

Baranwal's experience as the director of the Gateway for Accelerated Innovation in Nuclear, also referred to as GAIN, provides her with an informed perspective to push forward the research, development, and deployment of advanced reactor technologies.

Congress began to demonstrate its strong support for advanced nuclear through the enactment of two bills in the last Congress, the Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act and the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. These new laws are intended to facilitate reactor development and streamline the licensing process at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

In addition, legislation I have sponsored, the Nuclear Energy Leadership Act, has garnered 17 bipartisan cosponsors in this new Congress. Our bill provides for the next steps on advanced nuclear technologies, including the need to ensure high-assay, low-enriched uranium fuel is available for them.

We need a strong leader in the Office of Nuclear Energy, someone who recognizes the potential of these technologies, who will move forward so that we can realize that potential and who will work to restore the United States' leadership in nuclear energy. I appreciate Dr. Baranwal's willingness to serve in this role and urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rita Baranwal, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Nuclear Energy).

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 180 Ex.]		
YEAS—86		
Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Baldwin	Gardner	Peters
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Grassley	Reed
Blackburn	Hassan	Risch
Blumenthal	Hawley	Roberts
Blunt	Heinrich	Romney
Boozman	Hirono	Rubio
Braun	Hoover	Sasse
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Burr	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cantwell	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Johnson	Shaheen
Cardin	Jones	Shelby
Carper	Kaine	Sinema
Casey	Kennedy	Smith
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Udall
Cruz	McSally	Van Hollen
Daines	Menendez	Warner
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Murphy	Wyden
Ernst	Murray	Young
Feinstein	Paul	
NAYS—5		
Cortez Masto	Rosen	Warren
Markey	Schatz	
NOT VOTING—9		
Booker	Harris	Rounds
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Sanders
Gillibrand	Moran	Toomey

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following nominations: Executive Calendar Nos. 88, 90, 92, 93, 334, 195, 196, 197, and 287.

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

The clerk will report the nominations en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nominations of Seth Daniel Appleton, of Missouri, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Dino Falaschetti, of Montana, to be Director, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, for a term of six years; Robert Hunter Kurtz, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development; Bimal Patel, of Georgia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Allison Herren Lee, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for a term expiring June 5, 2022; Keith Krach, of California, to be an Under Secretary of State (Economic Growth, Energy, and the Environment); Keith Krach, of California, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; Keith Krach, of Cali-

fornia, to be United States Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of five years; United States Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of five years; Jeffrey L. Eberhardt, of Wisconsin, a Career Member of the Senior Executive Service, to be Special Representative of the President for Nuclear Nonproliferation, with the rank of Ambassador.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements relating to the nominations be printed in the RECORD.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Appleton, Falaschetti, Kurtz, Patel, Lee, Krach, Krach, Krach, and Eberhardt nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session on the motion to proceed to S. 1790. I further ask that notwithstanding rule XXII, the postcloture time on S. 1790 expire at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, June 24.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

(The remarks of Mr. PORTMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1925 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. PORTMAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Trump administration, through the EPA Administrator, Andrew Wheeler, issued what was called the Clean Power Plan rule. That replaces the Obama-era Clean Power Plan rule that dealt with carbon emissions from our powerplants. I am very

concerned about this proposed rule, and I want to share some of my concerns with the Members of the Senate and the American people.

The Obama Clean Power Plan rule was aimed at reducing carbon emissions by 30 percent by the year 2030 compared to the 2005 level. It was a strong proposal, but it gave maximum discretion to the States on how they could meet those targets. Those States that relied more on coal-burning power generation were given different standards than those States that had already transitioned to cleaner energy sources. It was a fair rule, a tough rule, and a rule that would significantly reduce carbon emissions in this country.

Powerplants are the largest single source of carbon pollution, and we know how harmful carbon pollution is to our environment. Nearly 40 percent comes from power generation.

We need strong Federal regulation. We were moving in that direction under the previous administration. Now we demote the current emissions standards to a mere suggestion. That is wrong, and I hope that does not become the case.

There are many reasons that we should be concerned about this rule. We should be concerned about what we are doing about carbon pollution. Let me cite a few.

In the area of public health, we know that if we don't control carbon emission, we will have more premature deaths. The New York Times estimates that there would be 1,400 annual premature deaths as a result of not properly regulating the carbon emissions coming from powerplants.

We also know that because of the impact carbon has on public health, the failure to regulate it means more children will miss schooldays because of their respiratory challenges and more parents won't be able to work because they have to take care of their children. So the result is lost schooldays and lost workdays because of the failure to regulate, which affects our economy and our educating workforce.

We know that children who are vulnerable to respiratory ailments, such as asthma, are particularly at risk, and there will be more days that they will be confined to some form of air-conditioning rather than being able to go out in the neighborhood.

It is also a matter of our economy. We know that clean energy produces more jobs. That is where we are headed, and the faster we get there, the better it will be for our economy.

We also know, as a matter of energy security, the faster we move in this direction, the more secure we will be. America has taken steps to wean ourselves off of imported energy, but our allies around the world are still too dependent, as we know from the way Russia uses energy as a weapon. We need to transition to renewable energy sources so there can be energy security for America's allies.

Lastly, on the environment, carbon is the major pollutant for nitrogen pol-

lution in our waters. I say that because many of you have heard me talk frequently on the floor about the Chesapeake Bay and the importance of the Chesapeake Bay. It is a national treasure. It is the largest estuary in our hemisphere. It is critically important to the way of life here in the Chesapeake Bay watersheds—six States and the District of Columbia. We recognize its economic value—\$1 trillion to our economy.

Well, 85 million pounds of nitrogen pollution goes into the Chesapeake Bay from the air. One-third of the Chesapeake Bay's total nitrogen load comes as a result of our failure to regulate carbon going into the air. This causes algae blooms in the Chesapeake Bay. It causes dead zones. It makes it much more difficult for the stakeholders to meet their stated goals.

I am proud of the Chesapeake Bay Program. All the local governments have agreed on their responsibility. It is tailored toward the States and enforced through the help of the Federal Government. But because of this rule change, it is now going to be more difficult to meet the goals we have set for the Chesapeake Bay. It is not just affecting the powerplants; it is affecting our quality of life, public health, the environment, and the economy.

The States have acted. I am proud of what Maryland has done. We have shown that you can clean up your carbon emissions through power production and you can grow your economy. We have done that in the State of Maryland. We have joined with other States in the RGGI—with Delaware, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New York—and we have shown a 40-percent reduction in emissions since 2009. That is what the States have done.

In the rule that is being proposed, they are saying they are leaving it up to the States. Maryland has done that, but we are downwind. The progress we are making is being negated by the pollution coming in from the Midwest. We need a national standard in order to be able to meet our targets.

I would urge my colleagues, let's get engaged. This rule is bad for our economy. It is bad for public health. It is bad for energy security. It is bad for the environment. We can do better. Let's work together so that we have proper regulation at the national level dealing with carbon emissions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

VA MISSION ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I wanted to join with my colleagues this week to mark the implementation of an updated and streamlined healthcare system that is specifically for our veterans. This is made possible by the VA MISSION Act.

In Tennessee, we have such a large and vigorous and wonderful population of veterans. I will tell you, we are so

grateful to them for their service, and we are so grateful they have chosen to make Tennessee their retirement home.

One of our colleagues asked me one day about how patriotic Tennessee is. They had been there to visit. They saw flags out in so many places. They saw signs out that were "thank you" signs to our veterans. I told them that I felt like it was because we do have a strong military presence. Fort Campbell is primarily in Tennessee. We have Millington, the air naval station. We have Arnold. We have our National Guard, and a couple of our units have just finished a good deployment. We cherish these veterans, and they are such an integral part of our communities and our churches.

We have worked diligently on this healthcare system for veterans to specifically meet their needs. That should be the mission of the VA. It is not to serve itself but to serve the veterans.

Once this new structure that is put in place by the MISSION Act is fully implemented, members of the military community who have been, in my words, neglected for too long—their access to healthcare neglected—they are finally going to get the attention and the care they need. I use the term "neglected" because anybody who knew they were headed to the VA clinic for a checkup knew that was not going to be a quick checkup. There is a lot of paperwork that goes into that process of asking for that checkup and then seeing it actually take place.

I have heard from hundreds of veterans, their stories and their experiences. Sometimes you will hear them say it was a comedy of errors. But it is no comedy; it is a catastrophe of errors. The consequences from this have really taken a toll on the life, the health, the safety, and sometimes the sanity of our veterans community.

The reason you hear these stories is because we have asked generations of veterans to put their physical and their emotional health in the hands of practitioners whose hands were tied by arbitrary rules and procedures that turned even simple procedures into what would be a logistical nightmare. I have no doubt that if we went around this Chamber and each Member of this Chamber were to stand, they could—without any notes, right off the top of their head—give us a story they have heard from a veteran. That should never happen.

But as of this month, we have dealt with a lot of these issues. We have removed some of the roadblocks. And the new Community Care Program, which adopted elements from the successful Veterans Choice Program, will continue to allow veterans to seek care closer to home. What was once a cluster of seven programs has been merged into one single system—a whole-of-health, whole-of-the-soldier approach. It makes this process simpler and easier to understand and to implement this program.

Options will expand even more with the authorization of local provider agreements and access to walk-in community clinics, which is specifically and precisely, what for years veterans have said they want:

Just let me go to the doctor in my hometown.

We have a neighborhood clinic over here.

We have a clinic over at the pharmacy, the CVS or the Walgreens. Let me go there and not have to drive to a clinic that is out of town.

One provision in particular that I believe is going to really make a big difference is the removal of barriers that have prevented VA healthcare professionals from practicing telemedicine. Any of us who have used telemedicine and have Skyped with a physician know this is a timesaver. It gets you in front of the doctor in a more expeditious fashion. It allows you to get that advice to start taking and treating your ailment sooner. It is a huge timesaver. This is now going to be available.

As we are crafting these updates, we are careful to consider the cost to the patient and to make sure that veterans won't have to worry about receiving a massive bill if they see a provider at a local community facility. The VA MISSION Act keeps costs at these clinics in line with those at the VA healthcare centers.

We have also taken steps to encourage consistent treatment at the VA healthcare centers by providing the funds necessary for these clinics to retain top talent. You have to have healthcare professionals in the clinics in order for these clinics to see their patients.

Most importantly, the VA MISSION Act supports these changes via an updated and extensive system of reporting and accountability. For years, this body has debated the merits of various healthcare regimes for children, the elderly, and the poor, but for some reason, we have asked veterans to accept a system incapable of providing care without snarling patients in miles and miles of redtape. For this, we owe the veterans community an apology.

It is an honor to work with our veterans and now say that the VA MISSION Act is being implemented and that care is coming to your community. I think this reflects the sincere desire to do right by our best and our bravest.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, we are just a few days away from the first official Democratic Presidential debate of the campaign season in Miami, but for anyone paying close attention, the first meaningful debate is actually about only 48 hours away in South Carolina.

On Saturday, 11 Democrats, including 4 of the top 5 in the current polls,

are going to take part in a candidate forum hosted by the Planned Parenthood Action Fund.

What is Planned Parenthood? Planned Parenthood is the country's largest abortion business. That is their mainstay of operation. Last year, Planned Parenthood reported committing more than 330,000 abortions—somewhere between one-third and one-half of all abortions committed in America last year. Planned Parenthood's president has said that providing, protecting, and expanding access to abortion is part of the organization's "core mission." It does this work with the help of more than \$500 million in annual subsidies from the Federal Government; that is, from taxpayers across this country, many of whom believe that abortion is immoral. Yet the position of Planned Parenthood is and has long been abortion at any time, anywhere, for any reason for free. That used to represent the most extreme position anywhere in the Democratic Party. It was shared by only a very small, hard-fringe portion of its elected leaders.

Just to review some history, in 2008, Hillary Clinton was still calling for safe, legal, and rare abortion access, and as she would regularly emphasize, "by rare, I mean rare." Yet, today, the radical things that the Nation's largest abortion business wants are basically indistinguishable from the position of every Democrat who is now running for President—abortion at any time, anywhere, for any reason for free.

In fact, it is actually worse than this because the position of every Senator who is currently running for the Democratic nomination and of at least one Governor is that a living, breathing baby who survives an abortion procedure can still be left to die after birth. All seven Senators who are currently running for the Democratic Presidential nomination voted against the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act earlier this year, and Governor Bullock of Montana vetoed a State-level version of that bill just before he entered the race.

As things currently stand, it is entirely possible that the next Democratic nominee for the highest office in our land will be publicly agnostic about the moral status of post-abortion infanticide—morally agnostic about post-abortion infanticide.

Let's be clear. These candidates are wildly and spectacularly out of the mainstream in American life. Over the last two decades, Gallup polling has consistently shown that a majority of Americans are opposed to unrestricted abortion access beyond the first trimester. The Gallup numbers actually show that well under one-third of Americans support abortion beyond the first 3 months, and a new NBC/PBS/Marist poll finds that fully four out of five Americans are opposed to all abortion in the third trimester. That includes a majority of self-identifying pro-choice voters. I want to say that

again. A majority of self-identified pro-choice voters in America are opposed to abortion in the third trimester. So the polling of Americans is actually quite different than what the Democrats are going to pretend it to be over the next 2 days when they talk into their echo chamber.

What is even more important than anything about public opinion is that the Democrats are also out of step with our fundamental American conviction that all men are created equal—all men and women and babies. Instead, they are increasingly committed to the proposition that some people are less than human and are, therefore, disposable. Sadly, though, the most radical leftwing voices are winning in their party's echo chamber, and Democratic candidates have now decided that they must prostrate themselves before the "flush with cash" abortion industry. This has consequences well beyond policy. As Democrats' abortion positions have become more extreme, they have no longer sought to even persuade fellow citizens with whom they disagree. Rather, they have become openly hostile to Americans who disagree on this great moral challenge.

My colleague from New York, for instance, Senator GILLIBRAND, who will be attending this weekend's forum in South Carolina, made her feelings clear earlier this month in an interview with the Des Moines Register. In promising that she would appoint only judges who would uphold Roe v. Wade, here is what she said. Listen to this quote:

I think there [are] some issues that have such moral clarity that we have as a society decided that the other side is not acceptable.

Imagine saying that it's OK to appoint a judge who is racist or anti-Semitic or homophobic.

[This is not an issue where] there is a fair "other side." There is no moral equivalency when you come to racism, and I do not believe there is a moral equivalency when it comes to changing laws that deny women reproductive freedom.

What? What are we talking about here? Are you kidding me? Did you catch what she just said?

According to a sitting U.S. Senator and a candidate for the Democratic nomination to be President of the United States, holding pro-life views in America is no longer acceptable. It is not a fair position, she tells us. It is the moral equivalency of racism or anti-Semitism. Perhaps in the Senator's next interview she will suggest that pro-life Americans belong in a basket of deplorables.

There is so much wrong with this statement that it is difficult to know where to begin. We could note the plain, simple fact that it is not pro-lifers who have an ugly link to racism. Rather, since the very beginning, the American abortion industry has been intimately connected to eugenics. This is the origin of the movement.

As Planned Parenthood founder Margaret Sanger put it herself—and think about this quote—"the unbalance between the birth rate of the 'unfit' and

the ‘fit’ [is] the greatest present menace to civilization.”

Sanger’s racial opinions are a matter of some dispute, but this part is clear—that she intentionally targeted efforts at Black neighborhoods in Harlem and in the Deep South. Many of the people involved in her efforts took things a step further—going so far as to forcibly sterilize African-American women whom they deemed to be unfit to procreate.

We can also note that it is, in part, because of this ugly history that, today, Black women in America are 3½ times more likely to have abortions than White women, and in some parts of Senator GILLIBRAND’s home State, Black children are actually more likely to be aborted than to be carried to term.

We could also point to the continued eugenic use of abortion—for example, to kill children who have nonlife-threatening diseases. In the United States today, two-thirds of all babies in the womb who are found to have Down syndrome are aborted, and in some parts of Europe, the rate is pushing 100 percent. There are public ad campaigns in two nations in Europe that celebrate the fact that they have gotten rid of all of their Down syndrome babies.

Instead of going point by point, I will just recommend that anyone who wants to better understand this disturbing history read Justice Clarence Thomas’s concurring opinion last month in *Box v. Planned Parenthood of Indiana and Kentucky*. Yet, according to my Senate colleague, perhaps Justice Thomas is one of those racists—you know, one of those notorious pro-life racists who is stalking America.

In their leftward lurch to become the Planned Parenthood candidate, it is not just that the Democrats who seek this office are losing touch with where Americans actually are on the hard questions of abortion or with our fundamental American convictions, it is also, as my colleague from the State of New York has shown, that we are losing touch with even how to do politics like Americans, where you respect the dignity of people you differ with and argue about the ideas. You don’t declare them an unfit and an unworthy, unacceptable other side. Americans have always had a genius for talking to each other. In our constitutional system, we set up debate fora like this to be able to facilitate, channel, and elevate debate—even heated, feverish debate about really sensitive topics.

Our Framers held firmly to the principle that men and women in their exercise of reason could come to agreements by persuasion and by dialogue even if it took a long time and even if the topics were difficult. Anything less than that would be a violation of the basic dignity of our fellow citizens. Our Founders knew that hard political issues should not be resolved at gunpoint; they should be resolved by debate, which starts by assuming the dig-

nity of your counterparty in that debate.

We are watching that conviction go by the wayside right now. Slandering pro-life Americans as being, in effect, Klan members and Nazis is just a way to crush debate, not to persuade. It is a way of saying that these people—people like my mom, who prays outside abortion clinics; people like my daughters and my wife, who have spent a lot of hours volunteering at crisis pregnancy centers; and people like the overwhelming majority of Nebraskans, whom I get to represent, or Indians, whom the Presiding Officer now gets to represent—are so morally repugnant that they don’t deserve a voice, that they don’t deserve to be treated like human beings, that they don’t deserve to be engaged in debate, that they are not people you could possibly have a reasonable conversation with.

This is crazy talk.

It is not difficult to imagine where this approach leads. When we lose sight of the intrinsic and inexhaustible dignity of unborn children, we open the door to abortion’s violence, and when we lose sight of the dignity of our fellow citizens in debate, we open the door to yet other kinds of violence.

I have spent a lot of time with pro-lifers in my life, probably a lot more time than most of my colleagues who are going to be at the Planned Parenthood debate in South Carolina on Saturday. I will tell you what you will not find among these people is partisan caricature. What you will find are people who are passionately devoted to the dignity of every human being no matter how small or how vulnerable or what disease one might have been diagnosed with. You will find a lot of Americans, young and old, in the pro-life movement who care deeply about women who are in need. You will also find a lot of enthusiasm for promising in vitro surgeries and for scientific developments in ultrasound and neonatal technology. You will find fellow citizens who are ready to advance the basic American commitment to life through the tools of dialogue, persuasion, and respect.

The dehumanization of our friends and neighbors, whether they are in the opposite party or in the womb, destroys our national life together and our national conversation. On both sides, we need to be constantly stitching back together that fabric that has been torn asunder.

I suggest to the Democrats who are heading to the South Carolina debate this weekend to spend less time wrestling with each other in order to say more ridiculously extreme, clickbait things for high-propensity primary voters and spend more time listening to the voices of their pro-life fellow citizens. My guess is they will learn something, and our national debate will be the better for it.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Oregon.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, Ernest Hemingway said that the world is a fine place and worth fighting for, and I couldn’t agree more. My colleague from Delaware and I are here on the floor to fight for that world, to fight for our planet.

If you breathe in a lung full of air right now—and I invite anybody following this to do so—hold it for a few seconds, and breathe it out, the air that you will have just taken into your body, into your lungs, will have had 33 percent more carbon than when I was born. That is a dramatic transformation of the atmosphere on this planet. It doesn’t matter where you go. You could be doing this exercise here in DC, back home in Oregon, or in Japan. It is still 33 percent more carbon in a single lifetime. Because that extra carbon is blanketing our entire globe, it is having a huge impact—an impact we see in all kinds of ways.

Back home in Oregon, there has been a huge impact with the forest fires. We had forest fires this year that started in March. Perhaps you have seen some pictures of walls of flames and fires in Montana, in Washington, in Oregon, and in California in the last couple of years—smoke that has blanketed our cities and our States for weeks on end.

This is not the norm. This is the result of changing climate chaos, and it is not good.

We see extreme weather across the country. We see more powerful hurricanes assaulting the Southeast. We see more Lyme disease in the Northeast and fewer moose because the ticks kill the moose and ticks carry Lyme disease to humans. We see the slowest planting season in four decades—too much rain, flooded farms.

As of June 3, the Department of Agriculture told us 40 million acres of corn that would normally have been planted haven’t been planted.

Climate chaos is the greatest threat humans have ever seen on this planet, and it is happening for one simple reason: We discovered fossil fuels. We discovered that burning them could create a lot of energy, and we could transform the globe with that energy, but every single time you use those carbon sources, you put carbon in the air, and now we have started to really damage our own planet.

So what is the national response? Well, under President Obama, we had the Clean Power Plan—the CPP. The CPP laid out a pretty ambitious vision, an example for the world to follow, but, quite frankly, it wasn’t enough. It doesn’t accelerate enough our transition to renewable energy.

Just think about it this way: We have been gifted with a fabulous source of fusion energy. We don’t have to recreate fusion reactors here on the planet because we have it safely stowed millions of miles away in the Sun. That is a fusion reactor. All we have to do is capture the energy that shines on planet Earth, and we are in pretty good

shape. That Sun heats up the air and creates wind, and we can capture that same energy by capturing the wind.

We have geothermal energy, potential wave energy. We have to transition to these sources and quit burning carbon, and we need an ambitious plan to do so. We need a turning point.

Future generations will either celebrate the moment when we committed ourselves to saving our planet or they will ask why we failed, and right now we are looking at failure. The rate of carbon pollution isn't going down; it is accelerating upward. We are accelerating into oblivion.

When I was born, it took about 2 to 3 years to increase a single point of carbon pollution, parts per million. You can see how this curve is now accelerating upward. Now we are at about 2.5 points per year. That is a huge difference.

We are kind of lulled into this false sense of comfort. Well, don't we have more insulation in our buildings? Aren't we blessed with cars that get greater mileage? We have appliances that use a little less energy. Well, yes, those things are true, but they are not enough. Even with that, the curve is accelerating upward. So we are in trouble, but we do have some blessings in this battle.

Solar and wind electricity have plunged in cost, and the result is they are now cheaper than or competitive with fossil fuels. That is before you take into account the massive subsidies granted by legislative action to fossil fuels. So they are actually cheaper, and that is before you take into account the externalities—the damage that fossil fuels are doing to our planet. So now we can really see that renewables are a complete win except for the greed manifested through our political campaigns to keep burning fossil fuels.

It means more dollars in a few corporations' pockets, pockets of a few really rich people who say that their generational need for wealth—which they can't take with them to the grave anyway—that generational need, they are willing to sacrifice our planet for all.

Now, they are not willing to bear the costs. They are not willing to pay for the damage to all the homes destroyed by those more powerful hurricanes. They are not willing to pay for all the forests destroyed by the forest fires in Oregon. They are not willing to pay for the structures destroyed by those fires. They are not willing to pay the farmers whose crop is going to produce less because they had to plant so late. In other words, they want the private profit while planet Earth and the rest of us bear the consequences of their greed.

So we need a strong plan, and we need it now. We need to have a clear, robust response to transition to renewable energy quickly. So let's build on the foundation of the Clean Power Plan. Let's make this the turning mo-

ment in history that future generations can celebrate because we really do have a very fine planet, and it is worth fighting for.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. While the Senator from Oregon is here, I just want to say he mentioned we have a very fine planet, and God knows we do, but it is also the only planet we have, and I think for certainly everybody who serves in this body—and maybe some of these young pages will have the opportunity someday to live on another planet but probably not.

The President of France was just down the hall 2 years ago. I am sure Senator MERKLEY remembers it. President Macron addressed us on a variety of subjects, but one of those was the future of our planet.

He said these words. I will never forget them. He said: We only get one planet, planet Earth. There is no planet B. This is it.

He reminded us of our obligation, really a moral obligation, to take care of this gift from God that he has entrusted into our care.

It is in that spirit that I am pleased to rise today with Senator MERKLEY and other colleagues to speak out against the so-called Affordable Clean Energy rule that repeals and replaces the Clean Power Plan from the previous administration.

As I said when this rule was proposed in, I think, August of last year—and our colleague, given where he is from in America, maybe they say this in his State too—but we have a saying here that you can put lipstick on a pig, but it is still a pig.

I said at the time when this rule was introduced that the only thing that has changed from the proposal to the final rule is maybe a little more lipstick.

The Trump EPA rule promotes neither affordable energy nor clean energy. What it actually does is it attempts to scam the American people into believing that the EPA is doing something to stem the tide of climate change.

I think this poster probably speaks well to that thought, but this proposal, I think, is a failure of vision, and I think it is an abdication of leadership in our fight against climate change. We need to fight this problem head-on.

The fact that our climate is warming, the fact that we have this extreme weather, whether it happens to be in the Midwest with floods, the Northwest with wildfires the size of my State, whether it happens to be in the number of category 5 hurricanes that we are seeing, extreme weather—literally within an hour or so of here, Ellicott City, where they have had two 1,000-year floods in 18 months.

My wife and I were out in Palo Alto, CA, last weekend for the graduation of our oldest son from business school, and the week before we arrived there, he told us that the temperature in the Bay Area, where I used to be stationed

in the Navy during the Vietnam war, he said that the temperature reached 104 degrees. I don't ever remember it ever reaching 94 degrees in the years I was stationed in Moffett Field Naval Air Station.

Something is going on here, and it is serious. I think we have a pretty good idea what is causing this, and we need to fight this challenge head-on.

The good news is this doesn't have to be something to divide us as a nation. It doesn't have to be something that divides us as Democrats and Republicans. It doesn't have to be something that divides us with respect to the rest of the world. This is something that should unite us.

There is an old saying that the enemy of my enemy is my friend. Well, the enemy of a world that has all this crazy weather, extreme weather—and maybe in a lot of places in the internal part of our country you don't see what we see. What we see is that my State is sinking. Delaware is the lowest lying State in America. We are sinking, and the seas around us are rising. That is not a very good combination.

Folks who don't happen to live on our coast—I was born in West Virginia, grew up in other parts of the country, but for us it is real. It is not just something that is esoteric. We see it every day.

The science behind climate change is, I believe, settled. Climate change is real. It is happening. It is a growing threat to our country, and it is getting worse every year.

Climate change is leading to rising global temperatures, rising sea levels, more frequent and severe weather events such as hurricanes, rainfall measured by the foot, not by the inch, and drought-fueled wildfires, as I said earlier, the size of my State.

The more I hear about these extreme weather events, the more I am reminded of the story in the Old Testament. I think it is in the book of Exodus, where you may recall that Moses gets a call from on high to lead the people of Israel out of Egypt where they are in bondage.

He tells God: God, I am not a very good public speaker, and I don't think you have the right guy to do this.

The Lord said to him: You have a brother, Aaron, who is a real good speaker, a real good talker. Why don't the two of you sort of lead this effort together?

So, urged by the Almighty, the two brothers visited the pharaoh who was running the show in Egypt. They called on him and said: We are here to ask you to let our people go. Set us free.

Pharaoh was stubborn. He rejected their plea, and there were consequences to that rejection. I think there were about 10 different plagues that were brought to bear on Egypt in an effort to try to convince the pharaoh to let the people go, like the hordes of locusts that covered the land.

Moses and Aaron would go back to see the pharaoh and would say: We

want you to let our people go. The pharaoh would say, basically: Get out of here.

Then, after that, snakes would come out and appear everywhere, all over the land.

They would go back and see the pharaoh, and he would say: Get out of here.

Lizards came out of the rivers and covered the land, and they went back to see the pharaoh, and he said: Get out of here.

Finally, the river was turned to blood, and they went back to see him, and he said: Get out of here.

Finally, after the 10th plague, he changed his tune. The 10th plague, as you may recall, if you remember the Old Testament—the 10th plague was the firstborn sons of every Egyptian family died.

That time when Moses and Aaron showed up to see the pharaoh, he said: Why don't you leave. Take all your people and your stuff and just leave, and they left—and they left.

Our President's dismissal of the extreme weather that is associated with the unrelenting worsening reality of climate change reminds me of the pharaoh's dismissal of the plagues unleashed on the people of Israel 2,000 years ago.

The pharaoh was dismissive. This President is dismissive. We have seen this movie before. In this movie version of it, our President is playing the role of pharaoh, and we need to make sure we don't succumb to that.

The Obama-Biden administration finalized the Clean Power Plan to reduce carbon pollution and try to stem the tide of climate change.

The Clean Power Plan established the very first Federal targets to reduce carbon emissions from our Nation's electric powerplants, which at the time were the largest source of carbon pollution in our country not that long ago.

The rule was not developed on a whim. The Clean Power Plan was finalized after a lengthy rulemaking process, which was 2 years or longer in the making. They considered over 3.5 million public comments, and I am told they responded to every one of them.

The Clean Power Plan set real carbon reduction targets for each State but gave flexibility and time for States to meet these individualized standards. EPA estimated the Clean Power Plan would have achieved over \$54 billion—that is billion with a “b”—in health and climate benefits if fully implemented. The Clean Power Plan provided long-term certainty for U.S. businesses, helping American companies make smart investments at home and compete in the global energy market around the world.

When finalized, critics of the Clean Power Plan—and there were plenty of them—argued the plan's carbon targets were too ambitious. That is only about 4 or 5 years ago. Critics swore that every American consumer who relies on electricity to keep the lights on would soon be in dire straits. Adminis-

trator Wheeler echoed these false claims just yesterday. Today, we know just how wrong the Clean Power Plan critics were.

Even though the Clean Power Plan was never fully implemented, States and utilities went ahead and started making investments in order to meet the plan's carbon standards. They began acting in a way that said: We believe this is the way we are actually going to go as a country, and we need to get onboard.

As with other clean air regulations, America's utilities have been able to find ways to meet the carbon reduction targets faster and much cheaper than originally estimated. When George Herbert Walker Bush was President, he pushed for a cap-and-trade approach to reducing acid rain in the northeastern part of our country. It was killing all of our forests, and he came up with a plan to reduce acid rain cap and trade. People said: It is going to cost too much; it is going to take too long. At the end of the day, it cost less than half of what it was supposed to cost, and I think it was accomplished in about one-third of the time.

Today, our Nation's utilities are already on track to meet and surpass the goals set by the Clean Power Plan way ahead of schedule—not on schedule but way ahead of schedule—because even though the Clean Power Plan was held up in court, it sent clear signals to the utility industry of this country.

All the while, the vast majority of Americans are now enjoying lower utilities—let me say that again. They are enjoying lower utility bills, not higher, and more than 3 million Americans are now going to work in the clean energy sector every day, which includes jobs in renewable energy generation and energy efficiency.

Despite the revolutionary changes in our energy sector, leading climate scientists are now telling us that we need to do even more to protect American lives and our economy from the threats of climate change.

In the past year alone, the UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change issued an alarming report that concluded that if the global community does not enact “rapid and far-reaching” carbon reduction policies in the next decade, we could face irreversible damage to our planet as soon as 2040.

Just 6 months ago, 13 Federal agencies under the Trump administration concluded unanimously that if this country does not take more drastic actions to address climate change, every major sector of our economy could be negatively affected by climate change by the turn of the century—every one. Some sectors are expected to see hundreds of billions of dollars of loss every year. My recollection is, in the last year alone, we have suffered damages from extreme weather in our country that add up to hundreds of billions of dollars in 1 year alone.

What a science-based agency like EPA should be doing is building off of

Obama's forward-looking carbon reduction vision and strengthening the Clean Power Plan standards, not weakening them. But even though utilities are on track to meet carbon reduction targets and scientists are warning us to keep our foot on the gas pedal, the Trump administration, sadly, is hitting the brakes.

What this EPA has done fails to heed the warnings of climate scientists by weakening the Obama-Biden carbon standards put into place almost 4 years ago. The Clean Power Plan set clear targets for States to achieve a 32-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector by 2030. Let me say that again. The Clean Power Plan set clear targets for States to achieve an almost one-third reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the power sector by 2030.

In comparison, the Trump proposal fails to set any real carbon emission standards for the power sector. It fails to set any real carbon emission standards for the power sector.

This new proposed rule provides States with a menu of options for making coal-fired powerplants operate more efficiently, allowing States to decide whether to make coal plants implement those options. This means States could do nothing to clean up their powerplant emissions—nothing.

Add it up, and the dirty power scam fails to drive down powerplant carbon emissions. According to EPA's own analysis, this rule is, at best, going to keep powerplant carbon emissions at status quo levels. At worst, there are credible reports that show the scam may well result in an increase in carbon emissions.

Like all climate change policies by President Trump, the dirty power scam also fails to advance the American clean energy economy. Instead, this rule tries to take our country back to a decade ago, when this country relied much more heavily on dirty coal generation. EPA Administrator Wheeler even touted the dirty power scam as a way to support more coal energy production in the United States. But ask any utility CEO or investor. America's future is not in dirty coal; it is in clean energy.

As a native of West Virginia whose family members once worked in coal mines, let me say this. There are 50,000 people who work in coal mines in this country today, and those jobs are going down. Today, there are 3 million people who work in sustainable energy and clean energy and conservation businesses, and for each of those 50,000 miners, we have an obligation to them and their families. If they lose their employment opportunities because we are moving to cleaner, carbon-free air, we have an obligation to help them in terms of transitioning and training for other jobs that are available. We have 3 million jobs today in this country that nobody showed up to do because they don't have the skills, the education, or the desire to do those jobs.

Coal miners could do a number of jobs. People who work in coal mines could build windmills. They could build solar fields. They can do all kinds of stuff. They can build clean corridors for our transportation, fueling electric-powered vehicles across the highways across America. They could build hydrogen fueling stations. They can do all kinds of stuff.

Today, our utilities are making investments that will last 40 to 60 years, if not longer. We should be providing the right market signals today for a clean energy economy tomorrow.

The dirty power scam doesn't do that. What it does is create business uncertainty for our Nation's utilities and States grappling with the effects of climate change.

To recap, if I could, the dirty power scam does three things, regrettably: It fails to heed the warnings of climate scientists; it fails to drive down power-plant carbon emissions; and it fails to advance a clean energy economy.

Referring again to the failure of vision and leadership, that is why the dirty power scam is a failure of vision and an abdication of leadership in our fight against climate change. Repealing the Clean Power Plan and replacing it with a rule as ill-conceived as the dirty power scam will have serious consequences for the health of the public, our economy, and our planet. It is also a clear retreat from the EPA's responsibility to tackle the greatest environmental crises we face on our planet today, and those are climate change and the extreme weather that flows from it.

The people of this country deserve a strong economy. They deserve more job creation. They deserve cleaner air. They deserve better environmental quality. The American people and our neighbors around the world deserve a healthy planet that we can call home. The American people deserve better than the dirty power scam, plain and simple.

My colleagues and I are going to do everything in our power to make sure that the people of this country ultimately get the climate protection they deserve.

The last thing I would say before yielding back to Senator MERKLEY is that the issue of climate change is not something that should divide us. Ultimately, this is something that should unite us, not just within this body, not just within this country, but around the world. That is my hope and prayer because, at the end of the day, we can clean our air, we can clean our water, we can combat climate change, and we can create a lot of jobs—a lot more than the 3 million jobs we have already seen created.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, each year we have a debate on the National Defense Authorization Act. In the past,

it was a real debate—a debate for which people brought significant issues to the floor related to American national security. Their amendments were considered. We argued pro and con. We took votes. We lobbied our colleagues within our caucus or across the aisle with the wisdom of our viewpoint. That is a tradition; that is a practice; that is what this Chamber is all about—to take on the issues that we face as a Nation, wrestle with them, explore the pros and cons, find their strengths or weaknesses, sometimes come to compromises that take several viewpoints, and merge them together into an even stronger point of view. But I am deeply disturbed that the U.S. Senate is quickly losing the ability to consider the issues facing our Nation.

My colleague just spoke about the challenge of climate pollution, and I appreciate his doing so. But we have had few determined efforts to address the ideas different Members have for taking on that challenge, despite its devastation to so many ways and different parts of our country.

When it comes to the security of our country, no issue is more important than the question of going to war. Our Founders realized this is a decision that should never be vested in a single person, not even the President. They knew that a single individual might find political cause or corrupt purposes to make the decision to go to combat against a force and that such a decision should be debated in a Chamber like this and a Chamber like the House. That is why the Constitution gives to this body, the legislature of the United States of America, the power to go to war.

It is a question that came up early in our history. There was a challenge that we had off the Barbary Coast with corsairs, who are often referred to as pirates, taking charge of American brigs and holding them hostage.

Jefferson embraced the idea of going to war. He became President in 1801. Alexander Hamilton wanted to remind him what the Constitution said. As he said, "It belongs to Congress only to go to war." Any one of us should be able to pull out our pocket Constitutions, read article I, section 8—that deliberate delegation to this Chamber and the House to make that decision.

Well, right now we are in the drumbeat of war with Iran. There has been a lot of animosity between our two countries for a long period of time. The United States mounted a campaign through the Central Intelligence Agency to take out the directly elected leadership of Iran in 1953—a CIA-staged coup—and to install a leader, the Shah of Iran, who operated with great, shall I say, violence against the people. He had a secret police that was as feared as any in the world.

There were other points of animosity when the people of Iran rose up against that Shah and took hostage Americans. They kept them hostage for a great length of time during the Carter

administration. They did not release them until President Reagan came into office.

Then there was the Iraq-Iran war, a war in which hundreds of thousands of people in Iran died, and the United States assisted the Iraqis in that war against Iran. Well, we have had often no love lost between our two nations over this period of time.

I mention these few points of history to say that each side nurtures its grievances against the other, but something remarkable happened under the last administration. They worked to coordinate pressure from the entire world to strike a deal with Iran, to end their nuclear program, end the risk of Iran becoming a nuclear power. This agreement was something bought into by Russia and China, the European powers, and the United States. They did many concrete things, things that their rightwing did not like: dismantling their plutonium reactor, shipping enriched uranium out of their country, shutting down their centrifuges, allowing a massive amount of inspectors into their country to watch everything that they were doing.

In return, the deal was we would help them economically find a better standard of living. This is a moment of potential turning point in the relationship—this long animosity between the two countries—potentially a win-win, but then comes in a new administration, the Trump administration, and they don't like this possibility, this deal. The President says it is the worst deal ever struck. We, the United States, pulled out of the deal on May 8, 2018—just over a year ago. Since then, we have heard the drumbeats of war echoing on Capitol Hill.

The administration designated the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps as a terrorist organization and then proceeded to tighten the economic sanctions in order to pressure the economy of Iran.

So we had the end of the Uighurs, who are partners of ours, to be able to buy Iranian oil, greatly starving the economy of that nation. Then we deployed, in recent weeks, the *Abraham Lincoln* carrier strike force to the Gulf. Then we deployed a B-52 squadron to the Gulf. Then we heard the advocates in the administration saying: If anything happens with a connection with Iran, we will show them the ferocity of our forces. We will respond and show them not to mess with the United States of America.

Different officials cited different examples, but one was: If an Iranian militia in Iraq should happen to harm an American, that could be a trigger or if Iran were to disrupt the movement of oil from the Gulf, that could be a trigger.

When you deploy forces and then start looking for triggers, you can find one for war, if you want, but I stand here today to quote the Constitution of the United States of America, and that Constitution says the power of war

rests with this body—not the Oval Office.

As we have pressured Iran, we have had incidents occur that have been highlighted in recent days. Some mines were put on the side of a couple ships—blew a hole through the side, didn't sink the ships. The administration is pretty sure, they say, that Iran did this. Well, I always exercise some caution. We all remember the Iraq war. We remember that the administration then—the Bush administration—built what they said was a powerful case of weapons of mass destruction being cultivated by Saddam Hussein and the Iraq Government. We went to war on that evidence, and we were wrong.

Here we are at this moment and an administration that has predeployed forces, is squeezing the Iranian people as powerfully as possible. What happens in this situation? What is the goal? Some in the administration say the goal is negotiations. Now, let me get this straight. The United States broke the deal, strengthening the far right in Iran which said don't trust the Americans. We strengthened the Revolutionary Guard because the Revolutionary Guard did not like the deal to begin with. Then we economically squeezed the people of Iran, creating great hardship throughout the land—meaning we have moved the entire population in the direction of supporting the far right in that country.

Now, take these two things. We have strengthened not the moderates who want to see the nation on a different course but the far right. Then we have alienated much of the country and increased their support for the far right, and we have shown that when we sign a deal, we don't stand behind the deal because this administration broke the deal. How is that a foundation for negotiation? We are saying to Iran: We negotiated. You agreed, but we are breaking the deal, and now we want to negotiate again.

People don't tend to want to negotiate with folks who have broken the previous deal. So we here see that we have a challenge in which we stand on the precipice of potential war.

My colleague from New Mexico has an amendment that restates the fundamentals of our Constitution, and he has teamed up with my colleague from Virginia who is here on the floor as well, and I am certainly completely supportive of their effort. They are saying that while we are on this bill, on security, on Defense authorization, this is a moment we should be debating whether the President has the authority to go to war, and their amendment says: No, he does not. He must follow the Constitution, and he must come to this body for authorization. That is an important message for us to send. We must not leave the debate on Defense authorization without debating the Udall-King amendment.

My colleagues are here to speak to it in greater detail. I so much appreciate their work. This is a moment that this

Chamber must rise to the challenge of being a force that can wrestle with great issues before us, and there is no more important security issue at this moment than debating whether the President has the power to go to war. I stand with the Constitution. I hope my colleagues will all stand with the Constitution in this Chamber. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAYNE. Mr. President, I also rise today with my colleagues to talk about the rumors of war we have been hearing in this body and in the news. I want to advocate for a very simple amendment whose timing is, I think, propitious as we discuss the National Defense Authorization Act. Why wouldn't we discuss what we are hearing from the White House and others? Why wouldn't we discuss the events that are happening on the ground in the Strait of Hormuz in the Middle East?

The amendment Senator UDALL has prepared that is a bipartisan amendment that is before the body—and we hope for a vote early next week—is a straightforward one. No funds would be used to prosecute a war against Iran unless this Congress has a vote to authorize it, to authorize such a war. As my colleague from Oregon mentioned, that is what the Constitution suggests, and that is the debate we should be having.

Part of the reason I feel so strongly about this is because I am a Virginian. We are the most connected State to the military mission of the United States. All States are connected and all States are Patriotic, but if you just add up the kind of per capita in Virginia—our Active Duty, our Guard, our Reserve, our DOD civilians, like the nurses who work at the Fort Belvoir Hospital, the DOD contractors like the shipbuilders in Newport News, our military families—we are the most connected to the Nation's military mission. I am personally connected to this with a son in the U.S. Marines. So as a Virginian I feel very strongly about this, and I also feel strongly about it because we are proud of the Virginians, Madison, Jefferson, and others, who are among the Founders who crafted the Constitution. They tried to do some things that were pretty revolutionary then, and they are still revolutionary. Some of our Constitution was a great borrowing exercise—taking wonderful ideas from other constitutions and laws and assembling them together in a wonderful document they put together in 1787, but there were a couple of ideas in the Constitution of 1787 that were not chosen from elsewhere, that were really unique to our country and are still unique. One of the unique ideas is this:

War is not a matter for the Executive, the King, the Emperor, the Monarch, the Sultan, the Pope. No, war is a matter that needs to be declared by the people's elected legislative body.

That was revolutionary in 1787, and it is revolutionary today. The balance of power that was struck was that Con-

gress would declare war, and then once declared, there would only be one Commander in Chief—535 Commanders in Chief would be a disaster. The decision to initiate war would be for Congress, and then the President, working in tandem with military leadership, would be the Commander in Chief to prosecute a war if declared, but there should be no shortcut and no substitute for the debate in this body before the initiation of war.

The amendment that will be on the table—and then hopefully we will receive a vote on—that is bipartisan in nature would prevent funding for a war against Iran unless there is a vote of Congress to authorize such a war.

The amendment does make clear that no previous congressional act—for example, the 2001 authorization—can be tortured and twisted and stretched and bootstrapped into a declaration of war against Iran. The administration has sort of been trying to lay that as a predicate, suggesting that an authorization that passed in 2001 that did not mention Iran would authorize war against Iran, when not a single person who voted for it in 2001 ever thought it was to be used in justification for war against Iran. The administration would like to try to use that as a justification, they have said, in testimony here on the Hill.

Think about this: If they are so afraid to come to Congress and ask for an authorization that they want to try to use something from 18 years ago, what does it tell us about their confidence that they have a good justification that we need to be in a war?

The amendment we have does not prevent the United States from defending itself from attack against Iran. The President has the power as Commander in Chief under Article II, and the War Powers Resolution specifies that power and doesn't codify it. It doesn't need to be codified, but it makes clear that power is always inherent in the Office of the President.

Our amendment doesn't suggest that Iran's behavior is acceptable or consistent with international norms. I have been part of many efforts over the course of my time in the Senate to impose sanctions on Iran if they violated, for example, ballistic missile protocols, U.N. sanctions, or rules, and if they engaged in human rights abuses. The purpose here is not to stand up and defend Iranian behavior, but it is to stand for the proposition that we shouldn't be committed to a war without a vote of Congress.

I will say that this administration's actions and rhetoric have been unnecessarily provocative. It was the United States that pulled out of a diplomatic deal that was working, not Iran. When President Trump pulled out of the diplomatic deal at the time he did, his then-Secretary of State, Rex Tillerson; his then-Secretary of Defense, James Mattis; his then-National Security Advisor, General McMaster; his then and current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of

Staff, Gen. Joseph Dunford—all said that the Iran deal was working, that Iran was complying with it, and that the United States should stay in it. The President pulled out of the diplomatic deal nevertheless and in the year since has reimposed sanctions and taken a number of steps that are provocative toward Iran—diplomatic provocation, rhetorical provocation, economic provocation, and military provocation.

We have been having a set of briefings—some classified—from the administration on this. I am not going to get into classified material, but one thing I will acknowledge—and I am impressed by this—is the administration's intel experts, when they brief us on the situation—even yesterday—they will state that Iran's activities are—and this is pretty much a direct quote—in response to the "U.S. Maximum Pressure" campaign.

The "U.S. Maximum Pressure" campaign that started with the United States backing out of the diplomatic deal is leading to Iran taking other actions that we don't like, but they are not taking those actions unprovoked. Their actions need to be understood as a response to the "U.S. Maximum Pressure" campaign.

Senator MERKLEY talked about it. We pulled out of the deal. We reimposed sanctions. We designated part of the Iranian Government as a foreign terrorist organization. We misrepresented routine military operations in the region. We moved more troops and Patriot missiles and aircraft carriers and other military material into Iran's region. This is not their moving material into our region; it is our moving material into their neighborhood.

Just this week, the administration announced the deployment of an additional 1,000 troops to the Middle East to counter Iran, and that is what this administration is doing—a "U.S. Maximum Pressure" campaign that tears up diplomacy and thus raises the risk of unnecessary war.

I will also point out that it is not just U.S. activity that is provoking Iran. When the United States allows Saudi Arabia to get missiles they shouldn't have and when the United States observes the Saudis building a missile program—by public reports, possibly with the support of China—that is viewed as very dangerous by Iran. When the United States transfers nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia—not even briefing Congress about it—and the Saudis say they would try to build up a nuclear arsenal to counter Iran, it is a provocation. So the maximum pressure by the United States and nations like Saudi Arabia are leading to an unnecessary escalation of tension in the region.

I want to conclude because my colleague from New Mexico, who is the author of this, also wants to speak about why we need to take it up, but let me just say this. I am going to state my position for the record.

I think another war in the Middle East now would be a disaster. I think it would be catastrophic for the United States to tear up a diplomatic deal and then look our troops in the face and say "Because we tore up a diplomatic deal, you have to now go fight another war" when we have been in the Middle East for 18 years. I think it would represent just about as catastrophic a failure of American foreign policy as you could imagine.

I think it would also have the disadvantage of taking our eye off the ball. I have always been taught to keep the main thing the main thing. I think the main thing right now in national security for the United States is to keep our eye on our principal competitor, which is China. When we take our eye off our principal competitor and we engage in wars we needn't be in, China will be the victor in that. That is a very dangerous thing for us.

So I think it would be catastrophic for the United States to be engaged in another war in the Middle East, particularly a war against Iran right now. But if the President feels differently about that; if some of his advisers think we ought to be about regime change in Iran, as they have said; if some of them think it would be easy to beat Iran in a war, as they have said; if some colleagues here on the floor think we should be in a war with Iran, as some have publicly urged, let them come to the floor of the Senate, in full view of the American people, and make that argument.

Let's have that argument right here in the greatest deliberative body in the world with the American public watching, and I will make my argument about why a new war in the Middle East would be catastrophic and see who wants to stand up and make the argument that a new war in the Middle East is something this great Nation should do. And if we then have that argument and cast a vote and I lose, I am going to be disappointed, but we will have done what the Constitution suggests that we must do.

Our failure to have that debate is so unfair to our troops. It is unfair to our troops to put them in harm's way with Congress hiding under their desk, not being willing to state yea or nay on whether we should be engaged in hostilities.

Let's honor the troops and the sacrifice we would ask them to make, follow the Constitution, and have this debate before the American public. That is what the amendment would essentially guarantee that this body would do, and that is why I so strongly support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I thank you for the recognition, and let me thank the two Senators that preceded me here. Senator MERKLEY spoke on this issue of whether we should be going to another war in the Middle

East, and Senator Kaine, whom I have watched since he has been in the Senate, has been relentless and very consistent about raising the issues of authorizations of force and relying on authorizations of force from 2001 and 2002—what we consider very outdated in terms of looking at the facts on the ground. I know he has been working hard—Senator Kaine has—in the Armed Services Committee. Both of us have been working in the Foreign Relations Committee to try to address this constitutional issue that is really before us.

I came to the floor of the Senate 4 weeks ago warning that this administration's reckless escalation of tensions with Iran was blindly leading us to the brink of war. I urged this body to assert its constitutional authority and pass my bipartisan legislation, the Prevention of Unconstitutional War with Iran Act. I called on all of us, Republicans and Democrats, to make it clear that the President alone cannot wage war against Iran without authorization from Congress.

Well, here we are, 1 month later, and tensions with Iran have only increased. The threat of conflict has only drawn closer. Today, we woke up to the news that Iranian forces shot down a U.S. drone. That comes on the heels of 1,000 American troops being sent to the Middle East. Yet the Senate does nothing—nothing to assert Congress's constitutional authority and nothing to assume the responsibility that the Founders clearly placed on our shoulders, the people's representatives.

The Republican leadership should not duck all debate on the military conflict with Iran. We need to vote. We owe it to our men and women in uniform, whose lives would be put on the line, to have this debate, to make the hard choices, and to take the tough votes.

Today, we are calling for a vote on an amendment to the 2020 National Defense Authorization Act. The amendment prohibits funding for military operations against Iran without explicit authorization from Congress. I am joined in this amendment by Senators Kaine, Durbin, Paul, Merkley, and Murphy. My related bill has 25 cosponsors and still counting.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution couldn't be clearer. It is Congress and Congress alone that has the authority to declare war. This amendment recognizing Congress's clear-cut authority should have broad bipartisan support. Whether you support armed conflict with Iran or believe that the war would be a disaster, you should have the courage to cast a vote when the Constitution says it is your job.

Let's be clear. This bill does not tie our Armed Forces' hands. Our military is highly capable, and we have an inherent right of self-defense, which this amendment clearly underscores. But we need to step up. The situation is more urgent day by day.

The President and Secretary of State have accused Iran of being responsible

for the attack on two oil tankers last week. Iran has denied that involvement. There is a somewhat conflicting report from the Japanese tanker owner. I do not know whether Iran, its surrogates, or another party is responsible for this heinous action, but this administration's itch to go to war is all too reminiscent of how we got embroiled in Iraq in 2003 and how the disastrous tanker war of the 1980s began.

We must not make the same terrible mistakes again. We do need to find out precisely what happened and who is responsible, but the response need not be another endless war in the Middle East. We need a thorough and objective investigation of this incident, as has been called for by a number of nations, and the Senators need a real intelligence briefing that covers sources and evidence and not just a statement of opinions from administration officials.

If the Trump administration is entering our forces into hostilities, then this Congress should demand that a report be submitted to Congress in accordance with the War Powers Act. Those who wrote that act made it clear: "Hostilities also encompasses a state of confrontation in which no shots have been fired, but denotes a situation in which there is a clear potential either for such a state of confrontation or for actual armed conflict." We may have already crossed this threshold. Some have said we have.

The Reagan administration failed to submit such a report to Congress during the tanker wars, and the Congress failed to hold that administration accountable, despite the overwhelming evidence of hostilities.

Now, the current administration has hinted that it does not need to go to Congress for approval for hostilities against Iran. They seem to believe that the 9/11 AUMF gives them legal authority for war. Many of us in Congress today voted for that AUMF, including myself, and let me be clear—no one who voted for it thought it would be used to justify a war against Iran 18 years later. Congress needs to make that clear before it is too late.

Yes, the Strait of Hormuz, the Persian Gulf, and the Gulf of Oman should be safe from navigation. Vital interests are at stake. But I agree with the statement issued by the U.S. Central Command in the aftermath of this recent attack:

We have no interest in engaging in a new conflict in the Middle East. We will defend our interests, but a war with Iran is not in our strategic interest, nor in the best interest of the international community.

A war with Iran is not in our strategic interest, and a majority of Americans agree. The American people are tired of forever wars in the Middle East that take our resources, produce no strategic gains, and, most tragically, endanger the lives of American men and women.

In any war with Iran, we will have few allies to back us. The international community is not behind the National

Security Advisor and Secretary of State's bellicose rhetoric. We would have to go it nearly alone.

The administration's maximum pressure strategy is supposedly intended to bring Iran to the negotiating table, but this strategy has predictably failed to produce any negotiations or make any diplomatic inroads. Instead, it is emboldening the hardliners in Tehran who also want confrontation.

The administration's pulling out of the Iran nuclear agreement was a colossal strategic blunder. It was supposedly intended to get the U.S. a better deal, but violating our obligations has only produced saber-rattling, brinksmanship, and the very real risk that a miscalculation or mistake will result in an all-out war.

The United States and the world were safer with the Iran nuclear agreement. It included strict verification requirements. The International Atomic Energy Agency and the President's own intelligence and defense teams agreed that Iran was complying.

The unilateral withdrawal only undermined relations with our allies, signaled that the United States will not keep its word, and destabilized the Middle East even more. This was a predictable result and many warned the Trump administration about this outcome.

Iran threatens to exceed the agreement's limits on nuclear fuel within days. While I hope Iran holds to its end of the bargain, the United States pulling out of the agreement and reimposing sanctions has opened the door for Iran to walk away as well.

Now we must do all we can over the next 17 months to make sure this President does not precipitously start a war with Iran, a country of 80 million people, about four times the size of Iraq, and with proxy forces throughout the region. A war would cost trillions of dollars and undoubtedly American lives. With each passing day and with each incident, the risk of a catastrophic war grows closer.

I realize some of my colleagues have a different view of the situation. Some talk about how all options must be on the table or say that the Iranian regime must be overthrown. I hope they reconsider and change their minds.

If they don't, they should at least have the courage of their convictions. If you want to empower this President to fight a war with Iran, let's vote on that question. The American people and our men and women in uniform deserve to know that their representatives will debate, discuss, and vote on these most difficult of decisions. That is why all of us in this body must demand that this amendment be heard, debated, and voted on. Senate gridlock cannot be an excuse.

The Constitution puts this decision squarely in our court. It is long past time for Congress to reassert its war powers authority. Our oath demands that we make any decision to go to war. The real possibility that this ad-

ministration will precipitate conflict in Iran requires us to face this question now. The fact that American lives will be on the line places the moral imperative on us to debate this issue and to make clear to the President and his administration that any decision to go to war with Iran must be made by Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the National Defense Authorization Act and to highlight amendments that I have sponsored or cosponsored to enhance opportunities for servicemembers and their families.

The NDAA represents one of the Senate's most important responsibilities. It authorizes funding to support our servicemembers, including those who are serving in harm's way. It sets policy for our Nation's military and authorizes critical national defense priorities. It is vitally important to ensure that our men and women in uniform, as well as our Department of Defense civilians, have the training, ships, planes, vehicles, and other equipment they need to help defend our Nation and its interests.

I commend Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED and the other Members of the Armed Services Committee for their leadership and bipartisan work on this important legislation. They have done an excellent job.

This bill contains many provisions that are important to the State of Maine and to our Nation. To cite just a few items, I am pleased that the NDAA includes authorization for three Arleigh Burke destroyers, 94 fifth-generation Joint Strike Fighter aircraft, and six CH-53K King Stallion helicopters. These essential ships and aircraft will help to ensure that our military maintains its superiority in both the seas and skies. I also strongly support the 3.1 percent pay increase that members of the Armed Forces will receive when this bill is signed into law.

In addition, the NDAA expresses our commitment to key international partners and allies. For example, the bill includes a full \$500 million authorization to continue the cooperative missile defense programs with Israel, which are becoming increasingly vital in that volatile region. It also provides additional security assistance for Ukraine to help check continued Russian aggression on its eastern and southern borders.

To build on the impressive work done by Chairman INHOFE and the rest of the committee, I have introduced amendments to improve benefits for military widows, increased access to and awareness of Department of Defense and VA apprenticeship programs, and improved temporary duty travel lodging for DOD employees, such as those serving at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME.

The first amendment, which I am pleased to join my colleague Senator

DOUG JONES in sponsoring, calls for the elimination of a longtime inequity in the Survivor Benefit Plan and the Dependency and Indemnity Compensation Plan. This inequity, which causes there to be an offset between the two programs, is commonly known as the military widow's tax. This unfair offset is currently preventing as many as 65,000 surviving spouses—more than 260 of them in Maine—from receiving the full benefits that they deserve.

The Department of Defense's Survivor Benefits Plan, or SBP, is primarily an insurance benefit that military families purchase, usually in their retirement, and it provides cash benefits to a surviving spouse or other eligible recipients when the military retiree passes away. On the other hand, the Department of Veterans Affairs Dependency and Indemnity Compensation Program, known as DIC, is a monthly tax-free payment to survivors and dependents of servicemembers who pass away from service-related conditions.

For example, if a military retiree pays premiums into the insurance program, then, their spouse ought to be able to receive those benefits when the retiree passes away. However, what we find instead is that if the surviving spouse receiving SPB insurance payment is also eligible for the separate payment from the VA, there is a dollar-for-dollar offset. In some cases this leads to the total elimination of the Service Benefit Plan. In other cases, the offset greatly reduces the amount that is received. In either case, it is out and out unfair, and it harms survivors of our servicemembers and military retirees.

I am often reminded by our military commanders that you recruit the soldier, but you retain the family. We have an obligation to make sure that we are taking care of our military families, who have sacrificed so much.

This problem goes back decades, but this year can be the time that we finally solve it. With more than 75 Senators—three-quarters of the Senate—and 340 Members of the House of Representatives supporting this effort as cosponsors of the stand-alone bill, this is the year. It is our time to do our duty, not only to support the brave men and women of our military but also to honor our commitment to their families.

I would urge all of my colleagues to join in this effort and to support the repeal of the military widow's tax as part of the National Defense Authorization Act, and, indeed, Senator JONES and I have introduced an amendment to do just that.

Mr. President, the second amendment I wish to discuss is one that I have introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR. It would authorize servicemembers transitioning to civilian life to carry out skills training, apprenticeships, and internship programs at other Federal Agencies, in addition to the private sector. Currently, the military services are permitted to authorize

servicemember participation in job training, including apprenticeships and internships, beginning up to 6 months before their service obligation in the military is complete. In a recent report to Congress, the Department of Defense recommended that we expand this authority to allow for inclusion of Federal Agencies as well as the private sector as participants.

I am very grateful to Chairman INHOFE and to Senator REED for recently accepting this amendment and including it as part of the NDAA managers' amendment. That will ensure that these provisions are included in the Senate bill. This is a win-win for both servicemembers as well as Federal Agencies, as this simple expansion will create new opportunities for individual members of the military and allow the Federal Government to benefit from the talents that our highly trained soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines bring to their careers subsequent to their military service. It is a common-sense reform that will expand access to apprenticeships to our servicemembers and ease their transition.

Third is an amendment that I introduced with Senator CANTWELL. It would require the Department of Defense, in coordination with the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Labor, to report on their efforts to promote the utilization of apprenticeships and on-the-job training by servicemembers transitioning out of the military. So, obviously, this report is very much related to the earlier amendment that I just described.

The dramatic underutilization of apprenticeship and on-the-job training under the GI bill demonstrates the need to promote these vital programs. In fiscal year 2018, fewer than 1,500 veterans participated in apprenticeships and fewer than 1,400 participated in the other kinds of on-the-job training, and that is out of a universe of over a million beneficiaries of the VA's educational programs.

One obvious benefit of apprenticeship programs is that graduates learn hands-on skills for jobs that will immediately be available to them, and there are many of these kinds of good-paying jobs available in the State of Maine and elsewhere today.

Finally, there is an amendment that I have introduced with Senators SHAHEEN, KING, and HASSAN. This would address significant problems that the Department of Defense workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, ME, and elsewhere in the country have encountered with the Department's Integrated Lodging Pilot Program, which was initially authorized in the 2015 NDAA. The intent of the pilot program was to save money by assigning TDY lodging first at government facilities and then at specific commercial lodging at prenegotiated rates. However, what we have seen with employees at our shipyard is that they are often being forced to stay in subpar or inconvenient lodging—sometimes, in areas that simply are not safe.

Workers have shared stories with me and with the other members of the Maine and New Hampshire delegations about being awoken in the middle of the night to the sounds of loud shouts while staying at required government lodging, as well as more serious incidences of robberies and shootings nearby. In other cases, travelers describe staying in remote lodging on military installations without security or desk attendants nearby to resolve standard issues that are ordinarily addressed quickly at commercial hotels—basic things like dealing with room keys that don't work or addressing other problems in the hotel rooms.

Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, in fact, has directed its travel office to no longer use the Integrated Lodging Pilot Program for travel to at least one installation due to repeated problems with personnel who were promised lodging only to find that it was not even available when they arrived, leaving these workers scrambling to find an alternative place to stay.

This was a pilot project that simply did not work. It is for these reasons that I have joined my colleagues from Maine and New Hampshire in introducing an amendment that simply allows this pilot program to end in December of this year as currently scheduled. This program may be something worth revisiting after we straighten out the problems with it—certainly, after Congress reviews the still uncompleted DOD report on the pilot. But for the time being, it clearly has not worked well for the workers at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and other DOD employees, and it should be allowed to expire at the end of this year.

I am very proud of the role that the State of Maine plays in our national defense. From the accounting center in northern Maine to the Air National Guard base in Bangor that refuels so many military aircraft, to contractors like Bath Iron Works, where we will christen a ship on Saturday in honor of our former colleague Senator Daniel Inouye, to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, to countless other smaller suppliers, the State of Maine is essential to our national security.

Enactment of this bill is vitally important to the security of our Nation. I would encourage my colleagues to support the underlying bill, as well as these commonsense amendments.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

GUN SAFETY

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues who have come to the floor this week to call for action to prevent gun violence.

On Tuesday we marked the 4-year anniversary of the horrific shooting at the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, where a White supremacist killed nine people during Bible study.

Last week was the 3-year anniversary of the massacre at Pulse nightclub in

Orlando, when an act of terror and hatred took the lives of 49 people in the LGBTQ community.

After each of these tragedies, we say “never again” and “enough is enough.” But after each mass shooting, Congress fails to take action. The discussion fades into the background until another tragedy occurs, then this same cycle is repeated.

It is unacceptable that Congress has still yet to take meaningful action to address this epidemic. The victims who have been lost, their families, and those who have experienced life-changing injuries and trauma deserve action—as do all of our communities, because nearly every aspect of American life has been afflicted by gun violence.

Nowhere is the impact of gun violence and the way it has changed our lives more clear than in our Nation’s schools. Just this year, a friend of mine’s son started kindergarten. Shortly after the school year started, he and his other kindergarten peers had to participate in a drill—what to do if there is an active shooter or danger in your school.

At about the same time that my friend received information from the school that her son would be participating in a lockdown of sorts—a lockdown for 5-year-olds—she read an article by a teacher who had participated with her young students in such an active shooter drill. When the teacher got the kids still and turned off the lights in the room so they could practice staying safe, she noticed the little lights in the soles of their sneakers. You know those little light-up shoes that children have? The teacher wrote that she realized that if those children came to school with those shoes on a day when there was a shooter, even with the lights down, they would be targets. Well, needless to say, my friend’s son no longer has light-up sneakers.

It is time to finally meet words with action. It is time to finally take steps to keep the American people safe. It is time to finally pass commonsense gun laws.

A good start to address this public safety issue would be to improve our background check system. According to the Department of Justice, since 1994 background checks have stopped over 3 million dangerous individuals from obtaining guns, including people with violent criminal records, domestic abusers, and those with mental health issues.

But we know that there continue to be loopholes in that system. Research indicates that millions of guns are sold each year to individuals without background checks. We need to extend background checks to all gun sales and ensure that people who are legally barred from owning guns cannot easily access them.

I have joined with Senator MURPHY, who has been a passionate, dedicated leader on this issue, on legislation to do just that. Earlier this year, the

House of Representatives passed bipartisan gun safety legislation aimed at improving our background check system. There is real momentum and urgency on this issue. Strengthening background checks is a measure that the American people overwhelmingly support.

Unfortunately, Republican leadership in the Senate is more focused on putting the priorities of the gun lobby ahead of the will of the American people. It is outrageous that some in this body suggest that there is simply nothing that we can do to stop the gun violence that has plagued our country. The refusal to even bring up gun safety legislation for consideration is unconscionable. That must change.

I come from a State with a long tradition of responsible gun ownership. People across New Hampshire own guns for hunting, sports, and protection. I respect the tradition, and I am committed to upholding it, but I know that the people in New Hampshire don’t want dangerous weapons in the wrong hands. They are also deeply frustrated that Congress has refused to address the heartbreaking acts of violence that have become far too common in our country. Granite Staters, particularly our young people, are speaking out to voice these frustrations.

Last year, I was proud to march with students in Nashua who organized their own March For Our Lives rally, and students across our State have engaged in everything from writing to public officials to staging school walkouts. They are demanding that we take action, and Congress needs to listen to them.

I am going to keep pushing to pass commonsense gun safety laws, and it is long past time that the Senate finally take this issue up for debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO RECIPIENTS OF THE CONGRESSIONAL AWARD

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate this year’s winners of the Congressional Award. Established by Congress in 1979, the award recognizes the achievements of young Americans between the ages of 14 and 23 years old and celebrates their accomplishment in four program areas: voluntary public service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition/exploration.

The award challenges participants to set goals in an area that interests them, encouraging them to pursue new

interests and grow along the way. If they successfully achieve their goals, they earn bronze, silver, and gold certificates and medals. Through the program, these young Americans gain new skills, earn greater confidence, and position themselves to be productive citizens.

Today, recipients of the gold medal will be presented with their Congressional Award at a ceremony here in our Nation’s Capital. On behalf of the U.S. Senate, I would like to congratulate all of the winners for their accomplishments and for the example they set for others. Among this impressive group, my State of Kentucky is home to eight gold medalists. Through their efforts, the recipients of the 2019 Congressional Awards are strengthening their communities and our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of this year’s recipients of the Congressional Award Gold Medal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Alabama: Warren Griggs.

Arizona: Chantel Abdulai, Morgan Cryder, Ryan Jiang, Baya Laimeche, Alexis Massie, Rosemary Richards.

Arkansas: Sarah Douglass.

California: Flora Ahn, Yuna Baek, Logan Bhamidipaty, Pooja Bhatnagar, Madeline Brown, Abigail Brown, Amanda Cai, Andrew Chang, Casey Chang, Ann Chen, Yujin Choe, Jiseon Choi, Jung-yoon, Choi, David Choung, Joshua Yoon-Ho Chung, Evelyn Chung, Wesley Dale, Harmeen Dhariwal, Julia Dillenbeck, Joseph Dong, Claire Fernandez, Teresa Fundter, Andrew Funk, Scott Funk, Trenton Gin, Jeseung Han, Ye-Eun Han, Jennifer Ho, Andrew Hong, Mirabel Zixin Hu, Jacqueline Huff, Priscilla Hui, Dayeon Hwang, Seung Hyun Hwang, Justin Hyon, Carmina Inquito, Andrew Jockelle, Mindy Jun, Sky Jung, David Jung, Rachel Kang, Maisha Khanum, Ami Kim, Andrew Kim, AnneClare Kim, Calvin Kim, Elissa Kim, Evan Kim, Grace Goeun Kim, Grant Kim, Josephine Kim, Junhee Kim, Renny Kim, Stephanie Kim, Steve Kim, Sungmin Kim, Tiffany Kim, Faith Kim, Alex Kim-Man Klassen, Erin Kwak, Yohan Kwak, Chaerin Chloe Lee, Claire Lee, David Lee, Ethan Lee, Ethan Lee, Jin Lee, Jisung Lee, Justin Lee, Kendra Lee, Seohyeong Lee, Suhwoo Lee, Sunghae Lee, Jae Hoon Lee, Jay Lee, Jeong Eun Lee, Kelly Li, Tina Xiaotian Li, Daniel Lim, Nicole Jiayi Liu, Mackenzie Lo, Megan Loh, Vinit Majmudar, Kenichi Matsuo, Kevin Mok, Evan Morgan, William Mun, Paris Nguyen, Hyerin Noh, Laura Noronha, Yuna Oh, Anthony O’Leary, Sena Oten, Ayleen Park, Brian Park, Chelsie Park, Elisa Park, Esther Park, Hailey Park, Heejae Park, Hyoungjin Park, Julie Park, Noah Park, Rachel Park, Rachel Gia Park, Steven Park, Sung Yun Park, Weena Park, Eric Park, Akshat Patwardhan, Grace Pecheck, Isha Pema, Cris Plunkett, Nathan Pollon, Ethan Posard, Archit Raichura, Rene Servin, Sophia Shi, Jaeyong Shim, Katherine Simic, Helen Sohn, Joshua Son, Annette Son, Kenneth Song, Margaret Sugarman, Albert Sun, Colman Sun, Seraphine Sun, Loyalty Traster-Lee, Kenneth Jr. Um, Colin Wang, Jiahui Wang, Johnny Young Wang, Chuhan Wen, Samantha Wong, Richard Wu, Jack Xiao, Zifeng Xie, Qixiang Xiong, Andre Yeung, Aaron Yi, Danniell Yi, David Dongwon Yi, Brian Yoon, Na Won Yoon, Patrick Yu, Emily Yuan, Peter Ze, Tiffany Zha, Lin Yue Zhang, Yixuan Zhu.