretary of State hurt the feelings of a few Senators.

The actual purpose of those holds—only a courtesy; not a rule; not a law—is to give those Senators time to fully examine a proposal and to foster engagement between the Senate and administration in good faith. But that is not how this hold is being used. These arms sales have been held for more than a year—more than a year. How much time does the Senator from New Jersey need to make up his mind? How many times does the Secretary of State have to call him and meet with him? How many briefings do they have to provide? How many memos do they have to send?

This is not a request for more information or trying to work together in good faith. This is a stalling tactic, through and through. It is yet another example of the Democrats engaged in psychological projection in accusing this administration of violating norms, when in fact they are the ones who have been violating longstanding, unwritten rules, customs, and norms.

The administration is moving forward with this sale by making an emergency declaration, as provided by law and as Presidents have done many times in the past. President Reagan proceeded with sales of air-defense systems to, yes, Saudi Arabia using this very same provision. President George H. W. Bush did so as well, selling tanks and fighter aircraft to, yes, Saudi Arabia.

Even without this precedent, can there be any doubt—any doubt that our partners in the gulf are facing a genuine emergency as they fend off Iran? Oil tankers flying the flags of our allies and partners are ablaze in the Gulf of Oman. Civilian airports, oil pipelines, and American surveillance aircraft have all come under rocket attacks from Iran's terror proxy in Yemen.

Make no mistake—this is a genuine emergency, but too few of my colleagues are willing to see the plain facts. They want to talk about anything that will change the subject from Iran and its campaign of aggression throughout the Middle East.

A second objection is that some argue that our gulf partners are somehow beneath our support. Really? It was the United Arab Emirates, after all, that hosted Pope Francis earlier this year, and he conducted a mass for Christians in that nation. The Kingdom of Jordan is another important friend caught in the crossfire of this debate. Jordan has been a reliable and trustworthy partner of the United States for many years, and today it bears the brunt of the refugee crisis and chaos created by Assad's Iran-backed butchery in Syria.

While Democrats try to frame this vote as support for our gulf partners alone, let's not forget that numerous other strong allies of the United States would be affected by these votes as well, countries like the United Kingdom and France and South Korea and Israel—all part of the supply chain affected by these deals. Rejecting these sales will hurt them, too, and now is not the time to be rejecting our friends. Of course, you couldn't make any of these observations about the Islamic Republic of Iran, which is about as likely to host the Pope as it is to host a Pride parade.

Lost in the criticism of our partners is a much more worthy discussion about the elaborate architecture of torture and repression supervised by Ayatollah Khameini, who is personally responsible for American citizens being held in appalling captivity for years at a time. One such American citizen, Bob Levinson, has been missing in Iran for more than a decade.

The same media and politicians who trumpet every misdeed of America's steadfast partners in the region—regardless of whether such misdeeds are fact or fiction—are strangely silent about the undisputed fact that Iran has the blood on its hands of more than 600 American troops in Iraq in the last decade. Six hundred Americans were killed at the hands of Iran. Yet we propose to deny arms sales to some of the only countries that are committed to resisting Iran's bloodstained, anti-American theocracy? It is time to get our priorities straight.

Third, still other critics fault our gulf partners for their involvement in the civil war in Yemen, as though they are the aggressors in Yemen rather than states that were pulled into a conflict to push an Iranian-armed rebel group off of the Arabian Peninsula at the request of the Government of Yemen and with the support of the United Nations. Evidently, some of my fellow Senators would counsel our gulf partners to do nothing as a rebel group, armed by their sworn enemy, plunged a neighboring country into chaos, shooting rockets at their airports and oil pipelines. That would indeed be quite a restrained foreign policy. Some might also call it the height of stupidity that we would never tolerate for our own citizens.

As to the appalling human rights conditions in Yemen, I think the current U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, Matthew Tueller, said it best to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: ''Almost 100 percent of the humanitarian catastrophe in Yemen has been caused by the Iranian-backed Houthis.'' Almost 100 percent. Mr. Tueller is not some Trump appointee. He is not some partisan hack. He is a career Foreign Service officer who served as Ambassador to Yemen under, yes, President Obama. If there is anyone in the U.S. Government who is in a position to know what is going on in Yemen and who is to blame for the carnage in Yemen, it is the man on the ground rather than politicians in Washington.

Underlying this whole debate is a romantic wish—a naive delusion—that our foreign policy can always be pristine, requiring no compromises whatsoever, no acknowledgment of the messy facts around the world, or even that we could flee away from that messy, complicated, dangerous world entirely, relying solely on the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans to keep us safe. A cursory review of history proves that neither option is available. A cursory review of newspaper headlines proves it too.

Our main adversary in the Middle East—the Islamic Republic of Iran—is a revolutionary power dedicated, from its inception years ago, to the destruction of Americans and, indeed, America itself. They don't try to hide it. ''Death to America'' is their slogan, and they chant it all the time. Our departure from the field will not dissuade the ayatollahs from that purpose; it will only embolden them, as will the abandonment of our allies in the region.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam President, the arms industry is a unique industry. It is not like making shoes or apparel. It is not like selling watches. You are selling things that, when used properly, kill other people. They are deadly weapons that we have. We have accumulated the technology by the taxpayer paying for this. We have helicopters, planes, guided missiles, and we are able to refuel planes.

It is not a jobs program, and it is not something that—we don't willy-nilly give weapons to everyone. We don't sell weapons to Russia and we don't sell weapons to China because we have disagreements, and we don't think it would be in our best interest to sell weapons to them.

We also don't sell weapons, typically, to people we think are untrustworthy. I think there is every evidence that Saudi Arabia can be put in that category. When you have direct evidence and when our own intelligence community has concluded that there is high confidence that the Crown Prince of Saudi Arabia butchered a dissident with a bone saw in a consulate in a foreign country, you would think that would give us pause as to giving Saudi Arabia or selling Saudi Arabia more weapons.

But it is worse than that. We are not only selling Saudi Arabia offensive weapons, we are also talking about giving them nuclear technology. The nuclear technology, they say, is only for energy, but you have to wonder. A country that sits atop one of the largest oil reserves in the world is now saying ''Oh, we don't have enough fossil fuel. We need nuclear power''? There have been people who have gotten nuclear technology and then have moved on to nuclear weapons.

What could possibly be the worst thing to happen to the Middle East? It would be to have three powers there with nuclear weapons. We had Iran before. They now have the knowledge to enrich. They made an agreement not to enrich. They are still threatening to enrich uranium. What do you think will happen if Saudi Arabia gets nuclear technology and there is any rumor of their progressing on towards developing nuclear weapons? What will Iran do? Automatically, they will do the same thing.

It also happens in the conventional weapons arena. So every time we sell or give missiles to Saudi Arabia, what do you think Iran does? They have to either buy more or make more. It is an arms race. We are feeding both sides of an arms race.

But you will hear people in Washington say: But Iran—they are a malign influence. Well, yeah. So is Saudi Arabia. But what do we do when we have two powers that show tendencies toward evil and show tendencies toward acting in ways that are against our national interest? Do we just blindly give weapons to anybody who is opposed to Iran because Iran is a malign influence? Well, what about Saudi Arabia? They have spent $100 billion spreading this radical jihadism to other cultures; $100 billion around the world preaching hatred of Christians, hatred of Jews, hatred of Hindus. Yet we give them more weapons.

There is a madrasa supported by Saudi Arabia—that is a so-called religious school in Pakistan—and 80 percent of the boys who graduate from the school—because, of course, girls aren't allowed to go to school under this kind of religion—80 percent of the boys who graduate from the school fight in the Taliban against the United States. Why would we give weapons to a country that teaches hatred of our country and actually trains fighters to fight against our soldiers? What person in what insane world thinks it is a good idea to fund people who fundamentally don't like us? Why in the world do we keep doing this?

Last week, we voted on sending weapons to Qatar. Do you know who Qatar supplies weapons with? Hamas. I thought we were allies with Israel. But we fund Qatar, which sends missiles and weapons to Hamas, who then bombs Israel. Qatar also hosts fundraisers for ISIS. Remember ISIS—the ones chopping people's heads off? Why would we give weapons to countries that give weapons to our enemies?

In the Syrian civil war, we went in on the side of those who were opposed to Assad. Now, Assad is no saint, no Democrat, no Jeffersonian Democrat, no believer in freedom; yet the people on the other side—most of them hate Israel. Most of them despise any rights for women. Most of them—many of them are allied with al-Qaida. Who is al-Qaida? The people who attacked us on 9/11. Al-Nusra, al-Qaida, ISIS—who do they get weapons from? Saudi Arabia and Qatar.

Even Hillary Clinton admitted this in one of the emails that were released. Hillary Clinton was talking to John Podesta by email, and she said: We have to do something about this. Saudi Arabia and Qatar are arming and providing logistical help to ISIS.

So why does it go on? Some would say: Because people make a big profit on this. This is a jobs program for the arms industry, and we have to make sure they make their profit.

I disagree. This is an industry that uniquely has to do with our national interests. It is uniquely paid for by the taxpayer. These weapons are owned by the taxpayer, and we should not sell them to people who are not our friends.

This is what the debate is about today. We will vote shortly on whether or not we should sell offensive weapons to Saudi Arabia.

What are they doing with the weapons? Well, they are bombing civilians in Yemen, for one. They are transferring some of the weapons in Yemen to al-Qaida. Al-Qaida and the larger umbrella group that attacked us on 9/11 are active. They are called AQAP in Yemen. There are news reports in the last week that Saudi Arabia is indiscriminantly giving arms to anybody who is opposed to the group they are fighting against, the Houthis.

Who supports the Houthis? The Iranians.

Is one side better than the other?

Are we so blind to the malign influence of Saudi Arabia that we give money and weapons to anybody regardless of what they do? You can chop up a dissident. You can cut a dissident up to pieces with a bone saw, and we will still give you weapons?

My goodness, I can't imagine. I do not think that people in this body who will continue to sell weapons to Saudi Arabia are listening to the people at home. I guarantee, if we asked the people at home, if we had a national poll and everybody got to give their opinion, how many people at home do you think are saying: Oh, well, they just chopped up a dissident—no big deal. Let's just keep sending them weapons. Oh, well, they are giving weapons to Hamas. Yes, you know, we don't really care. Or, well, they are bombing civilians.

The Saudis killed 150 people at a funeral procession—people marching at a funeral procession. They knew it was a funeral procession. This was no fog of war, no mistake. This was an intentional act to kill people at a funeral procession. There were 150 people killed and 450 wounded. About 1 year ago, they killed 40 schoolchildren on a schoolbus.

They are indiscriminately bombing civilians, and they are blockading Yemen, which is one of the poorest countries on the planet. Millions of people—some estimate between 14 and 17 million people—live on the edge of starvation because of this war. The Saudis are preventing food from coming in. They have blockaded Hodeida, which is one of the key ports where food needs to come in. Yemen imports 80 percent of their food. The Saudis are blockading them and people are starving, and we are allied with Saudis. We supply them with bombs that they drop on civilians and until the last few months we were refueling the very planes that were dropping the bombs.

People talk sometimes about, you know, a dream of peace in the Middle East. If you want to have a peace plan in the Middle East, people say: Well, it is Israel and Palestine who have to come to a peace agreement.

Do you know what the bigger problem is—an even bigger problem than that conundrum—which is a conundrum? It is figuring out how to have peace between Saudi Arabia and their allies and Iran. Everything around here is Iran, Iran, Iran, Iran. Do you know who spends the third-most amount of money on the military in the world? Saudi Arabia. First, it is the United States. We spend more than the next 10 countries combined. We spend more than all the rest of NATO combined, for that matter. Then, a distant second is China, and, then, there is Saudi Arabia.

Saudi Arabia spends more on their military than Russia and more than most of our NATO allies. Yet people say: Oh, we have to give them more arms because Iran is a bad actor. What if they are both bad actors?

Currently, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf sheikdoms around them spend 8 times more than Iran. I am not saying Iran is a great place or that the government is great. What I am saying is, when you have two bad actors, when you have two malign influences, do you think we always have to choose the lesser of two evils? Do we have to always look askance and say: Oh, whatever—you know, as long as we are doing something that is opposed to Iran.

One of our other so-called allies over there is Bahrain. We have a naval base there, and we say: It is important to have a naval base, and we have to look the other way. They have 4,000 political prisoners. Saudi Arabia actually imprisons people for political reasons, and they don't just kill them. They behead them and crucify them—I think, in that order. They put the bodies out for public display.

They executed a guy named Sheikh Nimr al-Nimr, who was of a minority religion. The Saudis are Sunnis. This guy was a Shia religious person and spokesman. He was executed. His nephew is being held in prison and has been for several years now. He was 17 when he was arrested. His crime was sending a text message to encourage people to protest against the authoritarian regime of Saudi Arabia.

I think the problem is that some people come to the conclusion that arms are always good and we should never do anything to condition the sale of arms to behavior. Well, I am not for sending more arms there, period, because it is a cauldron always threatening to boil over.

Let's say you were someone who would say: Oh, no, we have to arm them. Perhaps we should condition arms on good behavior. Perhaps, if you are cutting up a dissident with a bone saw in a foreign country, maybe we should stop arms for a while to see if maybe you can get better people in the government or maybe to see if your ways will change.

Saudi Arabia said: Oh, we are doing it differently now. We are not going to fund radical jihadism around the world.

But they spent $100 billion infecting the world with the ideas of hatred of the West, hatred of Christians, hatred of Jews, and hatred of Hindus. There used to be a couple hundred of these schools in Pakistan. There is now said to be 20,000 schools in Pakistan. The Saudis support schools not just in Pakistan but throughout the world—in Indonesia and India and all over the Middle East. They support these schools that teach intolerance and hatred of the West. Yet we are one of their biggest arms suppliers. It makes utterly no sense, and it should be reconsidered.

We will have a chance to vote today, and the numbers are growing. When I first introduced a resolution to disapprove of arm sales to Saudi Arabia, I think I got 22 votes. We did it again a couple of months later, and I think we got in the forties. I think there is a chance today that we will get close to 60 votes.

We will have to get to 67 to overcome a Presidential veto. Look, I am a big fan of the President on many fronts, but on this someone has to stand up, even a Member of his own party and say: Arms sales are not jobs programs, and they should be conditioned on behavior, and we should not sell arms to countries that hate us.

As for these countries that burn our flag and chant ''Death to America,'' we shouldn't be arming them.

At one point in time, there were reports about ISIS. Remember the people who were beheading people in the desert over the last couple of years and spreading throughout the region? There were reports that they have $1 billion worth of Humvees. Some of them were captured, but some came because of indiscriminate arms. There are arms everywhere.

So when we had the Syrian civil war going on, all throughout the news media—public, private, everywhere—everyone was saying that Saudi Arabia and Qatar were giving arms to anybody, indiscriminantly giving arms to people. One of the groups that got arms and one of the groups that got antitank weapons—these are shoulder-launched missiles—said in a news report right after they got them: When we are done with Assad—they didn't talk about ISIS, and most of them didn't care about ISIS because they actually kind of agree with ISIS's religion—we are going after Israel next.

So we are arming people who are potential if not real enemies of Israel. We are arming people who are teaching hatred of the West, hatred of Christians, hatred of Hindus, and hatred of Jews. We are arming these people. Why are we doing that?

Let's say you don't agree with everything I have said, and you say: Well, maybe we should get them to behave better. Why don't you withhold arms for 6 months at the least?

Why don't we just stop for a while?

They have enough arms to blow up the Middle East 10 times over. Is there just no stopping? Is there no limitation to what we will do? Do we not believe that any of our arms sales should be conditioned on behavior?

This is a big deal and a big vote, and it is my hope that the American people will watch how people vote and decide: Is this who I want representing me? Do I want someone representing me who is selling arms to people who hate our country, who spend hundreds of billions of dollars on schools teaching hatred of our country? Do I want to have people representing me who continue to flood the Middle East with arms?

That is what this vote is about, and I hope the American public will pay attention to how people vote today and to which direction they want the country to go in.

We have had enough war. This is something I agree with the President on. We have had enough war. We have

been at war too long in too many places.

We have been 19 years in Afghanistan, and to what end? I was for the initial purpose of getting those who attacked us on 9/11. I would have voted to go. But after 19 years, it is nation-building. We are spending $50 billion a year. We build roads, and they blow them up. We build schools, and they blow them up.

We have roads and schools crumbling in our country. We don't have an extra $50 billion to spend in Afghanistan. We are $1 trillion short this year. We are going to spend $4 trillion, and we are bringing in $1 trillion—not great economics, not great budget balancing on our part.

No. 1, we cannot afford to try to be everywhere all the time, and, No. 2, the money we are spending overseas is counterproductive.

We went into Iraq and toppled a dictator. What did we get? Chaos. In the chaos we get ISIS and other groups forming.

We went into Libya and toppled the dictator in Libya. What did we get? Chaos. It is so confusing in Libya that I am not even sure which side the U.S. Government is supporting. They were supporting the U.N.-sanctioned government and now they appear to be supporting military generals who are trying to overthrow that government.

One thing is for sure: The country of Qatar that we voted to send arms to last week is supporting the side opposite us. So we give arms to people who are directly involved in a civil war where we are involved on the other side of the civil war. To me, it seems utterly preposterous that we keep doing that. There is Qatar's support for the other side in Libya and their support for Hamas. They are letting ISIS and al-Qaida do fundraising in their country.

Maybe we need to take a break from the arms race in the Middle East.

I don't think that someone can make a practical or reasonable argument that there has been more peace since we sent more weapons over there. They have plenty of weapons to kill each other for another thousand years. They have been killing each other for 1,000 years. They have enough weapons to kill each other for another 1,000 years.

Maybe we don't need to be involved in every civil war in the world. Maybe we can't afford it, and maybe when we have gotten involved, we had the unintended consequences of actually making it worse.

People have this idea that when you topple a dictator, somehow the next person they elect is going to be Thomas Jefferson. Well, guess what. Every time we have toppled a dictator, the people they end up electing are not Thomas Jefferson. Sometimes in the elections we don't like whom they elected in the elections and people go back and topple them again.

So when Egypt actually had an election, they elected somebody from the Muslim Brotherhood. Many in the Middle East and many in our country didn't want him. So we helped to get rid of him, and now we have a military rule with no elections and with the idea that you can be detained without trial. People say: Well, it is stable. It is another military autocracy, but we are going to put up with it.

We need to rethink our approach to the Middle East. We need to rethink the approach that we need to arm one or both sides in every war. We need to think whether regime change is a good idea, and we need to look at the practical effects of our foreign policy and say: Are we safer somehow?

I think one universal truth is that we are usually poorer by the time we are done, because what we end up doing is spending good money after bad.

I will give you a couple of examples in Afghanistan. In Afghanistan we spent $90 million in a luxury hotel in downtown Kabul. You say: How does that $90 million hotel protect us? Well, it doesn't, but it is money. Money runs through all this. Somebody is getting rich, but not the American taxpayer.

The guy who built it, I think, was a Jordanian national, but he built a shell of a hotel. He took the $90 million. He got all the payment, and it was never built. It mostly doesn't have walls, and none of it was completed. It is now a danger because it sits up across from our embassy and snipers crawl up in the building.

So the thing is that we asked for $90 million, and we need more now because, apparently, we now need to tear it down because it is a danger to our embassy and our soldiers.

So if we could just get $200,000 more, they are going to spend another couple hundred thousand dollars tearing down a hotel that we asked you to build in the first place, which we had no business building whatsoever.

We built a gas station for them in Afghanistan, too. But because our purpose in the military is now sometimes to fight the enemy but also to fight climate change—you didn't know this, but part of the military's goal is climate change now—so we built them a gas station. But we want to reduce the carbon footprint. So we built a gas station that sells natural gas. Well, the problem was, No. 1, nobody in Afghanistan has a car. The average income is about $800. Almost nobody has a car, and no one has one that burns natural gas.

So what they did is that they had to give them credit cards and buy them cars that actually ran on natural gas.

We wanted to visit over there and the military said it was too dangerous to take us there. So we have no idea if it is even in operation at this point.

I say we need to rethink this, and I urge today a vote against selling more arms to Saudi Arabia.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will be voting in support of the resolutions of disapproval, and let me tell you why. A strategic relationship with the United States should be coveted, and the difference between a relationship and a strategic relationship is very important.

We deal with people all the time that engage in practices that we don't like, abhor, and are against. Sometimes you have to sit down and talk with Putin about Syria. Sometimes you have to sit down and talk with the Chinese, even though they imprison the Uighurs. And there are even more egregious examples of the people you have to deal with, because that is part of the world as it is. But when you have a strategic relationship—and we have had one with Saudi Arabia for years—it is different.

What brings me here today? I want the people in Saudi Arabia—I have many friends there. I value my relationships there.

I appreciate all that Saudi Arabia has done in the past to work with the United States, militarily and otherwise, but I want to be clear to my friends in Saudi Arabia—and really throughout the world—a strategic relationship has certain requirements attached to it. You don't have to run your country like the United States would have you do. You don't have to mirror the United States in terms of your values, but you do have to respect the relationship.

There are certain minimum requirements that I think come with a strategic relationship: No. 1, you cannot kill somebody in the most brutal fashion in a consulate of another country—which violates every norm known to the international community—because they wrote a bad article about you.

You cannot imprison people and torture them in the fashion that has been going on in Saudi Arabia.

You cannot hold the Prime Minister of another country captive for a period of time to bend them to your will.

You cannot rendition people that just simply oppose your views. Terrorism cannot be defined as simple dissent.

The reason I am voting with Senator PAUL and others today is to send a signal to Saudi Arabia that if you act the way you are acting, there is no space for a strategic relationship. There is no amount of oil you can produce that will get me and others to give you a pass on chopping somebody up in a consulate. Did MBS do it? Yes—not because the U.N. said so but because our intelligence and my common sense lead me to believe there is no other viable alternative. You can figure this one out pretty quickly.

What happens next? It cannot be business as usual. Saudi Arabia has been a partner. They will have to be a partner in the future. Shooting rockets into Saudi Arabia from Yemen—Iran supporting the Houthi rebels—bothers me. Defensive armaments, I support, but the war in Yemen is out of control.

I am trying to deliver the strongest message I know how to deliver: Don't take this relationship for granted—and obviously you have.

It is disrespectful to the President of the United States to put him in this position. It is disrespectful to all the allies in Congress for you to put us in this position. Clearly, you don't care that much about this relationship. You care more about the critics and maintaining power at any and all cost.

Here is the deal: My relationship with Saudi Arabia is forever changed, and it will not go back to the way it used to be until Saudi Arabia changes its behavior. The leadership of Saudi Arabia has charted a course that is unsustainable. I reject. There is no amount of oil that can be produced to change my view that our values are more important than oil. We can get oil from other people, but your values come from within.

There is no amount of threat coming from Iran that is going to require me to give a pass to this brutal, barbaric behavior. More is expected of a strategic partner. Saudi Arabia doesn't protect the United States from Iran. To believe otherwise is recasting conditions on the ground.

Saudi Arabia has been a partner. I hope they can be in the future, but Saudi Arabia, through their leadership, made a tremendously bad decision, and it is just not Mr. Khashoggi. Until you change in Saudi Arabia, until you embrace the concept that the strategic relationship with the United States is important, therefore, I must respect it—I am not telling you how to run your country. I am not saying you have to be a Jeffersonian democracy. I respect the right of self-determination by all people, but I will not bless or turn a blind eye to brutality that, in my view, disqualifies a person or a country from being a strategic partner.

If this doesn't do it, what would? If we give this a pass, what is next?

We are going to stand up to the thugs in Iran. We are going to push back against China's cheating. We are going after al-Qaida, ISIS, and all the other bad actors on the planet. We are going to work with people we don't like, but when it comes to a strategic partnership, we need to put the world on notice: It comes with a minimum price, and that price is you cannot have a strategic relationship with the United States and behave in a fashion that shows no respect for human dignity, no respect for international norms.

You have lost me, and that is too bad. I have been on this floor a lot standing up for our friends in Saudi Arabia—which has not always been easy to do—but the days of treating Saudi Arabia the way I used to treat them are over.

My hope is we can find a way to restart this relationship, but it is going to require change. That is why I am voting to support these resolutions.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I come to the floor again to urge my colleagues to stand up for Congress as a coequal branch of government and assert our institutional rights in the arms sales process.

I want to thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined with me in this effort to bring us here today.

As we get ready to vote on these resolutions, I want to again remind my colleagues what is at stake here. At the end of the day, these votes are not about any one President or any one arms sale. There will be another President in the White House someday. There will be another President who will want to claim Executive authorities to run over Congress and who will want to use emergency declarations to push through their agenda. We in this body must embrace our article I responsibilities and ensure that we serve as an effective check on whoever that Executive is.

Regarding these resolutions, in particular, we must both assert our role in upholding the rule of law at home and use our position to ensure that when our government seeks to sell weapons, those sales advance our national security interests and our values. It is the Congress that provided the President with the authority to sell arms while retaining strong oversight in the process.

At the risk of getting in the weeds, I want to briefly explain why Secretary Pompeo's 22 emergency certifications don't meet the basic requirements laid out by Congress in the Arms Export Control Act. I will be submitting a further statement for the RECORD detailing my statutory concerns, and I encourage my colleagues to read it.

First of all, Secretary Pompeo provided us with one single emergency declaration for 22 separate arms sales, when the law requires each come with its own individual justification. It is obvious why the Secretary flouted the statute: His bogus emergency doesn't pass the laugh test, in general. Furthermore, the Secretary is trying to justify these sales by relying on a section of the Arms Export Control Act—article 36(c)—that arguably does not grant him the authority to do what he is even trying to do.

Congress made fairly clear back in 2000 that this provision only allows for the United States to make emergency arms sales in very limited situations—for example, to sell arms to NATO partners and other steadfast allies that share our values, like Israel, Australia, and Japan.

This is a power grab, pure and simple, with lasting implications for the role of Congress in the sale of arms around the world. We cannot, as an institution, stand for it.

Let me turn to the proposed sales. As a number of my colleagues and I have already laid out, the administration's argument that this is an emergency meriting pushing through $8 billion worth of arms sales to Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates simply does not pass muster.

The weapons sales this administration is trying to push through without congressional review will not in any way equip the United States or our allies to better face any imminent threats from Iran.

The Assistant Secretary of State, R. Clarke Cooper, admitted as much multiple times last week before the House of Representatives. In one instance, he noted that the administration had been considering this emergency determination for months. In another, he conceded that a majority of these sales will not even be functional or come online for months or, even in some cases, years.

Let's take a moment to review why last year I decided to put a hold on a sale of 60,000 precision-guided munition kits. Saudi Arabia, at the helm of its coalition, has used these weapons to devastating effects in Yemen. The two resolutions we will consider individually relate to the sales of precision-guided munitions and parts.

We have heard that these weapons are humanitarian weapons. When they are used to precisely target civilians, how can we possibly continue to sell them? These are components of bombs that we know have killed thousands of civilians in Yemen—patients in hospitals, children on schoolbuses. In fact, the Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project last week released data showing more than 90,000 people have been killed in Yemen since 2015. The list goes on.

Yemen has become a humanitarian catastrophe. Twelve thousand people have died under the Saudi-led coalition. There are 85,000 children who have died from starvation in Yemen, an incomprehensible moral tragedy. Another 14 million people remain at risk, especially as cholera resurges across the country.

This is the challenge we have. It is our bombs that are dropping on those civilians. We cannot morally continue to support such a sale.

Secondly, Saudi Arabia, which continues to do this with impunity, also with impunity went ahead and dismembered Jamal Khashoggi, a journalist who was a resident here in the United States. The gruesome report of the U.N. Special Rapporteur on this issue is chilling. If the Senate wants to make it very clear that even if you are an ally, you cannot kill with impunity, this is the moment.

It is also the moment to tell the UAE that you can't take our weapons and give it to others whom we consider people on the terrorist list. That is going on here too.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for the Constitution, stand up for article I in our rights here, stand up for the Senate's institutional role to ultimately ensure that it has a say on arms sales, stand up for the proposition that we will not let any ally, simply because they are an ally, kill a journalist with impunity—something we cherish under our Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the freedom of expression under the First Amendment—and stand up for the proposition that we will not let our bombs fall on innocent civilians and have the moral responsibility, which will be a blemish on our history for years to come.

This is the moment for the Senate to stand up to its institutional prerogatives. This is the moment for the Senate to stand up for the Constitution. I have heard so many of my colleagues speak of the Constitution. This is the moment. This is the moment to stand up for some moral clarity.

This is the moment to send a global message: You cannot kill journalists with impunity. That is the message we must send to Saudi Arabia.

Vote yes on the resolutions of disapproval. Stand up for these propositions. Let's have a moment in which the Senate can be a profile in courage.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, in just a few moments, we are going to consider S.J. Res. 28 through S.J. Res. 48. I urge my colleagues to oppose these resolutions and to consider the sales that we are talking about here on their own merits.

First of all, we are not talking about the killing of Mr. Khashoggi. That was a murderous act; it was an awful act; and it cannot be condoned or tolerated in any way, shape, or form. Yet it is not what we are voting on here today. Indeed, we hope to eventually bring to the floor a resolution, possibly even a bill, that speaks to that horrific act. Those negotiations have been going on for some time, and we hope to reach a conclusion, but we are not talking about that. We are talking about arms sales that the administration has determined are needed—and on which we have all been briefed—because of the current situation in the Middle East.

I want to speak very briefly about recent events that have been happening as far as Iran is concerned. Iran is conducting activities that are very worrisome and very troubling. When you have these kinds of things happen, it is obvious that a miscalculation can occur, which is the most worrisome thing here.

In any event, these arms sales are needed. To be clear, in the current statute, the administration is within its legal authority to declare an emergency. As stipulated in the Arms Export Control Act, which was passed by this body, the President can act swiftly if he concludes an emergency exists that requires a proposed sale that is in the national security interest of the United States. That has occurred.

Presidential authority to waive congressional notification was invoked for the very first time by President Carter in 1979. It has been used on three other subsequent occasions. The administration has said, as in those cases, this is a one-time invocation of the waiver authority in response to an acute threat from Iran. The administration has since returned to the regular congressional notification process for further arms sales, which is in place today.

These sales are needed to address the legitimate security requirements of other countries we support in response to there being numerous threats from Iran and its proxies. These threats are real. As the events over just even the recent 24 hours have shown us, it is important that these countries be ready to assist us and to act on their own behalf to counter what Iran has been doing.

Yesterday, Iranian-backed Houthi militants struck a Saudi civilian desalinization plant with a land attack cruise missile.

Last night, Iranian forces shot down a U.S. drone that was operating in international airspace over the Strait of Hormuz. It is the third U.S. aircraft they have targeted in recent weeks.

Last week, using limpet mines, Iran attacked two oil tankers that were traveling near the Strait of Hormuz. Yesterday, German Chancellor Merkel cited strong evidence that attributes that attack to Iran. There are very few people in the world who don't know for a fact that it has been Iran that has been responsible for all of this.

On that same day last week, the Iranian-supported Houthis fired a missile at Abha International Airport, in southern Saudi Arabia, and wounded 26 innocent Saudi civilians. Human Rights Watch announced this Houthi attack as a war crime.

On May 19, a rocket—likely by Iran's proxies—landed near the American Embassy in Baghdad.

On May 14, Iran's proxies used drones to strike two strategically important Saudi oil facilities.

Just 2 days earlier, on May 12, four more tankers were targeted by Iran while they were anchored in an Emirati port.

Each month, Iranian-sponsored Houthi rebels launch over 15 ballistic missiles and weaponized, unmanned aerial systems against Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates. This poses a significant threat and endangers the lives of 80,000 Americans who reside on the Arabian Peninsula.

These are the most recent examples of Iran's destabilizing actions on the world stage. These are serious, serious matters. As I said before, this is worrisome; this is troubling. The miscalculation of these kinds of things cause hostilities that lead to very large wars.

As Iran thinks through these things and calibrates them and tries to make determinations as to what is in its best interest, it is not going well. If you listen to Iran's public statements, they clearly do not coincide with facts. More importantly, Iran is miscalculating the resolve of the American people. It is miscalculating the fact that it is dealing with President Trump; it is not dealing with a former President.

I have talked to the President about this many times. He does not want to go to war with Iran. The American people don't want to go to war with Iran. This body does not want to go to war with Iran. This President is absolutely committed to protecting U.S. lives and U.S. interests, and he will do so. Iran should not miscalculate on that matter, for the President is deeply committed to that proposition.

Iran needs to back away from the edge that it has taken everyone to and deal with this matter entirely differently than it has, or there are going to be dire consequences.

In the face of the attacks I have described and the intimidation, our allies have an obligation to develop capabilities to protect their citizens from such threats. These arms sales are an essential part of our effort in helping them build those capabilities and resist Iranian intimidation.

I share my fellow Senators' concerns about the humanitarian crisis in Yemen and the need for all combatants to avoid civilian casualties. This package includes the sales of precision weapons, which, when combined with partner efforts to improve intelligence in targeting, will enable those who use the weapons to ensure their actions are precise, discriminate, and proportional so as to minimize civilian casualties. The precision munitions in these sales would also prove to be essential to other countries' efforts in defending themselves from more direct attacks from Iran.

Some of us have been briefed by U.S. personnel who have worked specifically with the Saudis to make these improvements, and I encourage my colleagues to have similar conversations. If you care about reducing civilian casualties, you should be an enthusiastic supporter of providing these exacting capabilities, which will be transferred pursuant to these sales. These are important for reducing civilian casualties, and we should all support them.

In closing, I will repeat several key points.

First, the emergency declaration is legal.

Second, these sales are necessary to answer for the legitimate security requirements of other nations that work to keep safe our fellow Americans who work, travel, and live around the world.

Third, to reject these sales at this time and under these circumstances is to reward recent Iranian aggression, to encourage further Iranian escalation, and most importantly, to encourage the miscalculation on the part of the Iranians, which will be disastrous if

they continue down the road they are going.

For all of these reasons, I urge my colleagues to vote against these resolutions.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 36

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read S.J. Res. 36 for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

Mr. MENENDEZ. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 177 Leg.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand	Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 36) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 36

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of a manufacturing license, technical assistance license, or export license with respect to any of the following proposed agreements or transfers to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Italian Republic is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1427 (EC–1427) submitted to Congress pursuant to subsections (c) and (d) of section 36 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019:

(A) Coproduction and manufacture in Saudi Arabia of Paveway Pre-Amp Circuit Card Assemblies (CCA), Guidance Electronics Assembly (GEA) CCAs, and Control Actuator System (CAS) CCAs for all Paveway variants.

(B) Coproduction and manufacture in Saudi Arabia of Paveway II Guidance Electronics Detector Assemblies (GEDA) and Computer Control Groups (CCG).

(C) The transfer of up to 64,603 additional kits, partial kits, and full-up-rounds.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 38

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read S.J. Res. 38 for the third time.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 178 Leg.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—2

Gillibrand	Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 38

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1422 (EC–1422) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the manufacture of the Aurora Fuzing System for the Paveway IV Precision Guided Bomb Program.

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 27, S.J. RES. 28, S.J. RES. 29, S.J. RES. 30, S.J. RES. 31, S.J. RES. 32, S.J. RES. 33, S.J. RES. 34, S.J. RES. 35, S.J. RES. 37, S.J. RES. 39, S.J. RES. 40, S.J. RES. 41, S.J. RES 42, S.J. RES. 43, S.J. RES. 44, S.J. RES 45, S.J. RES. 46, S.J. RES. 47, AND S.J. RES. 48 EN BLOC

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the clerk will read for the third time the remaining disapproval resolutions en bloc by number.

The joint resolutions were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and were read the third time.

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

Mr. WYDEN. 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 179 Leg.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Carper	Feinstein
Bennet	Casey	Graham
Blumenthal	Collins	Harris
Booker	Coons	Hassan
Brown	Cortez Masto	Heinrich
Cantwell	Duckworth	Hirono
Cardin	Durbin	Jones

Kaine	Murray	Smith
King	Paul	Stabenow
Klobuchar	Peters	Tester
Leahy	Reed	Udall
Manchin	Rosen	Van Hollen
Markey	Sanders	Warner
Menendez	Schatz	Warren
Merkley	Schumer	Whitehouse
Moran	Shaheen	Wyden
Murphy	Sinema	Young

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—4

Blackburn	Lee
Gillibrand	Rounds

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 27) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 27

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, and Australia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1424 (EC–1424) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the marketing, sale and on-going support for the ScanEagle and Integrator Unmanned Aerial Systems and for future Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) requirements for end-use by the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces; and hardware and defense services related to Wide Area Surveillance Payload (Redkite), laser designator, and integration of maritime search payload—Visual Detection and Ranging (ViDAR).

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 28

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17–39, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 20 RQ–21A Blackjack Unmanned Air Vehicles (UAVs); 40 Global Positioning Systems (GPS) with Selective Availability Anti-Spoofing Module (SAASM) Type II (MPE–S); air vehicle support equipment including 8 Ground Control Stations (GCS), 4 launchers, and 4 retrievers; spare and repair parts; publications; training; and technical support services.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 29) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 29

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 19–01, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of follow-on logistics support and service for the Royal Saudi Air Force aircraft, engines, and weapons; publications and technical documentation; support equipment; spare and repair parts; repair and return; calibration support and test equipment; personnel equipment; United States Government and contractor technical and logistics support; and other elements of program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 30) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 30

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 19–18, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of a blanket-order United States Marine Corps training, training support, and other training related services in support of the United Arab Emirates Presidential Guard Command.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 31) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 31

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 18–31, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of spare and repair parts, United States Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of program support for the Tactical Air Surveillance System aircraft program.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 32) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 18–21, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of follow-on support and services for Royal Saudi Air Force aircraft, engines, and weapons; publications and technical documentation; support equipment; spare and repair parts; repair and return; calibration support and test equipment; personnel equipment; United States Government and contractor technical and logistics support; and other related elements of program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 33) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 33

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17–73, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 20,004 Advanced Precision Kill Weapon Systems (APKWS) II All-Up-Rounds; weapons support and test equipment; spares; technical publications; personnel training; other training equipment; transportation; United States Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistical and program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 34) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 34

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17–70, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 331 Javelin Guided Missiles with container; System Integration and Checkout (SICO) service; Field Service Representative; United States Government and contractor technical and logistic support services' tools and test equipment; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 35

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following proposed foreign military sale to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The sale of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Transmittal No. 17–0B, submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(b)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 4, 2019: The proposed sale of 28 AH–64E Remanufactured Apache Attack Helicopters; 10 new AH–64E Apache Attack Helicopters; 76 T700–GE–701D Engines (56 remanufactured, 18 new, 6 spares, 2 installed); 40 AN/ASQ–170 Modernized Target Acquisition and Designation Sight/AN/AAR–11 Modernized Pilot Night Vision Sensors (28 remanufactured, 10 new, 2 spares); 32 remanufactured AN/APR–48B Modernized Radar Frequency Interferometers; 47 AAR–57 Common Missile Warning Systems (31 remanufactured, 10 new, 6 spares); 150 Embedded Global Positioning Systems with Inertial Navigation (60 remanufactured, 74 new, 16 spares); 45 Manned-Unmanned Teaming-International (MUMTi) systems (28 remanufactured, 10 new, 7 spares); and 15 new MUMTi System Upper Receivers, training devices, helmets, simulators, generators, transportation, wheeled vehicles and organization equipment, spare and repair parts,

support equipment, tools and test equipment, technical data and publications, personnel training and training equipment, United States Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics support.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 37) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 37

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to any of the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, or France is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including defense services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1425 (EC–1425) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of 44,000 GBU–12 Paveway II Kits and the proposed transfer of 16,000 GBU–10 Paveway II Kits.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 39) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 39

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the United Arab Emirates and United Kingdom of the following export of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1426 (EC–1426) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposal to amend a technical assistance agreement to support the installation, integration, modification, maintenance, and repair of F110–GE–132 gas turbine engines for use in F–16 Aircraft by the General Headquarters of the Armed Forces of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to India, Israel, Republic of Korea, and Kingdom of Saudi Arabia of the following license for export of certain defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1417 (EC–1417) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed manufacturing agreement with Huneed Technologies Company, Ltd. in South Korea to transfer defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support manufacture, production, test, inspection, modification, enhancement, rework, and repair of F/A18E/F and derivative series aircraft panels for end use by the Boeing Company.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 41) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 41

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates of the following license for export of technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1419 (EC–1419) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed technical assistance agreement providing technical data and defense services to Saudi Arabia and United Arab Emirates in support of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia Ministry of Defense Transformation Project.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to any of the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is prohibited:

(1) The transfer to the United Arab Emirates and to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the following defense articles, including technical data and defense services, described in Executive Communication 1421 (EC–1421) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed technical assistance agreement with Armed Forces of the United Arab Emirates to transfer defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support preparation shipment, delivery, and acceptance of the Guidance Enhanced (GEM–T) in support of the Patriot Program for end use by the Government of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 43

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1418 (EC–1418) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of technical data and defense services in order to provide technically qualified personnel to advise and assist the Royal Saudi Air Force (RSAF) in maintenance and training for the RSAF F–15 fleet of aircraft.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 44) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 44

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed retransfer of defense articles from the United Arab Emirates to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is prohibited:

(1) The retransfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1428 (EC–1428) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 3(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2753(d)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed retransfer of 500 Paveway II laser guided bombs (including Mk–82 warheads, FMU–152A/B fuzes, and guidance kits) from the United Arab Emirates to Jordan.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 45

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1416 (EC–1416) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of 15,000 120mm M933A1 mortar bombs to Saudi Arabia for end use by the Royal Land Forces of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 46) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 46

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1415 (EC–1415) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of 100 M107A1 .50 caliber semiautomatic rifles and sound suppressors to the United Arab Emirates for use by the Armed Forces General Headquarters of the United Arab Emirates.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 47) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 47

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1423 (EC–1423) submitted to Congress pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed export of defense articles, including data and defense services, to support the performance of maintenance and repair services of F110 engines to support the Ministry of Defense of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 48) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 48

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the issuance of an export license with respect to the following proposed exports to the United Arab Emirates is prohibited:

(1) The transfer of the following defense articles, including services and technical data, described in Executive Communication 1420 (EC–1420) submitted to Congress pursuant to

section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)) and published in the Congressional Record on June 3, 2019: The proposed transfer of defense articles, defense services, and technical data to support the export and integration of 60,000 FMU–152A/B Joint Programmable Bomb Fuze systems into the United Arab Emirates Armed Forces General Headquarters' fleet of the following aircraft and associated weapons: F–16, Mirage 2000, AT–802 Air Tractor and S2R–600 Archangel.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the unfinished business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to S. 1790, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1:45 p.m. today the Senate vote on the confirmation of the Baranwal nomination, with all other provisions under the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, yesterday I had a chance to sit down with a group of my constituents visiting DC from the Rio Grande Valley. For those who have never been to the Rio Grande Valley, I highly recommend a visit. It is a beautiful region, a unique part of our country, rich in culture and history and full of hard-working people and businesses that fuel our State's and the Nation's thriving economy. As record numbers of people continue to mass migrate across our southern border, it has become one of the most heavily impacted areas in our country, and it is working hard to manage the growing humanitarian crisis.

Last month alone, 144,000 people were detained coming across our border. It was the largest monthly total since 2006. It only begins to paint the picture of how challenging this mass migration has become. The vast majority of the people who crossed last month were either unaccompanied children or families, putting a strain on resources across the border, particularly when it comes to detention facilities.

It is no mistake that the human smugglers, whom we call coyotes back home, have figured out that if you can smuggle an unaccompanied child or family across the border, you vastly improve the chances of successfully placing them in the United States. That is because they understand our laws better than many Members of Congress do, and they know how to exploit them for their financial gain.

The detention facilities I referred to a moment ago have been around a long time—long before the current surge of families and children began arriving at our borders. They were built as short-term detention facilities for single adults. As trends have changed, the men and women of Customs and Border Protection have done everything in their power to make these facilities workable on an increasingly thin and inadequate budget.

I want to pause for a moment to say thank you to the men and women in uniform who are providing around-the-clock enforcement of our laws and providing quality and compassionate care to the migrants in their custody. It is a tough job. When you train to be a Customs and Border Patrol agent, you are not trained in child care, but that is what many of them find themselves doing—handing out juice boxes and diapers and providing assistance to those families as they seek to have their claims for asylum adjudicated.

This is a tough job, and it is getting tougher every day, particularly in the Rio Grande Valley and along the border. Of the 144,000 crossings last month, nearly 50,000 were apprehended in the Rio Grande Valley, making it the most heavily impacted of the entire border.

In fact, it should come as no surprise that Texas is impacted more than any other State because, of course, we share a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico. Two-thirds of the apprehensions so far this fiscal year have occurred in the Rio Grande Valley, El Paso, or Del Rio sectors. As Federal resources have rapidly depleted, Customs and Border Protection officers and agents have struggled to manage the processing, care, and transportation of these migrants, and local communities, it should be no surprise, have stepped in.

The Humanitarian Respite Center in McAllen is one of several locations working to care for the migrants and has had its doors open for 5 years now. In the summer of 2014, we saw then-unprecedented numbers of Central Americans, particularly children, arriving at the border. This was back when President Obama called this a ''humanitarian and security crisis.'' The scenes were heartbreaking and spurred many folks to action to try to offer their help.

Sister Norma Pimentel is the executive director of Catholic Charities in the Rio Grande Valley and led the creation of this respite center. Migrants who are released by CBP or ICE and are awaiting a court date are often dropped off at the center by officers or agents themselves. There they can get food, a hot shower, a good night's sleep, and travel to wherever they are going to await their court date.

There is certainly a need for this type of assistance under the circumstances, and it has been in existence only 5 years. The respite center has helped more than 150,000 people and continues its work as more people cross the border each day.

The number of unaccompanied children who illegally entered the United States last month is higher than in any other month since the 2014 surge that I mentioned a moment ago. The weight felt by those trying to provide assistance is getting heavier and heavier. As Federal resources dwindle, local communities in the Rio Grande Valley and along the entire Texas-Mexico border have been filling the gaps, despite the fact that, obviously, immigration and the sovereignty of our borders are Federal responsibilities. In the absence of Federal response, it is the State and local communities that have had to step up to help.

Like the respite center in McAllen, these communities regularly provide care, transportation, food, and shelter for migrants in need. I believe this generosity shows the true Texas spirit and helps illustrate how serious the problem has become and how desperately additional Federal resources are needed.

Thankfully, yesterday the Appropriations Committee took action. The committee announced an agreement on a border supplemental package that will include humanitarian assistance needed at the border. The nearly $4.6 billion includes funding to support the missions of the Department of Health and Human Services, which is providing care for the record number of unaccompanied children who are arriving in the United States. It also provides funding for the Department of Homeland Security, which is working to enforce our laws and properly care for the adults and families in their custody, as well as the Departments of Justice and Defense. The hard-working men and women in these Departments are working tirelessly to care for the migrants in their custody, and I want to thank each of them for working day in and day out to enforce our laws. But, as I mentioned, these are not the only folks trying to provide support with minimal support from the U.S. Government.

Earlier this month I sent a letter to the chairman and ranking member of both the Appropriations Committee and the Homeland Security Subcommittee, requesting that the funding package include reimbursement for local communities that helped carry the weight of the humanitarian crisis. NGOs, nongovernmental organizations, like the respite center in McAllen are trying to do more and more with less and less. Cities and counties are diverting hard-to-come-by taxpayer dollars from their intended purposes, such as public safety, power, and clean drinking water, to do the job that is the responsibility of the Federal Government. It is unfair for these folks to pay for a humanitarian crisis that is not of their making. I am glad to see the Appropriations Committee taking some action to right this wrong.