

We have an important job to do here. I see no reason for the delay. The majority leader has made it clear that he is happy to give the Senator from New Mexico a vote on this authorization for use of military force, that, frankly, I don't believe is necessary, but nevertheless, the majority leader has generously offered a vote on that. We ought to be voting on that today or tomorrow and not unnecessarily delay our work until Friday just to accommodate the Presidential candidates.

I would say that the Senator from New Mexico's amendment would attempt to put handcuffs on this President unlike any previous President, and, indeed, I believe it is probably unconstitutional. It would impair our ability to respond to further attacks by Tehran and in a way that would make them think that we were weak or irresolute in responding to their aggression. The most important thing we can do is to make clear to the Iranian regime that their aggression will not be unilateral but that we will meet it with proportional and devastating response.

No one wants to go to war in Iran, including the President of the United States. I don't believe Iran actually wants to go to war, but they are continuing their 30-year conflict with the United States, which has cost American lives and American treasury and now threatens to block the Strait of Hormuz, which would cause a huge disruption to the world economy.

I hope we can vote on the National Defense Authorization Act. I am happy to vote on the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico. I do not believe it will pass, and I do believe it is unconstitutional if it did. But in order to get our work done, we need to continue to vote and vote on the Defense authorization bill and the border supplemental without further delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3401, which was received from the House. I further ask that the time until 2 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders for debate only; that at 2 p.m., the Senate vote on the bill, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage; that if the bill is not passed, it remain pending and open to amendment, with the only amendments in order being the following: Shelby substitute amendment No. 901; the text of S. 1900, as reported; a Paul amendment, No. 902, to pay for spending by cutting foreign aid; further, that the Senate vote in relation

to the Paul amendment and, following its disposition, vote on adoption of the Shelby amendment, with a 60-vote affirmative threshold for adoption; finally, that following disposition of the Shelby amendment, the Senate vote on passage of the bill, as amended, if amended, with 60 affirmative votes required for passage and that the only debate in order be 2 minutes, equally divided, prior to each vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, following the disposition of H.R. 3401, there be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided between the managers, remaining on the closure motions filed during Monday's session of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND SECURITY AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER ACT, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3401, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3401) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

S. 1790

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise to address two very important bills that are before the Senate this week—the National Defense Authorization Act and the border supplemental appropriations bill.

First, on the NDAA, I am pleased that this bill meets the needs of our all-volunteer force by providing the brave men and women with one of the largest raises in a decade, that of 3.1 percent. With the rising threat of countries such as China, Russia, and Iran, this NDAA authorizes funding for crucial defense efforts to make certain that our military is well prepared and equipped to defend this Nation from the threats and challenges we face.

The NDAA substitute actually includes an amendment I offered, joined by my Senate Environment and Public Works chairman, JOHN BARRASSO, of Wyoming, by Ranking Member CARPER, and by several other bipartisan cosponsors. This amendment will formally address the PFAS contamination about which I have spoken on the floor. It directly mirrors my legislation, the PFAS Release Disclosure and Protection Act, which the committee approved last week.

PFAS pollution is a nationwide problem, but its effects are concentrated locally, often in rural and disadvantaged

communities, especially those near military installations where large volumes of certain firefighting foams have been deployed. Significant exposure to the legacy compounds of PFOA and PFOS have been linked to rare cancers and developmental issues.

I got involved with this issue because it is important but also because two communities in West Virginia were all too familiar with the PFAS contamination and its effects—Parkersburg, WV, which has endured a history of industrial PFAS contamination, and Martinsburg, which has been impacted by the use of firefighting foams.

My amendment will provide certainty to our citizens that the water coming out of their taps is safe—in my opinion, that is really not much to ask—by requiring that the EPA set a safe drinking water standard for PFOS and PFOA within 2 years and that it look at regulating other types of PFAS chemicals as the science would merit.

It also provides funding and technical assistance to ensure that small and rural water systems can monitor and address this contamination. That is a big issue for our rural State. We have a lot of small water systems, and we want them to have the same access to the science but also to the remediation that large systems have.

My legislation will also improve transparency by requiring emitters to report to the EPA the release of any of one of hundreds of PFAS compounds into the environment. Sure, we want to know that. Sure, we do. This information is essential for citizens, their local governments, and Federal agencies to be able to quickly and adequately respond to this pollution before it pervades the water or the soil. I think this increased accountability will contribute to there being fewer PFAS emissions in the first place.

Several other bipartisan provisions will accelerate research into PFAS and their effects on human health and the environment. It will ensure collaboration between Federal agencies and municipalities in addressing the challenges posed by contamination, and it will support the research and development into cleaning up these persistent compounds.

Crucially, this approach is rooted in science and a formal rulemaking process. We have put the Federal Government on a shot clock to act to end agencies' endless delays in addressing these challenges without short-circuiting the regulatory procedures.

Make no mistake—PFAS are essential to commerce, but some have been shown to carry substantial risks. This balanced regulatory strategy should provide the confidence to Americans that we are serious about protecting them from this pollution while also not upending the economy.

Another important environmental provision that is included in the NDAA substitute is the USE IT Act, which I introduced with Senator WHITEHOUSE, Ranking Member CARPER, and its lead

sponsor, Chairman BARRASSO. The USE IT Act follows up on the bipartisan expansion of the 45Q tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and storage, which was passed last Congress.

CCUS is key to eliminating CO₂ emissions while protecting West Virginia's coal and natural gas jobs. Trying to weave that balance is difficult sometimes, but the USE IT Act would provide CCUS project sponsors with a regulatory playbook so that they would know what Federal agencies' expectations are at the start of the process. This is essential for capital-intensive projects in their drawing private investment without having the fear of getting trapped in a regulatory purgatory.

Our decades-old environmental statutes never predicted a situation in which emissions would be captured and then actually used for an economic benefit. Carbon provides that opportunity, but regulatory standards that do not reflect this new reality, like New Source Review, sometimes get in the way. The USE IT Act addresses these issues, and it will also fund studies into the pollution reduction benefits of these technologies.

This is the sort of bipartisan and consensus-driven approach that will have a meaningful impact on emissions while it will protect jobs and drive innovation in the American economy, and I am glad that we are taking a significant step toward enacting this bill.

I thank Chairman INHOFE and the Armed Services Committee for their excellent work on the NDAA. It is important that we pass this bill this week.

H.R. 3401

Mr. President, I am also pleased that the Senate will soon vote to pass bipartisan legislation to provide resources that will address the humanitarian crisis at our southern border. I am the chairman of the Homeland Security Subcommittee on Appropriations, and I have spoken many times about the need to pass a supplemental funding bill.

Last night, the House of Representatives passed its version of the emergency border supplemental.

Actually, to be more accurate, I would say the Democrats in the House passed their partisan version of a Homeland Security bill. I think the top-line numbers in the House bill may be similar, but the policy implications of that bill are vast.

Time is of the essence here. I spoke about this last week on the floor. Time is moving quickly to meet this crisis that everyone agrees is occurring at our southern border.

The partisan House bill would be vetoed by President Trump. What is needed is not more partisanship; what is needed is a bill that will become law so that we can get those resources to the southern border. That is why I am encouraged and proud that a bipartisan compromise was reached in the Senate Appropriations Committee. We passed

it out of that committee 30 to 1 last week.

We may not agree on how we got here or how best to move forward, but we agree that there is a crisis—a major crisis—and that these resources are needed now. The metrics, the images, and the stories we all see and hear point to the urgency of this dire situation, so our committee worked in a serious and bipartisan way, under the leadership of Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY, to address the pressing issues as they are right now.

We can and we must work toward a long-term solution to address the immigration system, but right now, today, we all agree that a problem exists, and our committee has provided a bipartisan solution, which the leader just said we will be voting on later this afternoon. Let us move forward in that spirit on behalf of the families and the men and women in law enforcement who need our support. It is tough down there. I visited; it is tough.

It is crucial that the Senate pass the bipartisan border supplemental funding bill that we passed in the Appropriations Committee last week, and I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting it today. We have waited long enough. We can't afford to wait any longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

S. 1790

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to talk a little bit about a bill we should pass this week—I believe we will pass this week—for the 59th straight year.

There are very few things we authorize every year—frankly, there are very few things we need to authorize every year—but the authorizing bill in defense is the opportunity for the country and the Congress to look at what we need to do now that is more appropriate than what we needed to do a year ago to defend the country.

Certainly the men and women who serve in the military do that job in a selfless way, and they deserve the best we can do to be sure they are never involved in an unfair fight. We want to be sure they are always involved in a fight in which they have every possible advantage. They put their lives on the line to keep us safe, and it is up to us to be sure they have the equipment, the training, and the authorization they need and the authorities they need to carry out their work.

Every year about this time, we move toward the authorizing of what the Congress thinks the military needs. That is followed later by an appropriations bill that is directed in substantial ways by what this bill says should happen. In fact, the only thing the appropriations bill normally does is determine whether it can all be funded and in what segments it is to be funded.

We are debating this bill. I hope both Chambers—the House and the Senate—can pass this authorization bill as we move on to our next step in this process of defending the country.

I think you can argue about almost anything else the Federal Government does, but the No. 1 priority of the Federal Government is to defend the country—the No. 1 thing that we clearly cannot do by ourselves; the No. 1 thing that State and local government can be a partner in on some occasions, but it is not their responsibility, and they do not have the capacity to do what we need to do to defend the country. So we are here to take this important step in that.

This version, the Senate's version for this year, authorizes \$750 billion to support the Department of Defense and the nuclear and other defense responsibilities of the Department of Energy. Our adversaries are clearly increasing their military capabilities and their military commitments, and we need to be prepared to do just the same.

The burden of defending the country is an important one, and, frankly, it falls on a very small percentage of our population. About one-half of 1 percent of the American people serve in the military. We owe an obligation to that one-half of 1 percent to do our best for them.

This bill supports an across-the-board pay increase of 3.1 percent—a little more than inflation. It is the largest increase in nearly a decade at a time when the people who serve see challenges in more areas than we have seen in a while and coming from different directions than we have seen in a while.

This bill reforms military housing. Leader after leader in the military will tell us and make the point that the strength of the military is military families. So in military housing, particularly the family housing, there was thought to be a great idea a couple of decades ago to privatize family housing. For a couple of years, it looked like a great idea, but I think it is time we look again at our housing obligations and how they are being met.

We need to look at what we can do to be sure that the spouses of those serving have an opportunity, when they are transferred to a new location, to be able to get to work as quickly as possible in the field they are prepared to work in. In Missouri, in January of this year, the first spouse of someone who had been transferred to our State was sworn in immediately to the bar so she could immediately begin practicing law. Like any attorney, there are probably some future legal training requirements during the course of the following months. But to be able to go to work—whether as a medical technician or a doctor or a lawyer or an electrician or a welder—should be a priority of the country.

I asked Secretary of the Air Force Heather Wilson, when she testified before the committee: What is the best thing we can do for military families? I sponsored some legislation a few years ago so that military families can move earlier or stay longer for a job, for work, or for school. That makes a

difference to their families. If you need to go 2 months earlier than your serving spouse to get started in the school year at the right time or if you need to stay 2 months later or need up to 6 months of transition time, that is available now. Of course, that is beginning to have an impact on people's decision to stay in the military, if their family is considered as a priority and flexibility is part of that priority.

I asked Secretary Wilson for two things that we still need improvement on. One was to be sure to have the best schools possible near those military bases, and two was to be sure that spouses can go to work and that they can go to work, if they want to go to work, in the area they are trained for. So this allows for more effort to be made, to be sure that we are working with the Council of State Governments on a certification program where you could move to a State and quickly be doing that. Reciprocal opportunities for that quick transition is important.

There are changes in this bill that support families with special needs and support how you deal with a childcare provider on a military base, and there are things here to enhance suicide prevention and family advocacy programs. These are all critical, not only for people serving but for people wanting to continue to serve.

As I said before, the military family is one of our Nation's greatest assets, and the serving spouse is not the only one serving. The serving spouse is not the only one transferred to a new military location. The serving spouse is not the only one who has to be happy with the commitment to decide that you are going to go ahead and reenlist, and we need to be aware of that.

This legislation supports military construction projects, including the Army National Guard Readiness Center in Springfield, MO, where I live; the vehicle maintenance facility at Whiteman Air Force Base in our State; and the C-130 flight simulator facility at Rosecrans in St. Joe. They are all included in this authorization project. Projects like these are necessary to ensure that our military is ready to fight and also to support their needs when they are at home.

America's defense posture includes what is known as the nuclear triad. This means that we have three ways we can deliver a nuclear warhead. We hope to never have to have that happen. But if our adversaries have this capacity, our capacity has to exceed theirs, and this bill ensures that that continues to be the case.

The 509th and the 131st Bomb Wings at Whiteman Air Force Base host one of the legs of that triad. Earlier this year, the Air Force announced that Missouri will host the B-2's replacement. The principal B-2 location at Whiteman Air Force Base will host the B-21 Raider as it becomes available to replace that plane that has served the country for so long. I am proud to support what we need to do to make that transition.

There are other aircraft that we need to be sure have a viable part in the country's future. The NDAA bill we are talking about provides an additional 24 F-18 Super Hornets to the Navy and begins the purchase of 8 F-15s for the Air Force. All those planes are made in St. Louis.

The bill also includes critical mission support for the A-10 Warthog, a plane that our colleague Senator MCSALLY is pleased to have flown and flown well. By the way, I had a chance to introduce her the other day, and I almost ran out of firsts. She was the first woman to fly in combat and the first woman to command a combat unit in combat. She has 356 combat hours that she herself flew. She is the first person, of 260 senior military officers, to graduate No. 1 in that advanced training class.

The Missouri National Guard also flies the A-10. I have been with them when they were flying in Eastern Europe. That A-10 capacity continues to be critical.

The NDAA authorizes missile programs between the United States and Israel, where we have actually learned that you can target an incoming missile. Things like the Iron Dome, Arrow 3, David's Sling, have all—fortunately for Israel, fortunately for our military capacity—been proven to work against incoming missiles. These programs help Israel defend itself. They also increase our capability to do what they need to do.

Finally, Senator HAWLEY from Missouri, Senator MANCHIN from West Virginia, and I have proposed an amendment to the NDAA to make May 1 Silver Star Service Banner Day. Along with Senator McCaskill, my colleague who just left, I have been doing this annually for some time. We think this would be a great year to make this a permanent recognition of the Silver Star families.

I would particularly like to recognize Diana Lynn Newton, the cofounder of Silver Star Families of America, who passed away earlier this year. She and her husband Steve were the driving force behind the organization, and they helped thousands of veterans who were otherwise getting very little recognition for their Silver Star service. We are saddened by that loss. Hopefully, one of the things we will do in this bill to recognize her great commitment is to make the Silver Star recognition day an annual event.

There are bipartisan priorities here in this bill that deal with the needs of the military and their families. The pay raise is a significant part of this bill. But being sure that the No. 1 job of the Federal Government—defending the country—continues to be recognized as the No. 1 job makes this unique annual reauthorization of the Defense bill so important. I look forward to seeing this Congress pass this bill this week in the Senate and, hopefully, soon after that, in both the Senate and the House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). The Senator from Mississippi.

S. 1790

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I hope we will vote later on today to advance the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. Members who have been around here a long time realize what a bipartisan tradition this has been for the Senate. Those listening to us should appreciate that and I think take note of basically a half-a-century tradition of passing this national defense bill on a bipartisan—overwhelmingly bipartisan—basis each year. We don't let a year pass. We have been able to successfully do that for approximately half a century. We will see later on today whether that tradition will continue, and I believe it will.

I think we will be able to work something out with the House of Representatives. There are some differences that have emerged over there that we did not have in the Armed Services Committee when we reported overwhelmingly just a few weeks ago.

I am very hopeful that we will continue this tradition. I hope we will do so particularly this year to build on the great progress we have made the last couple of years. I think we should admit on both sides of the aisle that we had perhaps let our national security slip a little in terms of a priority over the last several years. We rectified that a couple of years ago. What we have done not only at the authorization level but also at the appropriations level is send a strong signal to our allies around the world that we are back to emphasizing strength and back to emphasizing protection of Americans and American interests but also a signal to those who would wish us ill.

We know how dangerous the world is now. I think if any of the 100 of us or those within the sound of my voice were asked the question "Is the world safer today than it was 2 years ago when we started on this quest to rebuild our defense?" I think the answer would be no. The world still needs the strength of the United States of America to keep those trade lines open and to maintain the peace to which we have become so accustomed.

We will pass this bill, and then we will have the task—and I want everybody to understand this—we will have the task of getting the bills done to actually pay for what we authorize. That is where, quite frankly, I am worried—with some of the talk I hear around town about perhaps negotiations going on between Democrats and Republicans over here, between House and Senate Members, and even in the executive branch—about just not quite getting to a comprehensive appropriations bill this year.

Perhaps some people say that we can save a little money on the margin simply by having what we call a continuing resolution—what they call, at the Pentagon, a CR—to just fund the

government without directives in the appropriations bill for another year at the same level that we have, both domestically and militarily. We know that of that discretionary budget, 50 percent is national security. Everything else in the Federal Government is called domestic spending, and that is another 50 percent, approximately.

I am here to tell you that if you ask the experts who are charged with defending this great United States of America, they will tell you that a continuing resolution is not only a mistake for the United States of America, it is a disaster for national defense. We need to raise this issue and to point out what the people are saying that we rely on.

The Pentagon has made progress the last couple of years. We have committed to a 355-ship Navy. We are rebuilding the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, and the Coast Guard. I can tell you that a continuing resolution, according to the experts—the uniformed people we put in office to make us safe—would reverse this progress. It would stop new programs, it would curtail production ramp-ups, and it would inhibit the flexibility necessary to make good resource allocations.

A weeklong CR would be a mistake. A yearlong CR would be a catastrophe for the defense of the United States of America.

With regard to the Navy and Marine Corps, it would delay heavy maintenance for the *Harry S. Truman* aircraft carrier. It would prevent the new guided missile frigate program from even starting. We have authorized this. We have already spent money getting ready for it. It would prevent the new guided missile program from beginning. It would cut the planned operations and maintenance budget by nearly \$6 billion. It would cut O&M funds that are critical for readiness. It would prevent 18 critical research and development efforts from starting, including large, unmanned surface vessel maritime drones and artificial intelligence development. This would be part of the result of a 1-year continuing resolution. It would prohibit funding for 33 critical military construction projects. A 1-year CR or even a shorter CR would prevent, during its existence, procurement of one Virginia class submarine, one fleet ocean tug, and two landing craft utility vessels to support our marines during this time when the world is more dangerous than it has been in quite a while.

With regard to the Air Force, a 1-year CR would constrain Air Force spending at fiscal year 2019 levels, decreasing buying power by \$11.8 billion. It would halt 88 new investment programs. It would delay awarding 40 MILCON projects across 18 States and limit the planned 4,400 total force end-strength growth. These are things we already voted for, but a 1-year CR would stop them. You can't do the extra 4,400 end-strength personnel we need.

With regard to the Army, it would negatively impact recent readiness gains and hamper modernization.

But don't take my word for it. Every chance I have gotten at committee level, we have asked the people in charge how a CR would affect our ability to defend the United States of America.

Here is what Gen. Joe Dunford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said earlier this year. And he wasn't on some soapbox; he was just answering questions from a Member of the U.S. Senate. He said: “[Past CRs have] delayed new starts and it's been incredibly inefficient in how we prioritize and allocate resources.”

Former Secretary of Defense Pat Shanahan said: “A Continuing Resolution would hamstring the Department . . . we cannot start new initiatives . . . our funding would be in the wrong accounts . . . and we would lose buying power.”

Is that what we want, rather than do our jobs, rather than do hard negotiations between Democrats and Republicans and the administration and agree on a figure for domestic and national security that we don't love but that gets us where we need to be in terms of defending the country?

Gen. David Goldfein, the top Air Force four star in the land, said: “[A] CR would have a significantly negative impact.” Is that what we want to have for the Air Force, a significantly negative impact? He said: “[I]t would put our end strength growth at risk because we would not be able to bring on the additional Airmen we need.”

GEN James McConville, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, said: “A continuing resolution would be devastating to the United States Army.”

This is not a politician; this is somebody who has given his career—given his professional adult life to being an officer in the U.S. Army. He said that a continuing resolution “would be devastating to the United States Army.”

Surely the elected representatives in the House and Senate can heed the words of these patriots and come to an agreement.

According to Lt. Gen. David Berger, Deputy Commandant of the Marine Corps for Combat Development, “Procurements are going to be delayed. New starts you cannot do.” These are new starts that we voted for and are expecting that the Department wants to do. If we pass a CR, they will not be able to do a new start.

The worst part about it for us is the unpredictability.

Jim Geurts, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, said: “Budget uncertainty associated with the continuing resolution adds instability, inefficiency, delays contracting, and delays fielding of critical capabilities.”

We need to stifle any talk either in this building or the Pentagon or down the street at the other end of Pennsylvania about a 1-year continuing resolution as being beneficial to the United

States of America. It would have an impact on every single State that does military manufacturing.

Those are just a few of the answers that have been given to us by the professionals we put in charge. Let's give our team what they need. Let's pass this bill this week, send it to the House, negotiate the differences that we have at the NDAA level, and patriotically do what we have done now for 58 straight years, but then, when we get back from this Independence Day break with our patriotic citizens and our families, let's get serious about arriving at a compromise number that gets us where we need to be in terms of continuing to make sure we have the resources to protect the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, this administration is in crisis when it comes to border security. John Sanders, the acting head of U.S. Customs and Border Protection, resigned yesterday as a result of the growing scandal and mistreatment of migrants, including children.

According to the Associated Press and NBC News reports, almost 300 migrant children have been removed from a Border Patrol facility in Texas after media reports of lawyers describing “appalling” and potentially dangerous conditions, DHS officials told NBC News. Lawyers who recently visited two Texas facilities holding migrant children described seeing young children and teenagers not being able to take showers for days or even weeks, inadequate food, flu outbreaks, and prolonged periods of detention. The facility in question has a capacity of about 100 people. Yet 300 migrant children were there.

The children who were removed were being held at a border station in Clint, TX. Some were wearing dirty clothes covered with mucous and even urine, said one advocacy organization. Teenage mothers wore clothing stained with breast milk. None of the children had access to soap or toothpaste, according to officials at the Immigrants’ Rights Clinic at Columbia Law School. Some migrants were sleeping on concrete benches or even outside at Border Patrol stations. This happened in the United States of America, not some Third World nation.

One lawyer representing the immigrant children said:

Almost every child I spoke with had not showered or bathed since they crossed the border—some of them more than three weeks ago. There is a stench that emanates from some of the children because they haven't had the opportunity to put on clean clothes or to take a shower. . . . I have never seen conditions as appalling as what we witnessed last week. The children are hungry, dirty and sick and being detained for long periods of time. . . . Children who are young themselves are being told by guards they must take care of even younger children. . . .

They don't know where their loved ones are who they crossed the border with.

According to news reports, the children have now been taken to a detention camp also in El Paso, TX, where they will remain under the custody of Border Patrol until they can be placed with the Department of Health and Human Services.

This is outrageous and unacceptable in the United States of America or in any other country. We can and we must do better. What is occurring in Texas may very well be a violation of our laws.

Federal law generally requires unaccompanied or separated migrant children be transferred to HHS within 72 hours, but according to news reports, some children at the Clint facility had been in Border Patrol custody for weeks. That is in violation of Federal law. Now news reports are saying these conditions have been replicated in other border facilities, such as the Central Processing Center in McAllen, TX.

Federal law also requires that children and families be held in "safe and sanitary" facilities under the Flores settlement. The public should be shocked that administration lawyers seem to argue that these horrific conditions do not violate the Flores agreement or Federal law. One government attorney recently argued that specific amenities, such as soap, toothbrushes, and even half a night's sleep, should not be required under the terms of the original settlement. The argument drew criticism from the panel of judges at the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals.

One panel judge replied during the argument:

To me it's more like it's within everybody's common understanding: If you don't have a toothbrush, if you don't have soap, if you don't have a blanket, it's not safe and sanitary. Wouldn't everybody agree to that? Would you agree to that?

I certainly hope every Senator agrees with that, and I hope every American does as well.

We have received conflicting media reports about children being moved back and forth between different facilities that can only be described as filthy and not fit for human habitation, particularly for children. This is not what America should stand for.

President Trump's erratic actions on immigration and border security have directly contributed to the crisis. Recall that President Trump had literally shut down the entire U.S. Government in the failed effort to fund an ineffective border wall. He has threatened to close down borders entirely. He has cut off security assistance to the very Central American countries that are trying to address the root causes of migration, which is contributing to the migrant crisis at our southern border.

This is an administration that instituted a policy of separating children from their parents at the border. This is an administration that proposed a Muslim travel ban. This is an adminis-

tration that is deliberately stoking fear by now threatening to tear apart families in the United States with longstanding ties to the community.

Instead, President Trump should work with Democrats and Republicans on comprehensive immigration reform. He could start by supporting legislation I cosponsored entitled the Central America Reform and Enforcement Act. This legislation would address many of the root causes of migration and alleviate, not exacerbate, the suffering at our southern border. This legislation would provide conditional security assistance to Central American countries to combat the scourge of drug cartels, violent gangs, and lawlessness that has pushed migrants to journey north. It would enhance monitoring of unaccompanied children after they are processed at the border and would ensure fair, orderly, and efficient processing of those who reach our border seeking protection.

I am pleased that at 2 o'clock today we will have the opportunity to act.

Last week, the Senate Appropriations Committee approved \$4.6 billion in emergency relief on an overwhelmingly, bipartisan vote—30 to 1.

I am pleased that this legislation will help better protect vulnerable children in the custody of the Department of Health and Human Services. The bill seeks to improve inhumane conditions for migrants in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security. The legislation improves due process protection for migrants.

The largest portion of this funding measure, \$2.88 billion, goes to the HHS Office of Refugee Resettlement, which is in charge of housing unaccompanied children who are the most vulnerable group of migrants. This office has advised Congress that it will run out of funds in July and has already stopped making payments for education, legal, and refugee support services.

The appropriations measure provides additional funds to assure the safety and well-being of these children through social services and case management to place children in appropriate homes, ideally with family members who are already here in the United States.

The bill requires ORR facilities that house children to comply with State-based licensure requirements, including minimum standards of humane care, oversight and transparency, with an exception made for influx facilities in emergencies.

The bill provides \$1.3 billion to address increasingly inhumane conditions for migrants apprehended and detained at DHS facilities. The DHS inspector general found dangerous overcrowding at these facilities, leading to sickness and even death in custody. The measure provides additional funds for migrant food, clothing, medical, and baby supplies, as well as funding to non-profits and local jurisdictions providing critical social services and shelter to migrants ultimately released from DHS custody.

The legislation improves due process for migrants and reduces the court backlog by nearly doubling the Legal Orientation Program, which will significantly expand the number of migrants who have access to their services. The bill provides additional funds to hire more immigration judge teams to reduce backlog of pending immigration cases.

Now let me point out what this legislation does not permit in terms of reigning in some of the worst excesses of President Trump's disastrous immigration policies. The legislation prohibits funding from going to the President's border wall or new detention beds and prohibits DHS from transferring funds for any other purpose. It prohibits information obtained from potential sponsors of unaccompanied children from being used in immigration enforcement actions.

I am pleased that last night the House of Representatives passed their version of the emergency supplemental appropriations bill by a vote of 230 to 195. The Senate will have an opportunity to vote on this legislation at 2 o'clock, and I will support it. The House legislation goes even further than the Senate legislation in enhancing protection for migrant children in government custody.

I urge the Senate to pass the emergency supplemental appropriations legislation later today, which provides desperately needed assistance to the most vulnerable migrants, the children. Let us take steps to end this humanitarian crisis on our own soil.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on July 9, the Trump administration will be in court defending the Texas v. United States lawsuit. Let me rephrase that. They will not be defending the lawsuit. They will be arguing on the side of the plaintiff in that lawsuit.

This is a virtually unprecedented move. Administrations traditionally defend the statutes of the United States, no matter what they feel about the politics of the underlying statute. But the Trump administration has made the decision to join with 22 Republican attorneys general to argue that the entirety of the Affordable Care Act should be dismantled, with nothing to replace it.

There are those of us who believe that it would not be wise policy to kick 20 million people off of insurance and get rid of all of the insurance protections in the Affordable Care Act, with no idea as to what comes next. We have begged our Republican colleagues to join us in telling the Trump administration—demanding that the Trump

administration argue against the attorneys general in this case.

I have listened to my Republican friends, and I have listened to the President himself over and over again say that they don't like the Affordable Care Act. They want to replace it with something else, something that insures more people, and something that continues to protect people with pre-existing conditions. If that is your position, it stands to reason that you would oppose a lawsuit that seeks to invalidate the entirety of the Affordable Care Act with nothing to replace it.

The bewitching hour is upon us. The oral arguments are the week after next. This lawsuit was successful at the district court level, so there is no reason not to believe there is a substantial possibility that it could be successful at the appellate court level as well.

I wanted to come to the floor, as we head into this week while we will be back in our districts, just to make sure that everybody understands what the stakes are on July 9 when the Trump administration will argue in court to get rid of insurance for 20 to 30 million Americans and what the stakes are for this Senate—in particular, Senate Republicans refusing to stand up to the President in his perpetuation of this lawsuit.

If the Affordable Care Act is struck down, there are 130 million Americans with preexisting conditions who could see insurance rates increase by up to 50 to 60 percent. Others will have their insurance withdrawn when they go through open enrollment next because no insurer will cover someone with serious, very expensive preexisting conditions. That was the way things worked before the Affordable Care Act was passed.

Gone is Medicaid expansion, which today covers 17 million people across the country—and I have been happy to see more and more States with Republican Governors or Republican State legislators adopt the Medicaid expansions and become a source of bipartisan agreement that more people should have access to Medicaid—but those 17 million people will lose their coverage.

There are 12 million seniors who will immediately pay more for prescription drugs because the Affordable Care Act gets rid of, over time, essentially the entirety of the Medicare part D doughnut hole.

There are 2.3 million adult children who are on their parents' insurance until they become 26, who would potentially lose access to that insurance. The Affordable Care Act requires insurance companies to cover those kids. Many insurers, without that requirement, would no longer cover those children.

Then many of the other protections in the marketplace, like bans on lifetime caps or annual caps, can be lost. Insurers would once again be back in the practice of saying to a very sick

child, a patient with cancer: You only get x amount of insurance coverage from us, and once you go beyond that number, then it is on your dime.

Again, remember, before the Affordable Care Act was passed, there were 1.5 million families every single year in this country who declared bankruptcy. Today, there are half as many families who declare bankruptcy in this country. It is not coincidence that studies have shown us that of those 1.5 million, half of them were declaring bankruptcy because of medical costs. When you don't go bankrupt any longer because of medical costs because you have access to affordable insurance and your insurance company can't kick you off because you get sick, you don't face the kind of destitution that families faced before.

So I think it does make sense to run through the lineup of who has weighed in in favor of this court case to invalidate the entirety of the Affordable Care Act and knock 20 to 30 million people off of insurance to jack up rates for millions more and who has weighed in against it.

Well, the President wants this lawsuit to succeed. Attorneys general want this lawsuit to succeed. And by the silence of my Republican colleagues, you would infer that many Republicans may want this lawsuit to succeed.

But here is who hates this lawsuit. I am not going to run through the whole list here, but this is essentially anybody who knows anything about healthcare. This is essentially every organization that represents people who have serious diseases, every association that represents doctors, and every association that represents hospitals. You don't really find all of those groups aligned on much at all because when you are moving around pieces in the healthcare system, often you will do something that benefits patients that insurers will not like or you benefit something at hospitals that single-practice offices will not like. This is pretty much everybody who says: If you kick 20 million people off insurance like that and you have no plan to replace it, that is a humanitarian catastrophe.

Here is what the AARP says in their filing opposing this lawsuit:

If this Court finds that the ACA is invalid, millions of older adults will lose the healthcare coverage and consumer protections they have relied on for years. They will also throw the Medicare and Medicaid programs into fiscal and administrative chaos, which will disrupt the nation's healthcare system and economy. It will plunge the more than 100 million people with preexisting conditions into an abyss of uncertainty about whether they can obtain coverage.

That is the AARP.

Here is what the American Medical Association says: "The decision below, if affirmed, would have devastating effects on the quality, cost, and availability of such care."

Families USA says: "Among those whose coverage rates increased due to

Medicaid expansion are young adults, people with HIV, veterans, rural residents, and racial and ethnic minorities."

For many of our most vulnerable citizens who are covered by Medicaid, eliminating the expansion would leave them without healthcare.

I mentioned the insurance companies are against this lawsuit. They say this: 'Invalidation of the ACA—irrespective of the continued operation of the so-called individual mandate—would wreak havoc on the healthcare system.'

Finally, Americans with disabilities say:

The result is a cruel irony: the population that needs healthcare the most has the hardest time obtaining it. For the last nine years, the ACA has helped change that. Stripping away its protections now will reverse the positive gains that people with disabilities have realized and will return this community to the same grim reality as before the ACA, if not place people with disabilities in an even worse position.

So let's not forget where we were before the Affordable Care Act was passed. I am not saying that it is perfect. I am not saying that we shouldn't work together to try to improve it. We just finished a debate in the Health Committee in which we passed a whole bunch of reforms to our healthcare system that Republicans and Democrats agree on.

But the American Cancer Society, in their filing, reminds the court: "A 2009 Harvard Medical School study found approximately 45,000 deaths annually could be attributed to lack of health insurance among working-age Americans."

The Heart Association said this: "Even during a heart attack, uninsured patients were more likely to delay seeking medical care because of the financial implications."

I could go on and on, reading from these filings or reading from the testimony that all of these groups have submitted. Again, that is not to say that these groups don't want changes in our healthcare system. Nobody on this list, as far as I know, is arguing for the status quo, just as no one in this body is arguing for the status quo. But to rip away Medicaid expansion, to rip out from the roots of the healthcare system the exchanges and the tax credits, to get rid of all of the insurance protections, to reverse the gains we have made on lowering prescription drug costs for seniors—to do all of that with nothing to replace it is to invite misery, destitution, and chaos.

Let's just be honest. We are not ready to ride to the rescue. I offered an amendment in the Health Committee today just asking for the Department of Health and Human Services to provide us with a report about what the landscape would look like in the healthcare system if *Texas v. United States* were successful. I didn't get a single Republican vote for that one. All I was asking was that we just get a report on how bad it is going to be so

that we can start doing a little bit of advance planning, and not a single Republican was willing to vote for that in committee today.

So we are deliberately boxing our eyes and ears about what the effects on our constituents could be if this lawsuit is successful. We are not in a position to ride to the rescue. There is no chance that this Congress is going to pass a new healthcare reform proposal that will restore healthcare to everybody who lost it. That is not happening, and I know that is not a surprise to anyone here.

You also shouldn't delude yourself into thinking this lawsuit will not be successful. There are lots of very smart legal scholars who suggest that this argument that the plaintiffs are making, which the Trump administration has endorsed, is nonsense. I tend to agree with them. The argument is that because you got rid of one section of the Affordable Care Act, then the court needs to invalidate the rest.

Well, Congress made its intent pretty clear. Republicans decided to get rid of the individual mandate for the penalty that is assessed if you don't have insurance and deliberately did not choose to get rid of the rest of it. I think that is not a smart decision, but the intent of Congress is pretty clear.

It is my belief that this argument doesn't hold water, and that is the belief of many smart legal scholars, but the district court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs. So you already have a Federal judge who invalidated the entire Affordable Care Act.

Since then, the Trump administration has upped the ante. The district court finding in favor of the plaintiffs, which invalidates the entire Affordable Care Act, didn't convince the President to say: Let's pull back the reins a little bit here. Let's maybe change our position. This feels too real. Let's hedge our bets. No; after the district court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, the administration changed their position to go all in on the plaintiffs' side. Their initial lawsuit only backed up some of the plaintiffs' claims.

So the district court ruled that the Affordable Care Act has to disappear overnight. The Trump administration has changed their position to weigh in and to support the entirety of the lawsuit, and we are not having a serious conversation about what happens if the fate that all of these groups are deeply fearful of comes to pass.

Finally, this is not about numbers. This isn't about statistics. This is about real people. Michael from New Fairfield, CT, says:

This is . . . personal to me, the ACA literally saved my life in 2016. I have pre-existing, recurrent skull base disease for most of my adult life. I underwent an 11-hour skull base neurosurgery to remove a benign tumor that involved my brain arteries, nasal passages, jaw and a total reconstruction of my middle and outer ear canals. My surgeon said I was a month away from a much more debilitating surgical outcome. As it is, my recovery and rehabilitation period has been a

full two years with resulting partial physical impairment.

My spouse and I both run our own businesses and the ACA is still our family's only option for healthcare. Without the operations and the ACA coverage, the disease would have continued to progress—I would have eventually died and my family would have had to sell the house and/or go bankrupt to manage the medical expenses.

David from Southport said:

In July of 2011 I was diagnosed with Colon Cancer. At the time, I was covered under an individual policy with Blue Cross Blue Shield. It was a very comprehensive policy and, after my deductible was satisfied, it covered all my doctor and hospital expenses, surgeries, chemotherapy, medications, etc.

However, a couple of years later I was advised that due to my preexisting condition I would not be able to renew my policy. . . .

At that time I enrolled in [the Affordable Care Act] Access Health CT and without this policy . . . [through Access Health CT] I would not be able to be insured and would face prohibitive costs for even basic care.

David's story can be told thousands of times over: a diagnosis followed by denial of coverage from an insurance company because of a preexisting condition.

There is no free market response when it comes to very sick people who want insurance. The free market tells the insurance company: Do not insure somebody who is going to cost you a lot of money. The free market would tell the insurance company to keep that person on the outside of insurance. So there has to be a public sector response. We provided that response with the Affordable Care Act and now, in a matter of weeks or months, it could all be gone.

So I come down to the floor this afternoon to once again engage my colleagues and ask them to work together. Let's try to find a common ground here, at least behind the premise that you shouldn't rip out the foundation of the modern healthcare system without a plan for what comes next.

I assume we will continue to offer unanimous consent requests to try to withhold funding for the Trump administration's perpetuation of this lawsuit. I would hope we can get Republican support for that motion, not because Republicans support the Affordable Care Act—I get it; I am not going to get Republicans to support the Affordable Care Act—but because my Republican friends need to make good on what they have said for years; that they want the Affordable Care Act to go, but they really want something else to replace it that will insure the same number of people and protect folks who are sick. That cannot happen if this lawsuit succeeds.

As we head back to our districts for this recess period, I wanted to make sure everybody knows how many groups that know something or anything about healthcare are standing against *Texas v. The United States*.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I am here to address the specific topic about energy laws, but hearing my friend and colleague from Connecticut talk about the healthcare law, I would just point out that as 20 Democratic candidates for President assemble tonight and tomorrow night in Miami, they are going to be there calling for a repeal and replacement of the Obama healthcare law.

The leading candidate, the Senator from Vermont, is going to say, under this healthcare law that we have now in this country, this healthcare system is the most bureaucratic, inefficient system in the world, and he is going to propose a one-size-fits-all healthcare system that repeals and replaces the ObamaCare healthcare law with a system where people will pay more to wait longer for worse care. As a result, 180 million people who get their insurance through their jobs will lose their insurance. Also, as a result, the 20 million Americans who are on Medicare Advantage will lose that coverage as well.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss my continued efforts to modernize our Nation's energy laws.

Since my arrival in 2007 in the Senate, I have worked in the Senate on pro-growth energy policies. My goal has always been to protect workers, to promote American energy, and to provide for innovation.

The Presiding Officer is from an energy State. He knows that today the United States is the world's top energy producer. We are the global leaders in oil as well as natural gas. Still, the energy sector is evolving at a fast clip. We need to stay ahead of the curve to stay on top, so our laws should reflect this changing reality.

The key, of course, is innovation. That is why I am constantly talking with folks in the industry, people back home in Wyoming, and taking the pulse. I listen to the workers in coal mines and oilfields of Campbell County, to the researchers at the labs at the University of Wyoming. What we discuss are best practices and issues such as: How can we streamline energy permitting? How can we speed research? How can we ensure safety and protect the environment?

My point is, we need to know the situation on the ground. I know the Presiding Officer hears that in North Dakota on a regular basis. That is how we need to make sure energy laws make sense—knowing what is happening on the ground.

I proposed practical reforms that reflect that reality. I recently offered legislation to modernize the Federal electricity law. It is called the UPDATE PURPA Act. PURPA refers to the 1978 Public Utility Regulatory Policy Act. Senators Risch, Cramer, and Daines are original cosponsors of this UPDATE PURPA law. Principally, we want to protect families from inflated electric bills.

People in Wyoming and North Dakota and other States are overpaying.

That is because PURPA requires State utilities to purchase renewable power and then pay above-market rates to do it. They have to buy it even when their customers do not need it, and that is the problem.

Forty years after that law was passed in 1978—fast forward, here we are 41 years later, and clearly it has outlived its purpose. The law's original intent was to diversify power sources, and it certainly succeeded. Wind and solar power now provide about 9 percent of the electricity in this country—9 percent wind and solar.

The fact is, renewable power technology has improved rapidly so we no longer need to micromanage these purchases. Consumers should not continue to overpay for electricity due to outdated rules, regulations, and laws. UPDATE PURPA would solve this problem. It protects utility customers from added costs; it frees State utilities from unnecessary mandates to buy power; and it helps develop all energy sources, including renewable energy.

I am also working to pass a bill called the USE IT Act. It stands for Utilizing Significant Emissions with Innovative Technologies. This bipartisan bill would help researchers find uses for captured carbon dioxide emissions.

The research is already happening in Wyoming. It is taking place outside Gillette in the Integrated Test Center. The USE IT Act will further this effort. It will apply our Nation's brightest minds to take carbon from the air, to capture it from the air, to trap it, and to transform it into valuable products.

Captured carbon can be used to extract oil from wells that otherwise would not be profitable. It can also be used to make building materials and carbon fiber. It can be used for medical purposes.

In addition, I am working to promote nuclear energy. Nuclear power is safe, reliable, and carbon-free. Today it provides 60 percent of America's carbon-free electricity. It is by far our largest carbon-free source, and it is doubling the wind and solar in terms of the total that we get from wind and solar. We have already made progress on advanced nuclear technology because earlier this year we passed a bipartisan nuclear bill called the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act, and that became law—signed into law.

This bill, now law, will ensure that we remain a leader in nuclear innovation. It will simplify the process for licensing and developing advanced reactors. This progress will help increase our use of carbon-free energy. We need all the energy. We need the renewable energy. We need the nuclear energy. We need the oil, gas, and coal. We need all of it, and we must address our nuclear waste problem.

That is why I fought to complete the licensing of the storage facility at Yucca Mountain. I recently chaired a committee hearing on this draft proposal.

As I wrote in the Wall Street Journal, “The lack of progress on Yucca Mountain has become a roadblock for nuclear power in America.”

Both parties want Americans to use more carbon-free energy, so both parties should embrace sensible, scientific solutions.

Another energy issue I am addressing is reform in the process that we use to get permits to get permission to explore for energy, to use our resources. Earlier this year, I introduced a bill called the ONSHORE Act. It stands for Opportunities for the Nation and States to Harness Onshore Resources for Energy.

We have a very talented staff that comes up with these creative names. It is onshore energy—Opportunities for Nations and States to Harness Resources for Energy. The ONSHORE Act will simplify the Federal onshore oil and gas permitting process. So whether we are talking about oil and gas permitting or utilities or carbon capture or nuclear power, we must engineer our way to American energy solutions.

Commonsense reforms will help the United States stay on top and stay safe at the same time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week, Democrats and Republicans on the Senate Appropriations Committee came together and we approved by a vote of 30 to 1 an emergency supplemental to address the most urgent humanitarian needs at our southern border. Some would say that the way the Senate has been led lately, you couldn't get a 30-to-1 vote to say the Sun rises in the east.

The bill reflects weeks of good-faith negotiations between Republicans and Democrats to forge a bipartisan agreement to mitigate what has been an escalating humanitarian crisis—one where infants and toddlers are sleeping on cold cement floors in wire cages and under bridges. Inaction is simply not an option for those who care about alleviating the suffering of desperate children and families seeking refuge in the United States.

Action in the Senate requires compromise. That is the reality in a body where 60 votes are required to move a bill forward. No one, Republican or Democrat, is going to get everything they want—including me, and I am the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee—but that is the nature of compromise. One thing I am not willing to compromise on is our American values, and this bill reflects that.

The Senate supplemental protects unaccompanied children, some of our most vulnerable migrants, by securing funds for their safety and their well-being in HHS custody. It includes \$109 million to ensure the safety and well-being of those children through post-release wraparound services, legal services, and case management to get children out of cages and put them in lov-

ing homes. It puts restrictions on the use of influx facilities. It establishes standards of care to ensure that children are kept in safe, sanitary facilities where they are properly cared for—not cages.

Our bill will mitigate inhumane conditions faced by migrant families in DHS custody by providing funds to improve conditions in grossly overcrowded facilities and buy food, clothing, and medical services for the people in our care. It provides money to ensure that we have diapers, formula, baby wipes, and other essential supplies for infants and toddlers.

Like the rest of the country, I read in horror the reports from a border facility in Clint, TX, where the children were unbathed, where sickness was spreading, and where infants were being cared for by other young children in custody barely old enough to care for themselves. No child, no matter where they are from, deserves to live in such conditions.

Our bill improves due process for migrants by expanding access to legal services and our immigration courts. It provides grants to nonprofit organizations and local jurisdictions that provide critical services in shelters to migrants released from DHS custody. Bolstering border security and treating migrants with humanity are not mutually exclusive goals. Indeed, accomplishing both together is the American way. We are America. We can do two things at once.

Apparently, President Trump never got the memo about our American values. Since the day he took office, he has demonized and vilified immigrants, asylum seekers, and refugees at every opportunity. Through false and inflammatory tweets and cruel policies, he has worked to instill widespread fear among immigrant communities, targeting asylum seekers as if they were hardened violent criminals.

In just this past week, he threatened widespread arrests of thousands of immigrant families, seemingly without concern for the many families that would be torn apart and the separated children who happen to be American citizens who would be left behind. Now he has backed away from that threat temporarily, but he has promised to revisit it.

Just last week, the Trump administration went to Federal court to argue that it should not be required to give detained migrant children toothbrushes and toothpaste, soap, towels, showers, or proper sleeping conditions when in U.S. custody—that such amenities are not part of the definition of “safe and sanitary” conditions.

What would we say if another country were holding Americans like that?

It has become painfully obvious: President Trump views immigrant families, asylum seekers, and refugees not as human beings but as political ammunition intended solely to rile his base. When asked about the horrendous conditions at DHS and ORR facilities

and the separation of families, he said it is not true and he repeated his threat of mass deportations—even though many of us here in the Congress in both parties have seen it. He is either willfully ignorant about what has been widely documented or he has no qualms about lying about it.

Not a single one of the President's anti-immigrant, fearmongering tactics would address the very real humanitarian crisis overwhelming our southern border. This is exactly why the bipartisan Senate supplemental does not provide a single dollar for President Trump's request for hundreds of millions in additional dollars for the incarceration of immigrants in ICE facilities.

It is why we did not provide any of his requested funds to pursue misguided policies like "Remain in Mexico," which law enforcement officials have stated actually encourages, not discourages, illegal crossings. It is why, in a bipartisan way, we included a strict prohibition on the transfer of supplemental funds for any purposes other than addressing the humanitarian crisis at the border. And finally, it is why we refused to include any of the deeply harmful, unprecedented changes to our immigration and asylum laws that the President has advocated for.

I am under no illusion that this supplemental bill will address all of the problems with our immigration system—far from it. It is a temporary solution to address some of the most urgent issues. We need to have a broader debate about comprehensively addressing those problems, just as we did years ago.

Years ago, a bipartisan group of Senators put forward a thoughtful, bipartisan immigration bill. As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I held three hearings on the bill. We had five days of markups. We considered 212 amendments, 141 of which were adopted, including nearly 50 from Republicans. And then 68 Senators supported the legislation on the floor.

Unfortunately, the Republican Speaker of the House would not bring up the bill, even though it would have passed overwhelmingly, because he thought it might violate the Dennis Hastert rule. I think, if we were to have that same process here again today, I would bet we would also have 68 Senators—Republicans and Democrats—vote for it.

Yet this is a conversation and a debate we will have to have on another day. I will be happy to work with those Republican and Democratic Senators who worked together to get an immigration bill before, but we are not going to do it in the context of an emergency supplemental, which is meant to address the most urgent humanitarian needs at the border. It is why Senator SHELBY and I and others—Republicans and Democrats—have worked for weeks, quietly behind the scenes, in order to put this together

and get our 31 votes. It is because we know we have to first act to provide safe, humane care for the migrant children and families who seek mercy and safety.

It was yesterday that the House passed its own version of an emergency supplemental for the southern border. It is also a very good bill, and it goes further in offering protections to immigrants in our care than we are able to do in this Chamber, because there have been objections from the Republican side of the aisle. It provides important additional protections for children who are under the care of the Office of Refugee Resettlement and for those being held at CBP processing facilities, and I support that. We should be taking care of the children in our custody as if they were our own. Taking care of children is not a partisan issue. We should all agree on that.

I am also pleased that the House bill includes a provision to protect the funding that Republicans and Democrats have already appropriated to address the causes of migration in Central America. I am upset the President has threatened to take that money and reprogram it elsewhere.

We were not able to reach agreement on that issue in the Senate, but in a few moments, we will have an opportunity to vote on the House bill. I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will be able to support it.

Neither the House nor the Senate bill has any funding for additional ICE detention beds. This is no mistake. The President's predisposition to turn to mass detention above all else is cruel, irresponsible, and also a horrible waste of taxpayers' money. There are alternatives to detention that exist that are safe and less expensive.

The administration needs to use the resources it has for ICE detention services to house those people who truly present a danger to our communities and not lock up every man, woman, and child simply for being here. Lock up those who really do present a danger. Most 5-year-old children do not. It makes no sense to lump them all in together. We carefully negotiated ICE's bed levels in the fiscal year 2019 Homeland Security Appropriations bill just a few months ago, which was passed by both Republicans and Democrats, and there is no reason to revisit it now.

We have heard that the administration plans to set up a request to fund more ICE detention beds through reprogramming the money that we need. I urge my Republican colleagues to join me in opposing any such request. The administration should not do administratively what both Republicans and Democrats have rejected.

Unfortunately, this is a pattern with this administration. It just wants to ignore bipartisan majorities in the House and Senate. It ignores the will of Congress. It uses loopholes and ignores traditional norms in the appropriations process. It uses suspect readings of the law to accomplish its agenda. When

Congress rejected the administration's request, it acted as though it was above the law, above the Constitution. Nobody is above the law in this country. None of us in the Senate are, and neither is the President of the United States.

Let's not forget the President's declaration of a national emergency to fund his wall when Congress debated it and refused to provide him the money he had requested. We have to stand up for ourselves as an institution. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join me—not as Democrats or Republicans but as U.S. Senators—in saying no to this President when he blatantly ignores the will of the Congress.

I thank Chairman SHELBY for working with me on this bipartisan humanitarian assistance bill.

We need to work quickly to resolve the differences between the House and the Senate bills so we can get a bill to the President's desk. I hope President Trump will have the good sense to sign the supplemental bill into law. Then let's turn to the much needed debate on comprehensive immigration reform. We showed we could do it when I was the chairman of the Judiciary. We showed we could get a 2-to-1 vote in this body. Let's do it again.

Of course, I urge Members to oppose the Paul amendment.

Four months ago, Republicans and Democrats came together and appropriated funds in the State and Foreign Operations Act that would help counter terrorism and human trafficking, promote democracy, combat poverty, provide humanitarian aid, and support global health programs. A bipartisan majority of Congress supported this funding and the President signed it into law. The Paul amendment proposes to rescind \$4.6 billion, clawing back programs with a wide range of consequences.

Counterterrorism programs would be cut. These funds support programs that target vulnerable youth to prevent radicalization. These programs provide governments with the tools to counter the influence of violent extremist organizations, including by countering terrorism financing.

Programs to combat human trafficking would be cut by the Paul amendment. These programs support nongovernmental organizations that promote stronger government policies and programs to combat human slavery and trafficking. They help hold perpetrators accountable and support governments that are combatting human trafficking, and they help to protect victims of trafficking.

Programs that strengthen civil society, independent media, and promote democracy in Venezuela, Iran, Cuba, Hungary, Egypt, and many other countries would be cut. These funds support efforts to hold governments accountable for repression, promote freedom of expression and religious freedom, and provide services to victims of persecution.

The Paul amendment would claw back humanitarian aid. There are more people forcibly displaced in the world today than at any time since World War II. It is a global humanitarian crisis that is contributing to instability and insecurity, including in our own hemisphere. The amendment would rescind funding for U.S. refugee aid and aid to victims of famine, earthquakes, and other natural disasters.

And funding for PEPFAR, programs to combat malaria and TB, and other global health programs would be cut by the Paul Amendment. This includes programs to respond to deadly pandemics like Ebola.

There are countless other examples, since the Paul amendment uses a meat cleaver approach to demolish most of our international development and humanitarian programs that reduce poverty, respond to crises, build free markets, and strengthen democratic institutions.

Why are there unobligated balances in these programs? These funds were appropriated only 4 months ago and are available for obligation through the next fiscal year for multiyear projects. That is how foreign assistance works.

In the last two foreign aid appropriations laws, Senator GRAHAM and I included targeted rescissions of funds that could no longer be spent effectively, or that were about to expire. That is the responsible approach, and one that preserves the integrity of the appropriations process. That is not the approach in this amendment.

I urge members to vote no on this amendment and pass the bipartisan bill reported by the committee 30 to 1 so that we can sit down with the House tonight to work out the differences with the House bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, today we will consider funding to address the humanitarian crisis on the border. The spending bill will be \$4 billion. While there is a humanitarian crisis at the border, we also have in our country a debt crisis. We are adding debt at about \$1 trillion every year. The overall debt is \$22 trillion, and the interest on the debt that we have to pay every year is exploding such that it is crowding out other spending.

While I do agree that there is a humanitarian crisis at the border, we must not ignore the debt crisis that faces our country. We should not borrow the money and pull out the credit card, yet again, every time a crisis occurs. Congress has an obligation to find lower priorities to cut to pay for higher priorities. I thought that is what legislating was about. You are supposed to say that right now we have a crisis at the border. So maybe we are not going to send welfare to foreign countries. Every American family has to make these decisions. Why doesn't Congress? What Congress does is simply add it to the bill your kids and your grandkids will be paying.

I am proposing to actually pay for this by taking the money from a part of the budget that is being wasted and put it into the humanitarian crisis on the border. Should we provide care and shelter to immigrants at the border or should we be paying for clown shows and a traveling circus? Should we provide food for the children that remain at the border or should we pay to support the businesses of deported immigrants?

Listen carefully. When we catch people coming across the border illegally, we send them back to the country and say: Don't worry. We will send you money to help you start a business.

They break our law, and we give them money to start a business back in their home country. If you ask politicians here, the answer is: Fund it all. Just put it on the credit card. We will just keep borrowing. Your kids and grandkids will pay for it.

I mentioned some of these examples that I would cut, but let's hear about some more. Where is your money going? Where is the money coming from so that we could actually pay for this crisis at the border? My amendment rescinds the remainder of this year's funds for the Inter-American Foundation. You may not have heard of this, but last time this bill was authorized was in 1985. For over 24 years, we haven't done anything. We haven't even looked at the program. We just keep feeding it money.

What do they fund in the Inter-American Foundation? Let's see. They spend money to support small businesses of deported immigrants. One time we asked them: Do you at least exclude criminal deportees? They had a blank look on their face, and they didn't have an answer. They aren't excluding people we deport because they have committed a crime in our country from receiving American welfare.

This group spent \$1.2 million helping people in Mexico, Guatemala, and El Salvador to improve their "spending strategies." Does that sound like a good use of money? If we need money at the border, let's quit sending it south of the border to improve the spending habits of those in Mexico, Guatemala, and El Salvador.

These funds also subsidized guinea pig farmers in Peru, a llama fair in Bolivia, and advertisements to buy carbon credits in Mexico. If we have a crisis at the border—both sides of the aisle have now finally woken up to there being a crisis—let's spend it on the crisis and not be supporting a llama fair in Bolivia or a guinea pig farm in Peru.

This same group that I would like to take the money from to spend it on the border spent half a million dollars to "jump start" the Haitian film industry. Does that sound like a national priority to anybody? If we want to treat people in a more humanitarian fashion on the border and we need to spend some money down there, maybe we could not be supporting the Haitian film community.

This group spent \$300,000 to help Brazilians get off Brazilian welfare. That might be better spent talking to Americans about American welfare. Yet we had no business in sending that money to Brazil.

Is any of this a higher priority than what we are doing at the border? I would say not.

Is it more important to pay for the cost of the situation on the border or should we also be sending foreign welfare abroad?

The United States spent \$223 million to fund a highway in Afghanistan. We found out afterward that the security that our government hired to protect the people while they were building the road at \$1 million a year were actually funneling the money to a terrorist group, called the Haqqani network, our sworn enemy. The Haqqani network is known for killing our soldiers, but we were paying those in the Haqqani network for being security guards while we wasted millions of dollars in building a highway in Afghanistan. I would say let's spend that money at home. The road we have now built for the Afghans is in such disrepair after only a few years that they can't afford to maintain it, so we are asking you to cough up a little more money. They need \$22 million to keep the highway in good repair.

We spent \$273 million on a development grant program that didn't actually do anything. It taught foreign people how to fill out grants to get more money from us. It is not enough that they are fleecing you and sending your money to all of these boondoggle projects around the world; we have a program to teach foreigners how to get more welfare from us.

This amendment takes \$4 billion that they want to spend on the border and says: That is fine. Let's do it. Yet let's take it from foreign aid. Let's take it from foreign welfare. Let's take it from llama fairs and guinea pig shows in Peru. It is utterly ridiculous. This program has not been looked at since 1985. If we eliminate the program, we can pay for the money they want to spend at the border.

That is what it would mean to be responsible legislators—to make priorities, decide where to spend the money, and not just simply run up the tab and say: Your kids and grandkids can pay for it.

I recommend a "yea" vote on offsetting the spending for this supplemental spending bill, and I hope Americans will watch to see who votes to offset this by cutting wasteful foreign welfare.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I believe there is no longer any question that the situation along our southern border has become a full-blown humanitarian and security crisis. I think that is a given. Leader McCONNELL has firmly established that fact right here on the Senate floor, and charges from the

other side of a manufactured crisis have fallen silent. At this juncture, there is little need to recapitulate the case for action.

We know what our professionals on the frontlines need in order to get a handle on the situation. The only question is, Will the Congress come together and act or fall prey to partisanship while the crisis escalates further?

I am pleased to say, last week, the Appropriations Committee charted a course for strong bipartisan action. By a vote of 30 to 1, the committee approved an emergency appropriations bill to address the crisis at the border—30 to 1. Such an overwhelming bipartisan vote would not have been possible without the cooperation of my colleague and good friend, Vice Chairman LEAHY. I thank Senator LEAHY for working with us to find a path forward.

This bipartisan committee product, which it is and which I will soon offer as a substitute amendment to the House bill, provides \$4.59 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations to address the humanitarian and security crisis at the border.

It does not contain everything that Senator LEAHY wanted, and it does not contain everything that I wanted. More importantly, it does not contain any poison pills from either side, which is remarkable. That is why it passed the Appropriations Committee by a vote of 30 to 1, and that is what gives us the best chance today, in the U.S. Senate—without further delay—of passing a bill that is badly needed.

I will take just a few minutes to briefly outline for my colleagues the particulars of the package reported by the Appropriations Committee.

Of the total funding provided, the lion's share—\$2.88 billion—will help the Department of Health and Human Services to provide safe and appropriate shelter and care for children in its custody.

An additional \$1.1 billion is included for Customs and Border Protection to establish migrant care and processing facilities; to provide medical care and consumables; and to pay travel and overtime costs for personnel.

There is \$209 million provided for Immigration and Customs Enforcement to fund the transportation costs and medical care for detainees; to conduct human trafficking operations; and, again, to pay travel and overtime costs for our personnel there.

There is \$30 million for FEMA in order to reimburse States and localities for expenses that they have incurred related to the massive influx of migrants in their communities.

There is \$220 million included for the Department of Justice to help process immigration cases and provide badly needed resources to the U.S. Marshals Service for the care and detention of Federal prisoners.

Finally, \$145 million is provided for the various branches of the U.S. military that have incurred operating expenses in support of multiple missions along the border.

I believe, overall, this is a solid bill. It provides the resources that are needed to address the crisis that we face at the border. As I say again, it contains no poison pills, and it is poised to pass the Senate with strong bipartisan support, unlike the version that came out of the House last night.

So I say to my colleagues in the House, now that there is a bipartisan acknowledgment that the crisis on our southern border is real, do not derail the one bipartisan vehicle with a real chance of becoming law soon.

Those who want to alleviate the suffering—and I think it is most of us—on the southern border will soon have a bipartisan path forward in the Senate bill that we have here.

Those who choose to obstruct over partisan demands will soon have a lot of questions, I think, to answer when the crisis escalates further, and it will.

I believe there is no excuse for leaving town at the end of this week without getting this job done. I hope we will be coming together soon and do our job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), 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), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 182 Leg.]

YEAS—37

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

NAYS—55

Alexander	Braun	Cornyn
Barrasso	Burr	Cotton
Blackburn	Capito	Cramer
Blunt	Cassidy	Crapo
Boozman	Collins	Cruz

Daines	Lankford	Romney
Enzi	Lee	Rubio
Ernst	Manchin	Sasse
Fischer	Markey	Scott (FL)
Gardner	McConnell	Scott (SC)
Graham	McSally	Shelby
Grassley	Merkley	Sullivan
Hawley	Moran	Thune
Hoeven	Murkowski	Tillis
Hyde-Smith	Paul	Toomey
Inhofe	Perdue	Wicker
Isakson	Portman	Young
Johnson	Risch	
Kennedy	Roberts	

NOT VOTING—8

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Gillibrand	Rounds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 37, the nays are 55.

Under the previous order, the 60-vote threshold having not been achieved, the bill was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate briefly on leader time.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, the bill that was before us has failed. Most of us on this side of the aisle would have much preferred that bill, but it has failed.

The bill that Senators SHELBY and LEAHY have worked on diligently is now before us. I am going to vote for it. I think most of us on this side are going to vote for it so that we can quickly move to conference.

Speaker PELOSI has called the President and suggested a few changes. I think there are four changes to this bill. We could quickly have a conference, talk about those four changes, try to get them in the bill, and finish this quickly. I hope that is what will happen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 901

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 901.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY] proposes an amendment numbered 901.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. SHELBY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

AMENDMENT NO. 902 TO AMENDMENT NO. 901

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 902.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. PAUL] proposes an amendment numbered 902 to amendment No. 901.

Mr. PAUL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To rescind \$4,586,000,000 from foreign assistance and exchange programs)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Of the unobligated balances for fiscal year 2019, there are hereby rescinded—

(1) all of the amounts for the East-West Center;

(2) all of the amounts for the Inter-American Foundation; and

(3) from the amounts appropriated under title III of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2019 (division F of Public Law 116-6), an amount equal to the difference between \$4,586,000,000 and the sum of the amounts rescinded under paragraphs (1) and (2).

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, we are going to spend over \$4 billion today, and I just propose that we pay for it. There is a humanitarian crisis at the border, but there is also a debt crisis.

We spend hundreds of millions, if not billions, on wasteful projects. Let's take it from foreign aid welfare and spend it on our southern border. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars subsidizing guinea pig farmers in Peru, a llama fair in Bolivia, and advertisements to buy carbon credits in Mexico. There was \$273 million spent trying to teach foreigners how to fill out grant applications to get more welfare from the United States, \$300,000 to help Brazilians get off of Brazilian welfare, and half a million dollars spent jump-starting the Haitian film industry. There are billions of dollars that we can spend on the southern border, but we should take it from somewhere and not add it to the debt of our kids and our grandkids.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am going to move to table this amendment. Being the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee, this is taking one disaster and creating 100 in its place. This \$4.6 billion will destroy all the humanitarian assistance we have passed to deal with an unprecedented wave of refugees. The global health programs are all impacted severely, including PEPFAR and the child survival and maternal health programs. This money comes out of those accounts. Can you imagine how it is going to be to deal with Ebola after cutting the Global Health Program?

Programs to counter the influence of Russia and China will be zeroed out. Counter-human trafficking programs will be dramatically reduced. Counter-terrorism programs are all affected by this amendment.

You are taking one problem at the border, and if you enact the Paul amendment, you will create 100 in its place.

So I move to table the Paul amendment No. 902.

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining votes in the series be 10 minutes in length.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll on the motion to table.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), 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), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 77, nays 15, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 183 Leg.]

YEAS—77

Alexander	Graham	Reed
Baldwin	Hassan	Risch
Blumenthal	Hawley	Roberts
Blunt	Heinrich	Romney
Boozman	Hirono	Rosen
Brown	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cantwell	Inhofe	Schatz
Capito	Isakson	Schumer
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Carper	Jones	Shaheen
Casey	Kaine	Shelby
Cassidy	King	Sinema
Collins	Leahy	Kennedy
Coons	Manchin	Smith
Cornyn	Markley	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Sullivan
Cotton	McSally	Tester
Cramer	Menendez	Thune
Crapo	Merkley	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Peters	Wyden
Gardner	Portman	Young

NAYS—15

Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Perdue
Braun	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Enzi	Lee	Toomey

NOT VOTING—8

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Gillibrand	Rounds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 77, and the nays are 15.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 901.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), 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), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 184 Leg.]

YEAS—84

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

NAYS—8

Hirono	Menendez	Van Hollen
Lee	Merkley	Wyden
Markey	Paul	

NOT VOTING—8

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Gillibrand	Rounds	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 84, and the nays are 8.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for adoption, the amendment (No. 901) is agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

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

Mr. LEAHY. 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.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), 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), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 185 Leg.]

YEAS—84

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

NAYS—8

Hirono	Menendez	Van Hollen
Lee	Merkley	Wyden
Markey	Paul	

NOT VOTING—8

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Klobuchar	Warren
Gillibrand	Rounds	

The bill (H.R. 3401), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motions filed on Senate amendment No. 764 and S. 1790 occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 3401

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am glad that the bipartisan Senate border supplemental has passed with an overwhelming vote. I commend Chairman SHELBY, Senator LEAHY, and the members of the Appropriations Committee for breaking the logjam.

S. 1790

Mr. President, on the NDAA, the Democratic leader and I have had extensive discussions on the path forward on the Defense bill. For the information of all of our colleagues, we intend

to stay in session this week to finish the NDAA bill and allow for a vote in relation to the Udall amendment. Senators should plan to vote on Friday on the Udall amendment. Yet the vote—here is the good news—will start first thing in the morning and be held open into the afternoon to accommodate as many Senators as possible.

To be clear, obviously, I believe that the Udall amendment can and should be defeated—I hope with a resounding vote in the Senate—and that we should put this issue to rest before we break for the Fourth of July recess. Holding up the Defense authorization bill is not an acceptable outcome.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, I thank the majority leader for understanding how strongly we feel on the Democratic side and how many Americans feel that the constitutional right of Congress to examine foreign conflict and potential war should be upheld. The fact that we will get a vote on the Udall amendment, which is something we have asked for, is only fair and only right. There may be differences of viewpoint on both sides, but the fact that it will be on the floor and be debated is exactly the right thing to do. It is something we want and have asked for, and I thank the majority leader for understanding that and allowing it to happen.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IRAN

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, Donald Trump and the hawks in his administration are fueling a dangerous escalation with Iran, and instead of taking responsibility for this escalation, the President is once again blaming others for a crisis of his own making.

Adding to the confusion and concern is the President's penchant for using his Twitter account or an outburst from the Oval Office to jump between calling for restraint and embracing a potential war.

Instead of listening to the President's latest outbursts or dissecting his latest tweet, let's take a hard look at what he has done to bring us to this dangerous moment.

In May 2018, Trump followed the lead of the hawks in his administration and unilaterally—unilaterally—pulled out of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the JCPOA, breaking the agreement and leaving its other signatories, especially our allies in Europe, holding the bag.

Only a few weeks earlier, Jim Mattis, the President's own Secretary of De-

fense, told the Senate Armed Services Committee, on which I sit, that the agreement was working as intended and had been written with an assumption that Iran would try to cheat. He went on to note that while the deal was imperfect, it established a strong verification and inspection regime that Iran was complying with the agreement.

I continue to agree with Secretary Mattis's conclusions. The purpose of the JCPOA was to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon within a 2- to 3-month timeframe. That is the kind of timeframe we were looking at. The JCPOA was not intended to cover Iran's ballistic missile program or its malign activities throughout the region.

What the JCPOA did accomplish, however, was lengthening Iran's nuclear breakout capacity from 3 months to 1 year. It included strong limitations on enrichment, redesigned and rebuilt the Arak heavy water reactor so it can only be used for peaceful-use research purposes and not for the enrichment of weapons-grade plutonium, and required Iran to ship all spent nuclear fuel out of the country.

The agreement also included a binding commitment from Iran to never pursue a nuclear weapons program. That is in the very beginning part of the JCPOA document. This commitment necessitated a continuous inspection regime by the International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA.

Further, the agreement included provisions that would see the international community reimpose sanctions automatically—the snapback—if Iran was violating the deal.

Instead of building upon the JCPOA to address Iran's other malign activities, Donald Trump threw out all the benefits of the deal, took on an enormous risk, and isolated the United States in the process.

In early April, the President took the unprecedented step of designating the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, the IRGC, a foreign terrorist organization. He designated the IRGC as a foreign terrorist organization. That was an unprecedented step, overruling the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dunford, in the process. General Dunford argued that this first-of-its-kind step would put American troops in the region at risk for retaliation. He was right.

Later that month, Donald Trump rescinded waivers granted to key American allies, such as Japan and India, to purchase Iranian oil, effectively strangling the Iranian economy in the process. Over the past few months, the administration has sent thousands of additional troops and a carrier strike group to the Persian Gulf.

These actions, taken unilaterally, have isolated the United States from our allies, encouraged Iran to stop complying with elements of the nuclear deal and to step up their aggressive actions in the region, and brought us to the dangerous precipice of war.

Although the President made the eleventh-hour decision—actually, 10 minutes before a strike—to call off a military response to Iran's downing of an Air Force drone, the fact that we got so close to a military strike is chilling, given the implications of igniting an open war with Iran.

We have learned to our peril over the past few years that Donald Trump does not keep his word or the word of our country. He says something one day, only to reverse himself at a moment's notice. We cannot rely on his restraint to avoid blundering into a war with Iran. That is why I am continuing to call on my colleagues to join in supporting a vote on Senator UDALL's amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act.

This amendment makes clear that only Congress can authorize the use of military force against Iran and would provide a clear check on Donald Trump, John Bolton, and other hawks in the administration.

We cannot allow this administration and this President a free hand to stack the deck toward military action and away from meaningful diplomacy. Otherwise, we risk committing another generation of American soldiers to a protracted, disastrous war in the Middle East.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

TRIBUTE TO BILL SWEENEY

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to my long-time staff member and friend, Bill Sweeney, who will be moving on to a new challenge in his career after nearly 20 years of service on my team.

Bill actually started working on the campaign November 1, 1999, and we were sharing stories of his being up in a crowded little space changing my "Stabenow for U.S. Congress" signs to "Stabenow for U.S. Senate" signs with little stickers that we used because we didn't have very much money at the time.

Bill has been with me a long, long time, and after so many years, it is tough to know what to say because there is so much to say.

Bill Sweeney has worn more hats on my team than anyone ever has. He started working on my campaign, as I mentioned, for the U.S. Senate as a fundraiser. After the campaign, I hired him as my systems administrator, and he played an integral role in setting up my new Senate office. By the way, we are still today using the systems he set up, and I truly believe they are the best the Senate has.

After a short time, I promoted him to director of information technology. Then, Bill's gift for messaging and writing led to more promotions as my director of outreach, speechwriter, and then senior communications adviser.

Eventually, he took on a broader role on my team as deputy chief of staff, chief of staff, and his position now as staff director of the Democratic Policy

and Communications Committee. But these are just Bill's official titles.

He has been a key strategist, writer, crisis manager, event planner, grammarian, computer programmer, and graphic designer. From directing key communications initiatives to designing floor charts, no job has been too big or too small for Bill, and I will be forever grateful.

He has drafted and edited countless speeches, columns, releases, constituent letters, statements, and talking points over the years.

Born and raised in Michigan, he has always been able to capture the values and the heart of Michigan in his writings. His attention to detail is impeccable. He is an expert on proofreading and has impressively planned and organized our annual caucus retreats and has provided us with extraordinary experiences and speakers.

Bill is also one of the most creative people I know, from designing logos to inventing the Velcro "countdown" floor chart, like the one you see here, which shows how many days Bill has worked for me in the U.S. Senate. It is actually very cool. I have to show you: They come off. That is pretty inventive. Whenever you see these on the floor of the U.S. Senate, you can think of Bill Sweeney. So we had to make sure Bill had his own chart before leaving.

He is someone who has always been able to make something look good and function well at the same time. He has a passion for organization. He designed many of the systems that my office relies on to run efficiently today. As I said earlier, we literally are using integrated systems that Bill has designed over the years.

Bill is also one of the smartest people I know. I will miss his sharp wit and his sense of humor. With all of the hats Bill has worn, he is leaving very big shoes to fill. I will always be incredibly grateful for his loyalty, his work ethic, his friendship, and his passion for service.

Bill will be joining the team at AARP and continuing to work on so many issues we have championed together over the years. I wish him incredible success and happiness in his new chapter in his career. I apologize, but I am so happy he is moving on to a big challenge and yet so sorry to lose him.

Thank you, Bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. MERKLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 1987 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. MERKLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

S. 1790

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I would like to speak about the legislation that is before us right now on the floor. It is the annual National Defense Authorization Act, incredibly important legislation that the Senate, pretty much every year, is able to pass on a bipartisan basis.

It is really an exception. There is so much else that we are locked up on here with partisan gridlock. With regard to our troops, we tend to come together, Republicans and Democrats, and make commitments to them that we are going to give our men and women serving in the Armed Forces the resources and support they need to carry out their critical mission.

We have now proceeded to that legislation. I want to talk a little about it. It has a lot of incredibly important things in it. It is really important to Ohio.

In my State of Ohio, we have a lot of defense installations. They are very important to our national security because they do important work. They are also important to our Ohio economy. Ohio's defense spending now accounts for more than 66,000 direct jobs, more than \$4 billion in salaries, and more than a \$14 billion economic impact. Forty-three of our 88 counties in Ohio are impacted by these facilities. So they are critical to our State, to our economy, to our soldiers and their families, and to tens of thousands of civilian employees as well.

Again, because of the good work being done in Ohio, including at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is our largest single employer in Ohio, it is really important to our military readiness and to our national security. This bill has proceeded through the Armed Services Committee in the bipartisan manner in which it usually is done. I love seeing that. It is legislation that every Member of this body, I hope, will be able to support at the end.

It has a lot of important initiatives and some much needed reforms—including, by the way, this year, a 3.1-percent pay raise for our troops. I think that is necessary. They are in harm's way around the world. They are ensuring our safety, and we should ensure that they are fairly compensated for their hard work and their sacrifices.

One of the bill's other important initiatives that has a big impact on my State is authorizing \$1.7 billion to increase the rate of production for both our M1 Abrams tanks and also for upgrades to 165 tanks that are already in service. That is an increase from last year's figure. It also authorizes about \$249 million to upgrade the Stryker armored fighting vehicles.

This is great news for the men and women who are out in the field in our Armed Forces. They love these vehicles, and they need them. The Abrams

and the Stryker are the most advanced and lethal tanks and armored vehicles on the battlefield today. One of our priorities in Congress should be to ensure that we are providing our troops with what they need to be able to do their duty and to protect themselves. We want to be sure they have the highest quality equipment to be able to do that. Only by ensuring that these funds are allocated to such key vehicles like this can we be sure our Armed Forces are able to maintain their advantage—their qualitative advantage on the battlefield.

This isn't just a big win for our military, however. It is also a big win for a plant called the Joint Systems Manufacturing Center, or JSMC, which is the tank plant in Lima, OH. The best tanks and armored vehicles in the world are made at this plant. It has the best workforce in the world to do it. I have seen them in action many times. It is the only facility in the United States that has the capacity to produce tanks like the Abrams tank and the Stryker armored vehicle. It is a really important strategic asset for our country in Lima, OH.

Having been out there a lot, visiting with the workers, watching them work, seeing what they can make, and having talked to the soldiers in the field who use these products, I can tell you how important they are. Most recently, I was at the Lima tank plant in March where I was able to speak directly with the workers there about the long-term health of the Lima plant, which the Obama administration, about 8 years ago, attempted to shutter.

The President sent a budget to Congress—President Obama—saying we would like to close down the tank plant because in the future we won't need these tanks, at least not immediately, and some day we will have a new generation of tanks, and meanwhile, let's just shut down this plant. Some of us stood up, and I fought against that. We were able to convince the U.S. Congress to overturn what the President wanted to do and instead to provide funding for the tank plant to keep it open. Even though production was down at that time, we were able to keep the plant open and not have it be mothballed, as the administration wanted to do. Thank goodness we did that because now we know—particularly with the Russian influence in Europe and what our allies are telling us they need—that we have to have these armored vehicles and these tanks, and we need to continually upgrade them.

If we had shut down that plant, we would have lost this incredible workforce that is there building something that is unique. There is nothing quite like the welding, as an example, and the cutting that goes into our tanks. We also would have lost the supply chain. That would have been detrimental. It would have cost taxpayers so much more to try to take that plant out of mothballs and recreate it again than to keep it open as we did.

Now, frankly, we kept it open mostly through foreign sales. Other countries around the world, including our allies, were still buying Abrams tanks and Stryker vehicles. And Israel was buying the Nemera vehicle, which is an armored vehicle that is much like our Abrams tank without the turret. That kept us going, plus a little bit of upgrade to our tanks.

Now, today, again, and since 8 years ago, when there was a proposal to shutter this plant, we have been able to increase production slowly but surely to the point that today we have the ability to really have that plant humming. We have a lot of people who are working. It is on its way up, and that is really exciting.

The funding allocated under this legislation we talked about today is really important because it will allow this JSMC—the Lima tank plant—to hire, train, and retain more workers dedicated to making the best equipment possible to protect our troops.

I will tell you that the workers at the tank plant are very proud of what they do. A lot of them are veterans. They know that what they are doing every day by providing these armored vehicles has the potential to save the lives of the American men and women in uniform across the world who are relying on these vehicles to keep them safe and to be able to have that qualitative advantage on the battlefield by having the best equipment possible.

Last year, I had the opportunity to be the first Member of Congress to see the latest models of the Stryker Dragoon vehicles, up-armored at Lima. This was a real fight also. The Army came to us and said: We need to have some additional capability with regard to our Stryker vehicles to be able to push back against potential threats on the European continent. At that time we had no tanks in Europe, and we needed to upgrade what the Strykers could do by providing for additional lethality, particularly to provide a turret on top of the Stryker vehicle. We did that.

Now, as I saw with the 2nd Cavalry Regiment in Germany, they are using these vehicles, and those drivers of those vehicles, those other troops who are using those vehicles, love them. It feels like, again, it gives them the ability to be effective on the battlefield. They are also training with a coalition of our allies, including Poland, the United Kingdom, and Denmark. The work our men and women in uniform are doing with our allies in Europe is vitally important because it forms a framework of defense to protect our NATO allies from aggression.

The importance of an American military presence in Europe has never been in doubt, but perhaps now, more than at any time since the end of the Cold War, the security of Europe is uncertain. We have seen repeatedly, these past few years, instances of military aggression, electoral interference, and diplomatic provocation by Russia toward its western neighbors.

Nowhere is Russia's continued malign behavior on display more than in the country of Ukraine. For the past 5 years, we have seen Ukraine work to break free of Russia's orbit and seek greater integration with the democratic framework of the West, with the EU, with the United States, and with our NATO allies. Most vividly during the 2014 Maidan protest in Kiev, Russia responded to these appeals for democracy by illegally invading and annexing Crimea, which remains occupied in violation of international law to this day.

In the eastern region of Donbass, more than 4,000 Ukrainian soldiers have been killed fighting Russian-backed separatists. I have been to the frontlines, the so-called line of contact in the Donbass, and let me tell you that it is very much a hot war. Just last November, the Russian Navy attacked three Ukrainian naval vessels and captured two dozen Ukrainian sailors in international waters near the Kerch Strait. These individuals remain unlawfully detained by the Russian Government to this day. I urge my Senate colleagues and the entire international community to join me in calling for the release of those sailors.

I know here, on this side of the Atlantic, what is happening in Ukraine can sometimes seem like it is half a world away, but it is not. It is very relevant. In a sense, it is where the modern battle is taking place between two different ideologies—between whether a country wants to go toward freedom and democracy in the West or whether, again, to stay under the orbit of the Russian influence.

Here, in Ohio, we have a large and vibrant Ukrainian-American community, particularly in Northeast Ohio, who have a vested interest in seeing that their ancestral homeland can defend itself from Russian aggression as it works to align itself more with NATO and the West while promoting a platform of democracy, freedom, transparency, and free markets.

Frankly, we should all be supportive of Ukraine's efforts to reshape itself as a beacon of liberty in the region. As co-chair of the Senate Ukraine Caucus, which I cofounded with my colleague Dick Durbin, I have been an advocate of the Ukraine as it works to break free from Russia's influence. I traveled to Kyiv to meet with their newly elected President, Volodymyr Zelensky. I am encouraged from my meetings that they will stay on the right path toward reform, but to properly do so, they also have to defend themselves from Russian aggression.

For the past 3 years, I have successfully introduced and passed amendments to the legislation before us today, the National Defense Authorization Act, to expand U.S. military aid to the Ukraine. These provisions built and expanded the primary statutory framework for U.S. security assistance to Ukraine, the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative.

This year, I was pleased to see a further \$300 million authorized in lethal

and nonlethal aid to Ukraine in the NDAA. This security assistance package is good news and sends a strong signal that America stands with the Ukrainian people, and we will make sure their military has the capabilities it needs to defend its sovereign territory on land and in the sea and air.

But our commitment to Ukraine security should extend to other forms of support as well. I have offered an amendment that I hope will be included in the final bill to pressure Russia to release the Ukrainian sailors kidnapped in the Kerch Strait. It would do so by adding the release of the 24 Ukrainian sailors as a condition for any U.S. military cooperation with Russia. We need to take a firm stance against Russia's blatant disregard for international law in this matter, and passing this amendment will help us do so.

I am glad to see that the National Defense Authorization Act will keep the lines of production running, from the factory floors in Lima to the frontlines all around the world. I am glad we will be continuing to help Ukraine defend itself from unlawful Russian aggression. I hope we can also push for the release of the Ukrainian sailors who have been detained illegally in the Kerch Strait.

I look forward to voting on the bill's final passage in the Senate in the next week so the men and women who give so much of themselves to keep us safe have the resources they need to fulfill their important mission.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAMER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO CAL WILLIAMS

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Wednesday. Now, normally it is Thursday when I come down here to talk about somebody who is making a huge difference in my State, somebody we refer to as the Alaskan of the Week, someone who is doing something for the community or the State or the country or maybe all of the above. I know we have a new set of pages, but I think it is commonly known that this is the most anticipated speech of the week by the pages. I see the heads nodding, so that is great.

You guys are learning well, early, so that is wonderful, and I know that the Presiding Officer really enjoys it as well.

I am going to talk today about Calvin Williams, whom everybody in Alaska knows as Cal, who is our Alaskan of the Week, who lives in Anchorage via Louisiana. I am going to talk a lot about Cal here and why he certainly deserves this great honor, but also

when I give these remarks, I like to talk just a little bit about what is going on in Alaska at the time.

We have just celebrated the summer solstice, which in a lot of States isn't a big deal, but in Alaska, it is actually a huge deal. It is the longest day of the year, which was last week, and that really means something. You get the 12 midnight Sun energy, and everybody is out. There are celebrations throughout the State. Friends and neighbors gather at parties and community events well past 12 midnight. I had the opportunity to spend last weekend in Fairbanks, AK, where there was a 12 midnight Sun baseball game and a 12 midnight Sun 10K run. I got to participate in some of that. There was just great energy and a great feeling and a lot of sunlight all night.

Across the country and in Alaska, we also just celebrated Juneteenth, which marks the anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation. Anchorage celebrated the weekend before last, and Cal Williams, our Alaskan of the Week, was there, as he has been there nearly every year since the first celebration in the 1980s. Cal is a staple at that event and has been at so many other events in Alaska over the decades where people get together, where he has been a community leader and has tried to do good things for our communities throughout the State. So let me tell you a little bit about Cal and how lucky we are to have him in the great State of Alaska.

He was born in 1941 in Monroe, LA. I know we have some Louisianans as pages here. That was the segregated South, and he was born 7 days before the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor. He is from a very patriotic family. His parents immediately joined the cause of fighting and supporting our Nation during World War II. His mother worked in the factories to help out the war effort, and his father joined the Army and was sent to the Pacific theater to defend America.

Basically, Cal was raised by his grandmother, who happened to live across the street from church and a K-12 Catholic school, built and run by the Franciscans to serve the African-American Catholic community in the area. Nobody in his family was Catholic, but it was the best school in the area, so that was where he went. The lessons he was taught at this school, the Little Flower Academy—to serve the less fortunate, to feed the hungry, to help all in need—have stayed with Cal forever and have really driven his sense of service.

The much beloved Sister Consuela, who was the longtime principal and homeroom teacher, made sure that he learned all this.

Sister Consuela was feared and respected. If you did anything bad, if the Sister didn't see you [do something bad], you knew that God did. I carry that with me today.

After high school, he attended Grambling State University—another all-Black school—where he pursued the-

ater and singing. Anybody who knows Cal knows this is another thing that has stayed with him throughout his life.

Then, like his patriotic mom and dad, he decided to enlist in the Air Force. He was stationed at Vandenberg Air Force Base, where he worked on the Titan II Missile System—an elite position, something that he credits to the schooling he received at Little Flower.

When he got out of the Air Force, he made it back to Louisiana to take care of his father, who had gotten sick. This was during the height of the movement for civil rights—one of the greatest movements, of course, in our Nation's history, a lot of which took place here on this Senate floor. As he often does, Cal jumped in. He jumped in with both feet. He began working with CORE, the Congress of Racial Equality—one of the leading civil rights organizations in the early years of the civil rights movement. He and six other students were the first Black students to proudly integrate what was then called Northeast Louisiana State College.

Eventually, a friend who had moved to Alaska talked him into coming up to our great State. This was in 1965. Cal brought all of his intelligence, his theatrical and musical talents, his abiding deep faith, his fun, and his deep commitment to civil rights and community service to our State in 1965.

In some ways, it was a good time to be an activist in Alaska. Our State certainly isn't perfect. It is a State, though, that is very committed to equal rights and justice for all. Yet, just like everywhere in the country, we had our problems, and we had our challenges. As I mentioned, we certainly were not perfect in that realm, so Cal had work to do.

Initially, he was a dishwasher in the hospital by day and was a community activist by night. He helped to lobby the mayor's office in Anchorage to get paved roads and to bring electricity to predominantly African-American neighborhoods. He also helped bring people into the voting booths, which was so important.

The same friend who brought him to Alaska, Charles LeViege, started a newspaper that focused on the African-American community. He joined with the Alaska Native leadership to lobby for the landmark legislation that, again, took place on the Senate floor, here, in 1971—the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. He became the president of the Anchorage chapter of the NAACP, of which he is still a vice president to this very day.

I have only gotten to 1971, and you can see how much he has done.

In the 1970s, he had a little sojourn in Hollywood to fulfill a lifelong dream of being in the movies. He was. He got some gigs—a spot in a film with Angie Dickinson. The pages don't know who she is, but she was a great actress.

But like some people who leave Alaska, he missed it too much, so he decided to come back, and he did.

So over the years since he has been back, he has helped raise funds for an African-American economic development venture. The group built a building in the Fairview community of Anchorage, which is still there today. They had a social club on the top sponsored by the Alaska Black Caucus—a place to meet with executives and bank officers in a nice setting, community leaders.

He worked in television. He worked for the Alaska Housing Finance Corporation, which has been key to helping people get home ownership.

All through these years, he clung to his roots and his faith. He is a member of the Knights of Columbus and a faithful parishioner at St. Anthony's Catholic Church in Anchorage, where he is the director of the church's Filipino gospel choir, which sounds like angels. "When we sing," he said, "we sing for the Lord." And no doubt, when they sing, the Lord is listening.

He visits prisons to read the Bible with inmates, sings every week to the patients at Providence Extended Care and every other week to our senior home, which we call the Pioneer Home in Alaska. The residents there love Cal's Elvis impersonations.

If you are in Alaska and happen to be there for Christmas, you should stop by Bean's Cafe, a place where the hungry go for a meal, and Cal will be there every Christmas wearing a Santa cap, singing for hours for everybody who comes in the door.

This is a gentleman who has done so much for his community and my State, and what is he most proud of? When asked, "My greatest achievement was in 2017 when I received the St. Francis Stewardship Award from the Archdiocese of Anchorage," Cal said.

St. Francis was the patron saint of the Little Flower Academy. "I have come full circle," he said. "Sister Consuela would be proud of me." Then he adds: "But nothing was ever enough for her."

It is enough for all of us, though, Cal. I thank him for all he has done for Anchorage, for so many different communities, for Alaska, and as an example for our country—for his generosity, kindness, enthusiasm, faith, and faith-filled service throughout his life.

Congratulations to Cal for being our Alaskan of the Week.

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS MANSOUR

Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that my office is saying goodbye to my very first Coast Guard fellow, recently promoted—actually, promoted yesterday—to lieutenant commander, Thomas Mansour.

Thomas happens to be sitting right next to me here on the Senate floor. Tom is from Montgomery County, MD. He graduated from Eckerd College in St. Petersburg, FL. We were lucky to have him join my office as a Coast Guard fellow for the last 2 years, and he has done great work.

I am going to brag about him a little bit here on the floor. I will probably embarrass him.

Among other things, he was instrumental in the 2018 Coast Guard Authorization Act. The subcommittee that I chair on the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee is in charge of the Coast Guard. We were the ones drafting that. It had many provisions in it for the whole Coast Guard, certainly many for Alaska and other parts of the country.

He also brought his expertise to the 2017 and 2018 Homeland Security budgets. His efforts helped secure landmark appropriations for the first Polar Security Cutter, an icebreaker for the Coast Guard, the first one in 40 years, and for critical infrastructure projects for the Coast Guard around Alaska and around the rest of the country.

Probably his signature initiative—and very, very hard work—was on a bill that we affectionately know in my office as the Save Our Seas Act, both the first one, which our offices worked closely on with Senator WHITEHOUSE from Rhode Island and was signed by the President last fall to much fanfare in the Oval Office, and our Save Our Seas Act 2.0, which Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator MENENDEZ and I rolled out in a press conference just this morning.

SOS 2.0, as we call it, is an innovative piece of legislation that really sets us on a promising path as a nation to tackle the serious problem of plastics, ocean debris, and trash that enter our oceans and harm fisheries, marine life, and possibly human life. This litter ends up on the shores of Alaska, all around America, and threatens the livelihoods of coastal communities throughout America.

Tom did yeoman's work to ensure that we introduced in the Senate today a comprehensive, substantive bill that all stakeholders—Democrats, Republicans, the Trump administration, environmental groups, industry—are all working on together. Literally, all of the key stakeholders on this critical issue are pulling on the same oar.

He did incredible work on this bill. He is a great team player, someone I am proud of and we are going to miss.

Tom is getting married this summer to his fiance Meg, and they will be entering a whole new chapter in their lives. It will be an exciting one, I am sure. We wish them all the best.

I can't thank Tom enough for all of the work he has done for my State, for our country, and I ask that all of my colleagues in the Senate recognize the great work that he did. Just here on the spot, I might even make him an honorary Alaskan of the Week for the great job he has done.

Thank you for the opportunity to say a few words about Tom.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the issue of immigration is one that is front and center in the minds of most Americans, as it should be.

For the last 2½ years, our country has been roiling with immigration controversy. This new President, now 2½ years into his term, came to office and immediately instituted a travel ban on a majority of Muslim countries. It was controversial.

In the city of Chicago, people showed up spontaneously at the airport, lawyers, to counsel travelers to try to find some volunteer effort that might respond to their worry and concern about the travel ban imposed by President Trump.

The case went to court. The court stayed this decision and, in a later adjudication, allowed it to go forward.

It was the first of many actions taken by President Trump on the issue of immigration—most of them very controversial.

I remember the repeal of DACA in September of 2017. This is a program I had worked on for years. It started with the DREAM Act, which I introduced with my fellow U.S. Senator Barack Obama as cosponsor. We tried to pass it here in the Senate but were stopped time and again by the rules of the Senate and the filibuster.

Regardless of that, time passed and President Obama became President, and I appealed to him, with the assistance of Senator Lugar, a Republican Senator of Indiana, asking if he could find some way as President to provide relief to these young people brought to the United States as children, who wanted a chance to earn their way to legal status in America.

President Obama came up with a program called DACA, and that program said that if you are one of those children, you could come forward, pay a substantial filing fee, go through a criminal background check, and if we established that you are no threat to this country, that you are moving forward with your education and had plans for a job and a career, we would allow you to stay legally in the United States and not be deported for 2 years at a time, renewable—check in and make sure that your status hasn't changed.

In the end, 790,000—790,000—young people across America took advantage of DACA. Their lives were changed overnight. With DACA, there was no longer a fear of a knock on a door. They could become students and, as students, become teachers.

They can learn skills to be nurses, engineers, entrepreneurs, even doctors. It was a liberation for these 790,000 given the chance, finally, to be part of America and its future.

As I have said so many times on the floor, and Senator MENENDEZ was the first to ever say it, and I thought it was such an apt description of these

young people: They had spent their entire lives pledging allegiance to that flag every morning, believing it was their flag. They learned, at some point, they were not legally here in America. President Obama gave them a chance—790,000.

In September of 2017, President Donald Trump ended the DACA Program. He challenged Congress: Pass a law. Don't rely on an Executive order; pass a law. Well, we tried. We tried, on a bipartisan basis in the Senate, and President Trump rejected our effort. It was unfortunate, but it meant that these people—these 790,000 and hundreds of thousands of others who could have been eligible—were stopped in their tracks. Luckily—luckily—the courts came to their rescue and said for these people, despite President Trump's decision, the 790,000 should be protected from deportation. No new ones could apply, but it gave them temporary relief, which could end any day, any week, or any month. That, in my mind, was the second major move by President Trump to roil up this immigration situation in America, to get tough on 790,000 young men and women who simply wanted a chance to live in this country.

He then terminated temporary protected status. That was a category of immigration given to people who were in dire circumstances—victims of terrible extreme weather events or political and human disasters in their country—who were allowed to come here and live in the United States in a protected status, hundreds of thousands of them from all over the world. This President, Donald Trump, said: The end of it. We are going to put an end to it. It is over. That was the third strike as far as I was concerned, but it wasn't the end, by far.

Last June 2018, with a great deal of pride and with biblical quotes, Attorney General Jeff Sessions came forward and announced a zero-tolerance policy: Anyone presenting himself at the border would be considered suspect criminal, and if they had in their custody a young child, they would be separated. In the end, at least—at least—2,880 infants, toddlers, and children were separated from their parents. It was a dramatic move. It was an inhumane move, but it was done to create what they call a deterrence to discourage people from coming to our border. Within days, the public reaction against zero tolerance grew to a point where even this President, who does not have "sorry" in his vocabulary, came forward and said they were going to end that policy of zero tolerance.

What about the children, though, the ones who actually were separated? It took a Federal judge in Southern California to come forward and say there had to be an accounting of the children and their parents and a reuniting. It went on for weeks and months. Still, to this day, there are children adrift in America. Their families can't be found because zero tolerance—this inhumane

policy—was such an abject failure. Even "ending it" didn't end the struggle that many of these young people are still going through to this day. That was the fourth thing this President did by way of getting tough on immigration policy.

Then he announced several weeks ago in one of his infamous tweets that he was going to initiate a policy of mass arrests and mass deportations. There are some 11 million—that is the best estimate—undocumented people in this country, and the President said millions would be deported. We saw it in its earliest stages around the city of Chicago.

Betty Rendon, a grandmother who had been in the United States for more than 10 years, was deported. How dangerous was Betty Rendon to this country? Not at all. In fact, she was a seminary student at a Lutheran seminary near Chicago. She had deep family roots, children and grandchildren in the community who were American citizens, but that was not enough. ICE, the agency of enforcement of Department of Homeland Security, issued deportation orders, and she was forced to leave this country.

I have asked those in charge at the Department of Homeland Security: What threat was this woman to America? After being here 10 years and living a life that showed she was no threat to anyone, why was she a priority to deport from this country? They couldn't answer.

Now we have an unprecedented humanitarian crisis at our border. I thought long and hard about the statement I am about to make and the photo which I am about to display. Even though it has been on the front page of major newspapers like the New York Times, it is such a heartbreakingly photo that I at least warn in advance anyone following this speech that if you would be troubled by the images in this photo, please look away or turn away from what I am about to show you, but I believe it has to be shown to the American people. It is a photo of a shocking and horrifying image of Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez and his 23-month-old daughter Valeria. They died in their effort to try to cross from Mexico into the United States. This is the photo which was in the newspapers. It is a shocking portrayal of the desperation this family faced.

We are told by his wife that they tried to come through the ordinary port of entry, the usual place to present yourself to seek asylum in the United States—this mother, father, and child—and they were told that the ordinary port of entry was closed to them. So they attempted to cross the Rio Grande River.

From what we were told, this father took his little daughter, less than 2 years old, and swam across the river. He put her on the bank and then went back to help his wife come across. His daughter panicked and jumped in the river behind him. He tried to rescue her. They both drowned.

This is an illustration of the crisis in real terms, a crisis we face at this border that should never be taking place.

Valeria, this 23-month-old girl, according to her mother, loved to dance, play with her stuffed animals, and brush the hair of her madre and padre. Her father Oscar had sold his motorcycle and borrowed money to flee from El Salvador to come to the United States. He and his wife, Tania Vanessa Avalos, were simply looking for safety and opportunity for their family. Vanessa's mother said: "They wanted a better future for their girl." They planned to cross into the United States and seek asylum and try to find a safe place in the future.

That is the reality of what we are discussing on the floor of the Senate this evening and have been for the last several days. Unfortunately, President Trump responded to this tragedy with a political statement. He tweeted: "The Democrats should change the Loopholes and Asylum Laws so lives will be saved at our Southern Border."

I might remind the President that the same laws he now deals with in this border crisis were exactly the laws President Obama was faced with when he was President. Something different has happened. It isn't just the laws of this country; it is the way we are administering the laws that currently exist.

I sincerely believe we are better than this situation depicted in that photograph and what we have heard over and over. I believe America can have a secure border and respect our international obligations to provide safe haven to those fleeing persecution, as we have done as Democrats and Republicans for decades before this administration.

Yesterday I met with Mark Morgan. Last month, President Trump named him as Acting Director of U.S. Immigration Customs Enforcement, ICE. Mr. Morgan, a former marine and former FBI agent, had been asked to carry out the mass arrests that President Trump talked about in his tweet several weeks ago and the mass deportations of millions of immigrants whom the President had threatened.

Shortly before I met with Mr. Morgan, he was named to a different position, Acting Director of U.S. Customs and Border Protection. As of yesterday, he moved from being in charge of interior enforcement within the United States to be in charge of solving the humanitarian crisis we now face at our border.

If that sounds like a rash move and hard to explain, it is not the only one. In the 2½ years that President Trump has been President, we have had four different people leading the Department of Homeland Security—four—in 2½ years, and it is not the fault of the Senate or Congress for holding up nominations. They just change that often. Within the Department of Homeland Security, in every major department, we have had repeated turnovers

and changeovers in the leaders there. Even those today who are nominally in charge are in an acting capacity. They can't bring them through the regular order of vetting and background checks to be given these responsible positions. So as of yesterday, Mr. Morgan is in charge of this crisis at the border.

There is a gaping leadership vacuum in the Trump administration's Department of Homeland Security. To have four different heads of the Department in 2½ years, to have every position of responsibility for immigration or border security held by a temporary appointee is unacceptable, and the White House has not submitted names to Congress for permanent nominations to these positions.

The Trump administration can shuffle the deck chairs, but we know the obvious: President Trump's immigration and border security policies are failing. Their failures are found not only in the detention of children and families in inhumane circumstances but also this tragic photograph of a desperate couple turned away at the border who tried their best to find another way to present themselves in the United States.

We have a responsibility in Congress, Democrats and Republicans, to deal with this crisis that has been created by this administration.

In February, after the President finally agreed to end the longest government shutdown in the history of the United States, Congress passed a bipartisan omnibus appropriations bill that included \$414 million—in February, \$414 million—for humanitarian assistance at the border. I have asked what happened to this money. The explanations are hard to follow. Some said: Well, more than half of this humanitarian assistance has been invested in a building which will be ready for occupancy in about a year and a half.

Here we have kids without diapers at the border, questionable food sources, filthy clothes, separation of children from families, and they are setting out to build a building that might be open in a year and a half. It would seem to me that those who were in medical practice and triage cases would certainly start with the immediate humanitarian challenge before they start the long-term responsibility of building a building. More needs to be done at our border.

In April, I visited El Paso, TX. What I saw in the Border Patrol's overcrowded facilities was heartbreaking. I want to add here, as I do every time I bring this up, that I believe the men and women—the professional men and women at the border, the ones I met and spoke to—are caring people. They are genuinely concerned by the humanitarian crisis they see unfolding before them every single day. Some undoubtedly have done improper things and mistreated these detainees, but the ones I spoke to understood, as human beings, the need for us to do more as a country.

Last month, I led 24 Senators in calling on the International Committee of the Red Cross and the inspector general of the Department of Homeland Security to investigate these Border Patrol facilities, including the ones I visited in El Paso. The circumstances there were unacceptable by any normal American standard. To think that we were packing these people into detention cells far beyond the capacity—"capacity 35" written over the door. I counted 150 standing shoulder to shoulder in that room with one toilet. It is just unacceptable and impossible to explain that this is happening in America.

For me to call on the international Red Cross to look at this circumstance is something I never thought I would do. I have done that before but only in foreign countries, asking that some of the horrible conditions in the detention of prisoners be investigated by the International Red Cross. I never thought I would be asking the same of the Red Cross, to look in America.

Earlier this month, the inspector general of the Department of Homeland Security released a report detailing the inhumane and dangerous overcrowding of migrants at the El Paso port of entry, which I had visited. The office found the overcrowding was "an immediate risk to the health detainees and DHS employees."

Earlier today, the Senate passed legislation with funding to alleviate some overcrowding at the CPB facilities and to provide food supplies and medical care to migrants. This bill we have passed also includes critical funding for the Office of Refugee Resettlement to care for migrant children.

The House of Representatives passed their own version of the bill last night. The House legislation, which I also support, includes critical oversight measures, particularly when it comes to these children. Now it is time for us to reach an agreement—the House and the Senate, Democrats and Republicans—and to do it in a timely fashion.

I am willing to work with my colleagues to find a bipartisan answer, as I did on the first version of this, which passed in the Senate. What is happening at our border is unacceptable. The President has to come to realize that just getting tough is not the answer; it takes more.

We need to commit ourselves to international assistance in these three countries that are the sources of these people: El Salvador, Honduras, and Guatemala. Overwhelmingly, those are the origins of these migrants who come to the United States.

We have to realize, as well, that people are coming here in desperate circumstances, as this photograph I showed on the floor depicts. Many times they are prepared to risk their lives and even lose their lives as they try to make it to the United States in desperation. We have to find a way, an orderly way, to accept those who truly need our protection and need to be

brought to a place of safety. And we have to have a timely process so that the determination of eligibility is not 1 year or 2 years in the future. It is time for us to work together on a bipartisan basis to do that.

Mr. President, I see another Senator, my colleague from Oklahoma, on the floor. I hope he can give me 10 minutes.

Thank you. I appreciate that.

IRAN

Mr. President, although I may not often say it, I want to make it clear. I think President Trump made the right decision the other day in deciding not to start a war with Iran. He must accept responsibility for some of the challenges we now face.

I think the decision to walk away from the agreement that prohibited Iran from developing nuclear weapons was shortsighted. By every report that we have received, this agreement—international agreement—with international inspectors was being followed by the Iranians. Yet the President decided to walk away from it. His attempt to isolate Iran from our allies, to seek regime change, and to declare economic war on Iran, unfortunately, have all led to this moment in history where a confrontation seems imminent.

Many around the President here in Washington and abroad have been anxious for a conflict with Iran. Many of the same people were anxious for a conflict with Iraq. I remember that. I remember it well because I was one of 23 Senators who voted against the invasion of Iraq. They are still there, engaged in a war some 17 years later. Thousands of American lives have been lost, and thousands more have been injured. We are spending trillions of dollars in taxpayers' money in a war without end in Iraq.

One of the great tragedies of the Iraq war, one of the few its architects have ever admitted, is that the Iraq war actually ended up empowering Iran. Today, the Iraqi Government is actually something of an Iranian client state. Yet the same unrepentant voices are again beating the drums for regime change and another war in the Middle East.

Do the American people want a third war in the Middle East at this moment in our history? I don't think so.

Some have even had the audacity to argue the 2001 authorization for use of military force approved by this Congress to respond to those who attacked us on 9/11 somehow gives this President authority and permission to invade Iran. I don't agree with that at all.

I cannot imagine anyone here who took that vote 18 years ago thought they were voting to start a war with Iran that would still be going on 18 years later. I find that impossible to believe.

The Constitution is clear. Article I, section 8 says that the power to declare war is the explicit power of the U.S. Congress, and it should be.

No one should ever send our sons and daughters into war without the consent

of the American people through their elected representatives. Our Founding Fathers were wise in making sure this awesome power did not rest with a King-like or Queen-like figure but with the people's elected representatives.

I have made this same argument in the House and in the Senate during my career, regardless of who sat in the White House, a Republican or a Democrat.

Recently, I was pleased to join with Senator UDALL and others in legislation reaffirming no war with Iran without the consent of Congress. This bill is also now an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act. I sincerely hope we will have a timely vote to make sure the President understands that he cannot authorize the invasion or military force in Iran without the approval and permission of Congress.

Some of the eerie, familiar statements and distortions used to sell the Iraq war are reappearing now. Vice President Cheney repeatedly warned us in those days that Saddam Hussein was actively pursuing nuclear weapons. He even alleged there was "no doubt" that they were amassing those weapons to use against the United States.

Former Pentagon adviser Richard Perle argued that Iraqis could finance the postwar rebuilding from their own oil wealth, and he had "no doubt that they will."

President George W. Bush, who claimed war was actually his last choice, provocatively tried to link al-Qaida with Saddam Hussein—a dubious claim echoed by his then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, and one some are even trying to brazenly use today.

Secretary Rumsfeld even tried to claim war in Iraq would last "Five days or five weeks or five months, but it certainly isn't going to last any longer than that." That is what our Secretary of Defense said.

Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz and Vice President Cheney said we would be welcomed in Iraq as liberators. Wolfowitz argued that "hundreds of thousands of American troops is way off the mark."

Five days or 5 weeks, welcomed by the Iraqis? Well, the war started, and it has never ended. There are 150,000 American soldiers deployed in Iraq. The war continues into its second decade. Incidentally, no weapons of mass destruction were ever found, no nuclear weapons, and we certainly weren't greeted as liberators. Iraqi oil did not pay the \$2 trillion that American taxpayers were forced to pay for that war in Iraq.

More than 4,500 Americans have been killed and 32,000 wounded, including my brave and amazing colleague in the Senate, Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH.

How do some of the current occupants of the White House driving Iran policy feel about that Iraq war disaster? Well, National Security Advisor John Bolton said in 2015: "I still think

the decision to overthrow Saddam was correct." He made that statement 1 month after writing a New York Times op-ed piece entitled: "To Stop Iran's Bomb, Bomb Iran."

Sadly, what I find most stunning about the administration's march to war in Iran is that its actions have, in fact, contributed to the current mess and Iran's threat to restart its nuclear program.

President Trump has been pursuing a policy impossible to follow: calling for a regime change, trying to flatter and meet with the Iranian President Rouhani, trying to negotiate a better deal, threatening Iran militarily, tightening sanctions. Who knows what the policy is going to be from day to day.

The President impulsively withdrew from the nuclear agreement without first designing a credible way to get a better agreement. He went on to designate Iran's military as a terrorist organization, even against the advice of our military. And he tried to starve Iran of the agreed benefits it was to receive from the original deal.

Let me be clear. There is no doubt that Iran is responsible for dangerous destabilizing actions in that region and beyond. Its proxies attack our service-members in Iraq and threaten our allies in the region. But why not push back against Iran without withdrawing from the nuclear agreement? Why give them the pretext for belligerence and undermine our credibility with the global powers party to our own nuclear deal?

The tragic end result of this dangerous incoherence is that our allies are united against us, and Iran may we start nuclear activities, which had been frozen for the last 4 years.

This Congress, already a rubberstamp for too many of President Trump's instincts, must not do so in a march to another war in the Middle East as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I want to rise today to speak to the Senate and compliment two of my colleagues, Senator JIM INHOFE from my State of Oklahoma, my senior Senator, and Senator JACK REED, for their leadership and bipartisan work on this year's National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

This is a complicated bill. It has had hundreds of amendments, both in committee and in the initial managers' package that came out of committee that has already been debated, and there are a lot more amendments that are still being debated in the process.

It is an incredibly complicated issue to bring the authorization and information for all military for the next year. It is something that Congress has done for a long time. But for JIM INHOFE, this is his first year to chair this committee and to actually be the driver for this, and I think he has done an exceptional job of walking through this piece of legislation.

It is a \$750 billion authorization. There will be additional appropriations that have to be done to be able to designate that, but that is exactly what President Trump had asked for and said is what is needed, and it is what the Department of Defense has said that they would need to keep our country safe and to prepare for the future.

There are a lot of elements in the bill. I want to identify a few of them, beginning with a 3.1-percent pay increase for our troops. That is something that is much needed. The pay for our troops has been very, very behind for a long time, and this starts an initial process of getting them a little bit above inflation to start trying to catch up.

It also deals with an issue that is very important to our military families, and that is their housing. There are many areas and many bases and posts around the country and around the world where the housing has fallen behind: mold issues, plumbing issues, electrical issues, roofing issues, and flooring issues. It is important for the members of our military to have a safe place that they come home to that really feels like home. They are traveling around the world. They are in difficult places, and as much as their families can be kept safe and have a place that they can make home as a family—that is exceptionally important. For those single men and women, it is important that they have a place where they can actually get rest and have connection with each other. This bill deals with additional funding to deal with housing, which is much needed.

This bill also deals with spouses, in their transition from facility to facility, being able to pick up an additional job. For many of the spouses who are traveling with our men and women in the military, when they move to a new base or post, they also want to pick up a new job in that place. It takes months to do that transition now.

There is also an issue with licensing. If they have a professional skill in one State, when they move to another State, there are some additional hurdles for them just to move to that next State. This bill helps deal with that and, again, helps those families know that when they move, as we ask them to move to different locations, it is a little bit easier on their family to also pick up a second job if they choose to do that.

Oklahoma is home to Altus Air Force Base, Tinker Air Force Base, Vance Air Force Base, Fort Sill Army Post, McAlester Army Ammunition Plant, and, of course, the amazing facilities for our Army and Air International Guard. We have a lot of folks in Oklahoma who are veterans who come back to Oklahoma to retire, and a lot of folks who are actively serving there. This bill deals with every one of those facilities in some way.

Let me give a few examples. The KC-46 tanker—a brandnew tanker that will be the refueler for the next generation—has already begun its delivery. It

is coming to Altus, and it is already there at Altus Air Force Base. In fact, I had the privilege, along with Senator INHOFE, to ride in from Seattle on the very first KC-46 tanker coming to Altus Air Force Base in the 97th Air Mobility Wing. That wing does all the training for every pilot who will fly the KC-46 for the decades ahead. Whether they are in the Reserve or in the Guard or Active Duty, they are going to be connected to Altus Air Force Base for the KC-46. It has long been awaited, and it is finally arriving.

This bill does the authorization for an additional 15 tankers, as we are modernizing that force, and we will do a few every single year for quite a while.

The bill includes funding for the procurement of critical Army weapons and combat vehicles, including the Paladin Integrated Management System upgrade, which is assembled in Elgin, OK, right next to Fort Sill. The Fires Center of Excellence at Fort Sill organizes, trains, and equips all the Paladin units in the Army Paladin Integration Management. In fact, the skills that are coming in at Fort Sill Fires Center of Excellence are asked for all over the world. Almost every one of our allies and every single foreign base is asking for the good folks from Fort Sill who are trained to help protect our men and women around the world.

Additionally, Senator INHOFE and Senator REED and all their staff have worked to get in some of the amendments that I brought in on the base text. Those amendments—they heard it out. We got a chance to have dialogue. They have now been included long term.

One of those that I worked with one of my colleagues on—Senator SHAHEEN—we worked on a sense-of-the-Senate on dealing with Turkey. Turkey is a NATO ally. They worked very closely with us in the development of the F-35, but we have a problem. The leadership in Turkey is now reaching out to Russia to buy the S-400 air defense system. The F-35 is incompatible with the S-400 Russian system sitting right next to it. We will never ever allow the F-35 to sit next to the Russian S-400 system.

We tried to make that clear in multiple conversations with Turkey and with Turkey's leaders. We tried to bring this up over and over again. I worked with Senator INHOFE, along with my colleagues, Senator SHAHEEN and Senator JACK REED, to make it clear that we will not allow the F-35 to be sold to Turkey if they are also going to purchase the S-400 from Russia.

I maintain my strong support for the F-35 program and applaud its advanced capability. The military actually will be shaped around the F-35 in the days ahead, based on its capabilities. But we cannot allow Turkey to have the F-35 and also buy a Russian system at the same time.

One of my other amendments that I dealt with when I was dealing with

Turkey and the F-35 and the security of that advanced weapons system also dealt with something that some folks may not have noticed, but I did, and other folks have as well, and that is the retirement of chaplains.

We lose track at times that when people enter into the military, these mandatory retirement ages will sneak up on folks. Well, it is especially so for chaplains because many chaplains actually enter into their service in the military after—as a second career. For many folks in the military, that is their first career, and then they have a second one, but not so for chaplains. Many of them are pastors or missionaries or counselors in hospitals and other locations. They get into their service and then time out.

Chaplains need a little bit of extra time to serve so they can serve a full term with the U.S. military. One of our amendments in this bill allows those chaplains to be able to complete service and be a part of that.

There are many other aspects of this bill that is literally hundreds of pages long that deal with military service. I want to bring up one additional element. It is an element that has been in great debate in conversation here in Congress, and it deals with the country of Iran.

This bill deals with not the military policy specifically with Iran but deals with our defense and our preparation for any enemy, including Iran. There is an amendment coming up for debate and conversation that changes the rules of engagement with Iran, that literally says to this administration that they cannot engage in any hostilities with Iran. They can only defend themselves if attacked but cannot respond until they get a vote from Congress.

I cannot imagine a worse set of rules of engagement for anyone in the U.S. military who is forward-deployed and facing risk from Iran than to say: You can respond when Congress votes for it.

I will certainly vote against that amendment, as it comes up as one of the final amendments, to say to our military leadership: I will not handcuff you in the face of the threat that is Iran.

I have heard folks on this floor and in the media want to lay the issues we have with Iran on President Trump. May I remind this body that we had 444 hostages taken in Iran in 1979. Iran was the mover that bombed Beirut and our Embassy there in the 1980s. Iran is the one that attacked the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia and killed many of our folks in the 1990s. The reason Bashar Assad is still in power in Syria right now is because Iran and their forces have brought them up. The reason there is a civil war in Yemen right now is because Iran is providing the weapons there and the insight to be able to instigate that civil war that is happening in Yemen right now. The reason there is constant peril on Israel's borders all the way around is because Iran is funding Hezbollah and Iran is funding Hamas.

Iran is the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world, and the instability in the region is not something new and is not President Trump's fault. It has been a long-term issue with not only the United States but all of the West and all of the region.

Our issue is not with the Iranian people. They are smart. They are entrepreneurs. They are well educated. But they also live under the thumb of a ruthless regime led by the ayatollahs. That regime squashed the Green Movement several years ago in Iran—the people just wanting more freedom.

The issues we are facing with Iran right now are not President Trump's fault, are not because he is being mean, just as Iran's attack on the Khobar Towers and the murder of many of our people was not because President Clinton had put sanctions on Iran the year before. It wasn't President Clinton's fault that the Khobar Towers were attacked; it is not President Trump's fault in this case. He has pushed back on a terrorist regime and is demanding that they change their ways not only in the nuclear setting but also in conventional terrorism around the region and, quite frankly, around the world. We cannot allow them to continue to terrorize their neighbors.

No one wants a war with Iran. That is why we have used sanctions and diplomatic means to address this. All these accusations that the President is secretly going to try to take us to war with Iran I find absurd, especially for the man who is trying to get us out of a war in Afghanistan, out of a war in Syria, and out of a war in Iraq. Suddenly, secretly, he wants to get into a war with Iran? That is absurd.

All of the region is looking to us to help push back on the biggest bully in the region for decades, and every President since Jimmy Carter has tried to isolate and push back on Iran. I do not want to suddenly limit President Trump from trying to isolate and push back on Iran because some folks don't trust him.

In the days ahead, we as a nation will cautiously, diplomatically, economically isolate Iran to try to bring them into cooperation with the rest of the world, but in the meantime, let's not handcuff our folks who are in harm's way in that region and tell them: If you want to respond, come and get a vote from us first.

In closing, I again thank Senator INHOFE, who has done tireless work on this NDAA, and Senator JACK REED for their great bipartisan leadership on this. They have done yeomen's work on this.

I hope that this bill will not only pass the Senate but that we will put it on the President's desk in the days ahead and give some stability to our military forces around the world and that they will know we understand that 7 days a week, 24 hours a day, and in every time zone in the world, they are standing watch for peace and freedom. They are not a threatening presence. They are a peaceful presence, and

their strength has brought exceptional peace to the world. I am grateful for them and for their families and for the amazing sacrifice they make every day.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT NO. 900

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening to offer an amendment about the opioid addiction crisis that is devastating our Nation.

The origins of this epidemic are no doubt complicated, but there is a simple fact within this complicated problem; that is, the introduction of the synthetic opioid fentanyl has made this the deadliest drug epidemic in American history.

Fentanyl is 30 to 50 times more powerful than heroin, which is obviously lethal. Just 2 milligrams of this substance—that is equivalent to a few grains of salt—is enough to kill most people. This synthetic opioid has contributed to or caused 30,000 of the 50,000 opioid overdose deaths in the United States since 2017, and it is killing Pennsylvanians at an even higher percentage.

As is the case with most illicit drugs, the vast majority of this is not actually coming from within the borders of the United States; the vast majority originates outside our borders. So cooperation with the governments of other countries is essential if we are going to make progress in ending this scourge.

There are some countries that are extremely helpful. Canada and Mexico are, unfortunately, important transit points for drugs into the United States. Their governments work closely with ours and, I think it is fair to say, are doing all they reasonably can and continue to strive to do more to end this devastating influx. But fentanyl is particularly difficult because such tiny quantities are so lethal, and the fact is that not all foreign governments are as cooperative as they could be and they should be.

It is well known that the primary source of the fentanyl that is on the streets in Pennsylvania and across America—the source is ultimately China. China has been cooperating in some important ways. China shares advance electronic data on mail parcels, and that is helpful. As of May 1 of this year—a few weeks ago—China agreed to schedule fentanyl as a class that is prohibited in China, and that forgoes the need to schedule every conceivable variant of the chemical. That is a good development. But we can't be sure that China is going to follow through on its commitment—the one I just mentioned is very recent—and they still don't do all they should on pill presses. They also have a history of breaking agreements with the United States.

Maybe even more importantly, we don't know what other countries might decide to tolerate fentanyl production

within their borders and look the other way when it arrives in the United States.

Simply, there have to be consequences for countries that knowingly allow the production of fentanyl in their own land, to then be exported to the United States, and that do not—I am referring to the governments—cooperate with us as fully as they could and should be.

That brings me to the bill I introduced. It is called the Blocking Deadly Fentanyl Imports Act. It is a bipartisan bill that I introduced with DOUG JONES. I want to offer that as an amendment, to get a vote on this bill we are considering right now.

I should point out that since 1983, Congress has utilized the Foreign Assistance Act as a way to deal with this kind of problem. Specifically, this legislation—the Foreign Assistance Act, the existing law—forbids certain categories of U.S. foreign aid from going to countries that don't assist us sufficiently in our effort to control illicit substances.

There is a finite number of illicit drugs that are on the list. They include heroin, marijuana, cocaine, and methamphetamine and its precursor chemicals. Congress has periodically updated the list and expanded the list as times have changed. In 2005, the House and Senate voted to add methamphetamine and its precursors. Senator JONES and I and a number of our colleagues believe it is past time that we add fentanyl to this list, especially since it is arguably the most lethal drug in the world today.

Our bill would do a couple of things. It would add fentanyl to this list on the Foreign Assistance Act, the illicit substance list. That would then require the State Department to identify those countries—at the moment, China—that are the most significant sources of illicit fentanyl and fentanyl analogues.

Then we would toughen the requirements in determining whether or not another country is, in fact, sufficiently cooperating with the United States. We only toughen the requirements for those countries that are found to be significant sources of fentanyl, not the other drugs already on the list but those countries determined by our State Department to be significant sources of fentanyl. For that small set of countries, if the President finds that one or more of the following three criteria are not being met, then, those countries would face the risk of having these forms of financial aid withheld.

These are the three criteria we want them to meet: No. 1, whether they have in fact scheduled fentanyl and analogues as a controlled substance in their country; No. 2, whether steps are being taken to actually prosecute people who are illegally trafficking in fentanyl; and the final criteria we would add is whether or not they require the registration of pill presses, because we know that unregulated pill presses have been found to be used for

production of counterfeit pills that actually contain fentanyl.

That is the criteria that would get a country crosswise with us as a consequence of this legislation. What would the consequences be? The legislation contemplates that if a country is not doing enough with respect to the existing list of illicit narcotics, then, they would stand to lose various forms of foreign aid from the United States, specifically, economic development grants, development finance aid, health aid, agricultural aid, and military aid.

It is important to note there are other categories of aid that we provide to foreign countries and more precisely to entities within those countries that would not be affected by this. They are not affected under current law, and they would not be affected under our bill—aid such as products-related assistance, disaster relief, food aid, medical aid, and aid to refugees. Existing law doesn't interrupt those forms of aid even with bad-acting governments, and our bill wouldn't either. In addition, even the categories of foreign aid that could be shut off and that would be shut off are subject to a Presidential waiver. If, for whatever reason, the President believes it is more important that we continue even those forms of aid, then, under our amendment, the President could do so.

Again, to just sum up, the simple thing here is that a country that knowingly tolerates the production and export of fentanyl and is not as cooperative with our government as they could be in stopping it shouldn't be getting all kinds of U.S. foreign aid. That is all.

That is what our amendment would do. The majority on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee supports this. The State Department made some suggestions that we accepted. Some of the suggestions included that we drop the reference to precursor chemicals because that might capture too many countries that shouldn't be captured because they are not the precursor chemicals used for the purpose of producing illicit fentanyl. We acknowledged that, and we changed it.

I would again stress that the waivers are available to the President in the event the country ought to get those waivers.

So let me remind my colleagues that this is the worst drug crisis in American history. Fentanyl is at the heart of it. We should hold accountable countries that are not doing enough to stop this poison from leaving their country and coming into ours.

I am not asking for passage here and now, but I am asking for a vote. Let's have an up-or-down vote. I would be happy to set the vote at a 60-vote threshold. Let's send a message to any country in the world that there will be consequences for them if they choose to go down this road.

With that, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to set aside amendment No. 862 and call up my amendment No. 900.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I agree with the Senator from Pennsylvania that we need to fight the opioid epidemic from every angle.

The trafficking of this drug fentanyl coming into the United States has to stop. Many lives are at stake. In my State of New Jersey, over 3,100 New Jerseyans died in 2018 alone as a result of prescription pain killers, heroin, and fentanyl.

While I support the Senator from Pennsylvania's desire to use all of the leverage we have at our disposal to pressure China to do a better job at regulating illicit fentanyl, as is exemplified by the amendment I cosponsored with Senator SCHUMER and others that is in the underlying legislation we are considering as of now, the Senator from Pennsylvania's amendment could potentially have far more wide-reaching implications.

I believe every Member of the body should be concerned about the potential collateral damage should this become law.

The Trump administration's State Department, when we asked them for an assessment of the original version of this amendment, concluded that it would lead to the suspension of U.S. foreign assistance to every country on the planet. That is not something I can support.

When we talk about China, our aid to China isn't to China as a nation. China doesn't need our aid. It is giving out aid all over the world. Our aid to China is to individuals, entities, and organizations that actually promote our national interests and our national security by creating opportunities for different parts of Chinese society to be independent from the Chinese state. So it is not China that gets our foreign assistance, but, in large part, that ultimately would be denied, and that is a type of loss that the Chinese would be only too happy to see happen.

My office worked extensively through the weekend with the Senator from Pennsylvania's office. We offered numerous different compromise agreements, but none of them were acceptable. So while I agree with the spirit of this amendment, I cannot support it as it is currently drafted, and therefore I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, very briefly, I hope the Senator from New Jersey will continue to engage with us. There is a possibility that we are not as far apart as it may appear.

Let me be very clear. It is an absolute fact that every country in the world would not be affected by this legislation at all. Whoever at the State Department suggested that chose not to read the language or chose not to understand it. Our legislation would af-

fect a very narrow category of countries that are determined by our State Department to be major sources of fentanyl. At the moment, there is a grand total of one that I am aware of that would qualify for that designation. Nothing else flows from this. There are no consequences unless you first meet that criteria. So that alone makes it obvious that it couldn't possibly apply to every country in the world.

I would also underscore the categories of aid that would be subject to being withheld in the event that a country is, in fact, a source of fentanyl and is not cooperating with us—our economic development grants, development finance aid, health aid, agricultural aid and military aid are all forms of aid that I think are entirely reasonable to withhold. The categories that I think the Senator from New Jersey is concerned about we exclude from the risk of being withheld, because I acknowledged the Senator's point. There are categories of foreign aid that don't go to foreign governments. They go to NGOs. They go to folks on the ground who are actually advancing a cause we believe in. For instance, there is the democracy development fund. We wouldn't affect that even if a country is a major source of illicit fentanyl and not cooperating with us fully. We recognize that this category of funding doesn't help that government. It helps us with the hope that we could change that government. I am not convinced that we are as far apart as it may appear to be.

I would remind everyone that I am only seeking a vote. I am not asking for unanimous consent for the amendment itself. I hope we can get back to the business of actually debating substance and voting in this body. Sometimes the minority leader has suggested that we have become a graveyard of legislation. Well, I am just proposing that we have a debate and have a vote. I hope we can get to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, as I said, we worked all weekend long with the Senator from Pennsylvania's office, and we are happy to continue to work with him to see if we can come to a common ground. His original amendment that we were discussing did include the elimination of democracy promotion, and that is something that China would only be too happy to achieve.

I understand that in this amendment—which I have not had the full opportunity, nor my staff, to fully analyze—he may have excluded that. That is another step forward. So we are happy to engage with the Senator and see if we can come to common ground beyond today.

My goal, however, is to join the Senator in punishing countries that are ultimately allowing this to happen, but not to do it in a way that doesn't punish the country but actually denies

those whom we are trying to help inside of those countries in the pursuit of our own interests. So if we come to that point, I hope we can ultimately come to an agreement.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this evening to speak about the horrific humanitarian crisis at our southern border—the inhumane and truly despicable conditions under which migrants, including children, are being held by the U.S. Government. Children are being held for prolonged periods of time in facilities that are woefully inadequate, and that is an understatement.

On my left is a chart with some pictures. I want to walk through each of these pictures to talk about these children by name. Since September of 2018, these children have died while in United States Government custody.

I will start at the lower right-hand corner of the chart as you are facing the chart: Carlos Hernandez Vasquez, 16 years old; up here on the left top of the chart, Wilmer Josue Ramirez Vasquez, 2 years old; Darlyn Cristabel Cordova-Valle, age 10; Juan de Leon Gutierrez, right here on the other side of the chart, just 16 years old; Jakelin Caal Maquin—many know her name from the time when she passed away—just 7 years old; and finally, Felipe Gomez Alonzo, just 8 years old.

These six deaths occurred in the span of less than 1 year and are the first deaths in at least a decade. Mourning their deaths is not enough. I think we can at least agree on that. As much as anyone can mourn their deaths, that is not enough. We must act in light of this terrible darkness that these children experienced and that their families are living with and that our country is experiencing as well.

In recent weeks we have heard some of the reporting. There have been reports of children held without adequate medical attention, without food or water or sanitation.

Just by way of one searing example, Warren Binford, a law professor at Willamette University, who spoke with children at the Texas facility, said:

Basically, what we saw are dirty children who are malnourished, who are severely neglected. They are being kept in inhumane conditions. They are essentially being warehoused, as many as 300 children in a cell, with almost no adult supervision.

This is a lawyer who is trained to understand and to explain these kinds of conditions. This isn't some casual observer. This is an expert in her field who is telling us this. She is not a Member of Congress. She is not an employee of the U.S. Government. She is a lawyer who saw this with her own

eyes—children who are malnourished, neglected, living in inhumane conditions, warehoused, with 300 children in a cell with no adult supervision.

This same law professor reported witnessing a 14-year-old—a 14-year-old—caring for a 2-year-old without a diaper, lack of medical care, with flu outbreaks and lice infestation.

Law Professor Binford said:

It's the worst conditions I have ever witnessed in several years of doing these inspections.

That is what a trained professional is telling us about what is happening in these conditions.

A Senate colleague of mine talked about going into a facility where children were housed. This is a Senator with a lot of experience in the Senate. He said, usually when you walk through any kind of facility or any kind of environment in the United States of America where children are, you can hear them laughing and playing and having fun—that beautiful noise of children playing. He said you couldn't hear any of it. He talked about the eerie and disturbing quiet in that place. There was no noise, no laughing, no happiness, I guess, is probably the best way he described it.

Then this one Senator talked about making eye contact with a child. As soon as he or she made eye contact, the child would turn away.

I am sure we have other examples from colleagues here and in the House and within our government, but when a law professor who has been in a lot of these circumstances tells us this, we should listen, and we should act.

Another lawyer reported speaking with young mothers and children—all of whom were claiming asylum at a Texas facility. The mother reported a lack of proper medical care, or clean clothes, or sufficient cups or baby bottles, forcing reuse and sharing of those same cups and bottles, as well as mothers wiping their children's runny noses or vomit with their own clothes because they have nothing else—not even a paper towel—to clean with when they are experiencing these conditions. This particular lawyer was quoted in the Texas Tribune, just in case anyone wants a source.

These reports of overcrowding and lack of medical care, sanitation problems, and lack of food or water are an abomination. This is not America. It is not the America we grew up with. It is not the America we tell the world we are. We have told the world for generations that we care about each other; that we welcome people to our shores and try to treat them fairly. We can't say that when we have these kinds of insults.

Just imagine the fear a child experiences in these circumstances—the fear that comes from being alone, the fear of not having their mother or their father or some loved one nearby, in many circumstances. Some, I guess, might have an older sibling with them, but just imagine how frightened they are.

Then, to compound that, they don't have basic necessities. I can't even imagine the fear.

There is a great hymn in my faith that talks about being a servant. I will not go through all the lyrics. The song is named “The Servant Song.” I will take the sacredness out of it for purposes of where we are speaking today. One of the lines of “The Servant Song” says: “I will hold the . . . light for you in the night time of your fear.”

I can't imagine any other circumstance that anyone here could describe to better fit that description—in the night time of the fear of children who may have survived, but others, as this chart depicts, lost their lives because of failures of our government. A 2-year-old, a 10-year-old, a 7-year-old, a 16-year-old, an 8-year-old, and another 16-year-old who were in government custody of the United States of America lost their lives. I can't even begin to imagine that fear.

We all have to ask ourselves a lot of questions, but one question we have to ask ourselves in both Houses of Congress and the administration is, Will this government be there in the night time of the fear experienced by these children or not? It is readily apparent, from all the reporting month after month, that we are in no way meeting that test for too many children. Maybe some are in better conditions, but there are a lot of children—I don't even know the number. I hope it is only in the hundreds, but many people believe it is a lot more than that. There may be thousands or more who are in the night time of their fear.

Our government is not only part of creating the fear, we are doing next to nothing to alleviate it. We should ask ourselves, will we be there for them in the night time of their fear?

The administration's response to all of the reporting of this horror has been an insult to the United States of America. It is an insult to the taxpayers who send money to the government and say: Make sure that when a child comes to our borders, we treat them humanely; make sure the system works. It is an insult to our values, of course.

It is an insult to the proclamations we make as Americans to the world that we are a beacon of light for the world in so many ways. Thank goodness we are in some other facets of our government and of course the lives of our people. On this issue, we are bringing darkness not only to the lives of those children, but we are bringing darkness to the world.

We are less safe as a country when this happens. We empower people around the world—very bad actors around the world—who have been perpetuating this narrative for generations that America allows this to happen. When you do that, you empower the bad guys to recruit and to marshal their forces against you. When you treat children this way, who then lose their lives in government custody, we

are less safe. It hurts our national security. It doesn't just undermine our values. It is not just immoral. It makes us less safe. It is a national security threat as much as it is an insult to our values or at least the values we claim to have as a government in the executive and legislative branches.

This administration has sought to increase family detention. They sought to relax the standards under which children are held. The administration recently canceled English classes, recreational programs, and legal aid for unaccompanied minors at shelters across the country.

Recently, an attorney for the Department of Justice argued that the government should not be required to give a detained migrant child—or in this case children—toothbrushes, or soap, or towels, or showers, and probably goes on from there. It is hard to comprehend how insulting that is to our values: how cruel and inhumane that is. If our government can't provide that to a child, how can we call ourselves a government? How can we say we have the values that we claim to have as a government? This person was a lawyer for the U.S. Government from the U.S. Department of Justice. A lawyer said that, not some low-level employee of some department in the Federal Government. A lawyer in a court-room said our government shouldn't have to provide toothbrushes or soap or towels.

We should not be relaxing standards when, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics, the Department of Homeland Security facilities already don't meet the basic standards for care of children in residential settings. Moreover, the Academy of Pediatrics stated that detention itself, even for short periods of time, can cause psychological trauma and induce long-term mental health risks for children.

I made this point to the administration months ago; that when you are setting up your protocols about how to deal with a child, please consult with the American Academy of Pediatrics—which is probably the leading organization in the whole country—about how best to care for a child and what not to do. I think we should listen to them, and I hope the administration would not only be listening to the American Academy of Pediatrics but would be incorporating their expertise and protocols.

Conditions for migrant adults are also completely unacceptable and an insult to our values. Last month, the Department of Homeland Security Office of the Inspector General issued a report. This isn't just a routine report. I will read the headline: “Management Alert—DHS Needs to Address Dangerous Overcrowding Among Single Adults at El Paso Del Norte Processing Center.” This is a management alert sent by one part of the government—not just the executive branch but one department to the other—the inspector

general to the management of the Department of Homeland Security. That is how bad it is.

I will read just one line on page 9 of the report:

Recommendations.

We recommend the Acting Secretary of DHS:

1. Take immediate steps to alleviate the overcrowding at the El Paso Del Norte Bridge Processing Center.

They didn't say work on it for a couple of months and try to get something done. Their own inspector general is saying take immediate steps.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have at least the body of this report, if not the attachment, printed in the RECORD.

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

MANAGEMENT ALERT—DHS NEEDS TO ADDRESS DANGEROUS OVERCROWDING AMONG SINGLE ADULTS AT EL PASO DEL NORTE PROCESSING CENTER (REDACTED)

MAY 30, 2019

Memorandum for: The Honorable Kevin K. McAleenan, Acting Secretary, Department of Homeland Security.

From: John V. Kelly, Acting Inspector General.

Subject: Management Alert—DHS Needs to Address Dangerous Overcrowding Among Single Adults at El Paso Del Norte Processing Center.

For your action is our final management alert, Management Alert—DHS Needs to Address Dangerous Overcrowding Among Single Adults at El Paso Del Norte Processing Center, the purpose of which is to notify you of urgent issues that require immediate attention and action. Specifically, we are recommending that the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) take immediate steps to alleviate dangerous overcrowding at the El Paso Del Norte Processing Center (PDT). Issuance of this management alert is consistent with our duties under the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, to conduct inspections and recommend policies to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness in DHS programs and operations.

We have incorporated the formal comments provided by your office on the draft management alert and appended them verbatim. Your office concurred with the recommendation we made to alleviate overcrowding at PDT, but gave a target completion date of November 30, 2020. Because DHS's corrective action is critical to the im-

mediate health and safety needs of detainees, who cannot continue to be held in standing-room-only conditions for weeks until additional tents are constructed, we consider the recommendation open and unresolved. We will continue our spot inspections of the southern border facilities and may revisit El Paso sector sites to monitor overcrowding.

Consistent with our responsibility under the Inspector General Act, we will provide copies of our alert to congressional committees with oversight and appropriation responsibility over DHS. We also will post the alert on our website for public dissemination.

Please call me with any questions, or your staff may contact Diana Shaw, Assistant Inspector General for Special Reviews and Evaluations, at (202) 981-6000.

BACKGROUND

In May 2019, U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and Border Patrol leadership jointly testified before Congress that they are experiencing an unprecedented border security and humanitarian crisis along the southwest border. According to CBP statistics, the number of southwest border migrant apprehensions during the first seven months of FY 2019 has in general already surpassed that of the total apprehensions for each of the previous four fiscal years. At the sector level, El Paso has experienced the sharpest increase in apprehensions when comparing the first seven months of FY 2019 to the same period in FY 2018. Table 1 shows the total number of apprehensions by category and the percent increase for the El Paso sector.

TABLE 1.—EL PASO SECTOR BORDER PATROL APPREHENSIONS

	Apprehensions October 2017 to April 2018	Apprehensions October 2018 to April 2019	Percent Increase
Unaccompanied Alien Children	2,116	10,027	374%
Family Units	3,865	74,072	1,816
Single Adults	7,665	13,953	82
Total	13,646	98,052	619

Source: Border Patrol southwest border apprehensions by sector

During the week of May 6, 2019, we visited five Border Patrol stations and two ports of entry in the El Paso area, including greater El Paso and eastern New Mexico, as part of our unannounced spot inspections of CBP holding facilities. We reviewed compliance with CBP's Transport, Escort, Detention and Search (TEDS) standards, which govern CBP's interaction with detained individuals, and observed dangerous holding conditions at the El Paso Del Norte Processing Center (PDT) Border Patrol processing facility, located at the Paso Del Norte Bridge, that require immediate attention. Specifically, PDT does not have the capacity to hold the hundreds currently in custody safely, and has held the majority of its detainees longer than the 72 hours generally permitted under the TEDS standards (TEDS 4.1).

OVERCROWDING AND PROLONGED DETENTION AT THE PDT BORDER PATROL FACILITY PUTS DETAINES AND DHS PERSONNEL AT RISK

According to PDT Border Patrol processing facility staff, the facility's maximum capacity is 125 detainees. However, on May 7 and 8, 2019, Border Patrol's custody logs indicated that there were approximately 750 and 900 detainees on site, respectively. TEDS standards provide that "under no circumstances should the maximum [cell] occupancy rate, as set by the fire marshal, be exceeded" (TEDS 4.7). However, we observed dangerous overcrowding at the facility with single adults held in cells designed for one-fifth as many detainees. Specifically, we observed:

a cell with a maximum capacity of 12 held 76 detainees;

a cell with a maximum capacity of 8 held 41 detainees; and

a cell with a maximum capacity of 35 held 155 detainees.

PDT's seven general cells and three small isolation cells are unable to accommodate the number of detainees currently being held at the processing facility within TEDS standards. Further limiting available space is the need to separate detainees with infectious diseases, such as chicken pox, scabies, and influenza, from each other and from the general population.

Border Patrol agents told us some of the detainees had been held in standing-room-only conditions for days or weeks. According to Border Patrol's custody logs, there were 756 detainees on site when we visited PDT on May 7, 2019. Of those, 502 detainees (66 percent) had been held at PDT for longer than 72 hours, with 33 detainees (4 percent) held there for more than two weeks. On May 8, 2019, we returned to PDT for another unannounced spot inspection and observed that some family units and adult females had been transferred, but overall numbers were even higher as additional detainees had arrived for processing. According to Border Patrol staff, on May 8, 2019, the total number on site was approximately 900.

During our visits, we observed the triage of hundreds of detainees outside in the PDT parking lot. There were approximately 75 people treated for lice, hundreds of family units waiting in the tented area to be proc-

essed, and hundreds of detainees in line to surrender their valuables, such as money and phones, to DHS staff. Figure 4 depicts some of the outdoor lines we observed on May 7, 2019, and May 8, 2019. We also observed staff discarding all other detainee property, such as backpacks, suitcases, and handbags, in the nearby dumpster. Border Patrol personnel told us that these items might be wet, have bugs, and be muddy, and, therefore, presented a "biohazard."

We are concerned that overcrowding and prolonged detention represent an immediate risk to the health and safety not just of the detainees, but also DHS agents and officers. Border Patrol management on site said there is a high incidence of illness among their staff. Border Patrol management at PDT and other sites also raised concerns about employee morale and that conditions were elevating anxiety and affecting employees' personal lives. They noted that some employees eligible for retirement had accelerated their retirement dates, while others were considering alternative employment opportunities.

In addition, Border Patrol management on site said there is an ongoing concern that rising tensions among detainees could turn violent. We observed that staff must enter crowded cells or move large numbers of detainees for meals, medical care, and cell cleaning. For example, at the time of our visit, 140 adult male detainees were crowding the hallways and common areas of the facility while their cell was being cleaned. We observed staff having difficulty maneuvering around this crowd to perform their duties,

and were told that staff feel they have limited options if detainees decide not to cooperate.

The overcrowded conditions also complicate efforts to ensure compliance with TEDS standards. For example, CBP was struggling to maintain hygienic conditions in the holding cells. With limited access to showers and clean clothing, detainees were wearing soiled clothing for days or weeks. Although TEDS standards do not require a change of clothing for adults, Border Patrol agents said they were nevertheless trying to obtain clean clothing for adult females because the lack of clean clothes was “wearing down on them.” We also observed detainees standing on toilets in the cells to make room and gain breathing space, thus limiting access to the toilets. Border Patrol agents said detainees who were not ill were raising medical complaints to obtain temporary release from the cells, adding to the medical staffs burden.

DHS NEEDS A COORDINATED APPROACH TO MANAGING LONG-TERM DETENTION DURING SHARP INCREASE IN APPREHENSIONS

Although CBP headquarters management has been aware of the situation at PDT for months and detailed staff to assist with custody management, DHS has not identified a process to alleviate issues with overcrowding at PDT. Within DHS, providing long-term detention is the responsibility of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), not CBP. El Paso sector Border Patrol management said they are able to complete immigration processing for most detainees within a few days, but have not been able to transfer single adults into ICE custody quickly. Border Patrol managers at the stations we visited said they call ICE daily to request detention space for single adults. They said in some instances ICE officers tell them they cannot take the detainees. In other instances, ICE initially agrees to take some adult detainees, but then reverses the decision.

ICE has the infrastructure to transport and detain aliens nationwide, but its current ability to do both of these tasks is also strained. ICE senior managers stated that ICE does not currently have sufficient detention bed space to take all of Border Patrol’s adult detainees, and explained that Border Patrol has the authority to decide which detainees are the highest priority to transfer to ICE custody. ICE managers also stated that ICE prioritizes requests from CBP over any other requests for bed space and, when possible, uses its national transportation system to fly and transport detainees to available detention beds.

When we discussed the situation at PDT with ICE, ICE officials suggested the El Paso sector could develop a single point of contact to better prioritize requests for adult detention beds. They said with individual Border Patrol stations making requests to ICE, the highest priority detainees may not be transferred to ICE. Prioritization could alleviate the situation at PDT and in the El Paso sector in the short term, but would not contribute to a coordinated DHS approach to managing long-term detention during this sharp increase in border apprehensions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend the Acting Secretary of DHS:

1. Take immediate steps to alleviate the overcrowding at the El Paso Del Norte Bridge Processing Center (PDT).

DHS MANAGEMENT’S RESPONSE AND OIG ANALYSIS

DHS management provided written comments on a draft of this alert. We included a copy of DHS’ management comments in

their entirety in appendix A. We also incorporated DHS’ technical comments in the final alert, as appropriate.

DHS Response to Recommendation #1

Concur. CBP has constructed a 500-person holding capacity soft-sided structure at El Paso Station, will construct an additional tent by July 31, 2019, and will open a Centralized Processing Center within 18 months. CBP will continue to review the number of migrants in custody at Border Patrol stations to determine available space and transfer subjects accordingly. The Border Patrol, through its single point of contact at El Paso Sector, will continue to communicate with ICE to improve the migrant transfer process.

The estimated completion date is November 30, 2020.

OIG Response

We observed conditions at the El Paso Del Norte Processing Center (PDT) Border Patrol facility that represent an immediate risk to the health and safety of detainees and DHS employees. Specifically, Border Patrol agents told us some single adults had been held in standing-room-only conditions for days or weeks. Border Patrol management on site said there is an ongoing concern that rising tensions among detainees could turn violent. Dangerous overcrowding among single adults in PDT requires immediate action.

While we consider the actions outlined in DHS’ response to be partially responsive to the recommendation, the recommendation will remain unresolved and open until DHS offers an immediate corrective action plan to address the dangerous overcrowding at PDT.

**APPENDIX A—DHS’S MANAGEMENT COMMENTS
TO THE DRAFT MANAGEMENT ALERT**

MAY 28, 2019

Memorandum for: John V. Kelly, Acting Inspector General

From: Jim H. Crumpacker, CIA, CFE for Director, Departmental GAO-OIG Liaison Office.

Subject: Management Response to OIG Draft Management Alert: “DHS Needs to Address Dangerous Overcrowding Among Single Adults at El Paso Del Norte Processing Center (PDT)—For Official Use Only” (Project No. 19-039-SRE-CBP).

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this draft report. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) appreciates the work of the Office of Inspector General (OIG) in planning and conducting its review and issuing this report.

DHS performs an essential role in securing our Nation’s borders at and between ports of entry, and enforces U.S. immigration law within the interior of the country. U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) officers and agents continually uphold the utmost professionalism while performing essential border security operations. DHS is devoted to the care and processing of the individuals in our custody with the utmost dignity and respect.

The current situation on the border represents an acute and worsening crisis. Our immigration system is not equipped to accommodate a migration pattern like the one we are experiencing now. Previous patterns—somewhat predictable in composition and predicated on seasonal variations—are no longer the norm. Through April 2019, CBP enforcement actions along the southwest border are 84 percent higher than the same period last fiscal year; this includes a 117 percent increase in U.S. Border Patrol (USBP) apprehensions. Additionally, the speed with which illegal migrants are

transiting through Mexico to reach our southern border is frustrating our best efforts to respond quickly.

The current migration flow and the resulting humanitarian crisis are rapidly overwhelming the ability of the Federal Government to respond. In March 2019, CBP encountered over 103,000 illegal border crossers and inadmissible aliens. In April 2019, that number exceeded 109,000—the highest monthly levels in more than a decade.

DHS has taken steps to ensure an elevated standard of care in response to the current humanitarian crisis and has directed additional personnel and resources to the border. CBP has constructed a weatherproof and climate-controlled soft-sided structure in the El Paso Sector. The structure will allow Border Patrol agents to expedite, process, and transport migrants to ICE or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The structure provides areas for eating, sleeping, recreation, and personal hygiene for up to 500 people. There are also separate areas for processing, medical evaluations, bathroom facilities, laundry, trailers, sleeping mats, kitchen equipment, personal property storage boxes, office space, television, and lockers.

Additionally, a modular facility that is capable of holding up to 800 people is projected to be in use by July 2019. Construction of a permanent Centralized Processing Center (CPC) in El Paso is planned to further alleviate overcrowding. The CPC is expected to be operational in approximately 18 months, with a holding capacity of approximately 1,800. Congress can also help by working on targeted solutions to restore integrity to our immigration system and remove the incentives for families and children to cross our border illegally.

The draft report contained one recommendation, with which the Department concurs. Attached find our detailed response to the recommendation. Technical comments were previously provided under separate cover.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on this draft report. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions. We look forward to working with you again in the future.

**ATTACHMENT: MANAGEMENT RESPONSE TO
RECOMMENDATION CONTAINED IN 19-039-SRE-CBP**

The OIG recommended that the Acting Secretary of DHS:

Recommendation 1: Take immediate steps to alleviate the overcrowding at El Paso Del Norte Processing Center (PDT).

Response: Concur. In an effort to alleviate the overcrowding at the PDT brought on by the unprecedented increase in the number of families and children arriving at the Southwest Border, CBP has implemented a multi-layered approach.

CBP has constructed a 500 holding capacity soft-sided structure at El Paso Station that has been operational since May 2, 2019. CBP will construct an 800 holding capacity modular facility at El Paso Station to be operational by July 31, 2019. In addition, a permanent CPC with a holding capacity of approximately 1,800 is planned to further alleviate overcrowding in El Paso. It is scheduled to be operational within 18 months.

CBP will continue to review the number of migrants in custody at USBP stations within El Paso Sector to determine available space and transfer subjects accordingly. USBP, through its single point-of-contact at El Paso Sector, will continue to communicate with ICE’s Enforcement and Removal Operations to improve the migrant transfer process.

In an effort to supplement staff, CBP will continue to temporarily detail Border Patrol

Agents and CBP Surge Force personnel to El Paso Sector, as well as utilize personnel from the U.S. Department of Defense.

Due to capacity issues, USBP will continue processing non-criminal family units for immediate release under an order of recognition.

Estimated Completion Date: November 30, 2020.

APPENDIX B—MANAGEMENT ALERT
DISTRIBUTION

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

Secretary
Deputy Secretary
Chief of Staff
General Counsel
Executive Secretary
Director, GAO/OIG Liaison Office
Under Secretary Office of Strategy, Policy, and Plans
Assistant Secretary for Office of Public Affairs
Assistant Secretary for Office of Legislative Affairs
Commissioner, CBP
CBP Component Liaison

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET

Chief, Homeland Security Branch
DHS OIG Budget Examiner

CONGRESS

Congressional Oversight and Appropriations Committees

Mr. CASEY. This report details dangerous overcrowding for a prolonged basis at this detention center and the dangers it creates. According to the report, a facility with maximum capacity of 125 detainees is holding approximately 900. Some migrants were held in standing-room-only-conditions for days or weeks with limited access to showers or clean clothing. Migrants, many of whom are asylum seekers, were observed standing on toilets themselves to make room and gain breathing space. These conditions not only violate Custom and Border Patrol's transport, escort, detention, and search standards but are an affront to our values as a nation. Asylum seekers who have fled violence and suffered through an arduous journey should not be subjected to unhealthy, unsanitary, unsafe conditions under any circumstances.

Asylum seekers are coming to our shores because of violence in their home countries. Everyone knows this. This isn't a theory; it is fact. Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador rank in the top 10 countries in the world for homicide. Why do we think they are coming? Would any one of us journey hundreds or thousands of miles? I don't think so.

According to a report issued from Doctors Without Borders in 2017, Northern Triangle countries—the countries I just mentioned—are experiencing “violent displacement, persecution, sexual violence, and forced repatriation akin to the conditions found in the deadliest armed conflicts in the world today.” That is not some Member of Congress just talking.

For asylum seekers, the decision to move is not a choice; it is a necessity. The journey can further subject them to violence, danger, and other abuses along the way.

Once they arrive at our shores, it is critical that they are treated with compassion and human dignity and receive a fair opportunity to present their claims.

That is the America that we believe in. That is the America we were taught to believe that we are—a nation that respects human life, human values, and gives people a fair chance when they present themselves for asylum.

The only good news that we can report tonight is that the Senate passed a bill to provide nearly \$4.6 billion in humanitarian aid, including \$2.88 billion to the Office of Refugee Resettlement to care for migrant children and to help minimize the time they are held in Federal facilities, in Federal custody. The House also passed a bill, which I support. We must quickly conference these bills to provide the needed resources while we also ensure there are protections for migrants and greater accountability and transparency from DHS to ensure the funds are appropriately spent.

The faster we get this done, the better, and maybe we can reduce the likelihood that six more children will die in the next couple of months in the custody of the U.S. Government.

I end with this note: I talked about what we are as a nation and what we believe that we should be and the standard we are not meeting now. We must be a nation that respects people who come to our shores and treats them with a measure of human dignity and compassion.

What we must not be is a nation that refuses asylum seekers who flee persecution and violence from the murder capitals of the world. We must not be a nation that separates children from their families. We must not be a nation that gives migrants, including children, who are in squalid and inhumane conditions, no hope of getting out of that circumstance.

We are, indeed, when we are at our best, a nation of opportunity, a nation of immigrants, and, of course, a nation of laws. It is imperative that we fix our broken immigration system more broadly so that it, once again, reflects these American values.

As we work on a broad response to a broken immigration system, let us at least be there for those children in the nighttime of their fear—No. 1, not to create that fear and, No. 2, not to perpetuate it for these children. At a minimum, we should make a pledge in our government to never have six deaths of children who are in the custody of the U.S. Government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on Senate amendment No. 764 occur at 12 noon on Thursday, June 27; further, that if cloture is invoked, amendment Nos. 864, 863, and 862 be withdrawn and

the postcloture time be considered expired and the Senate vote on amendment No. 861, with no further amendments in order.

I further ask that the time until 1:45 p.m. be equally divided; that at 1:45 p.m., the Senate vote on the substitute amendment, as amended, if amended; that the cloture motion with respect to S. 1790 then be withdrawn and the Senate vote on the passage of S. 1790, as amended, if amended, with no further intervening action or debate; finally, that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, on Friday, June 28, the Senate vote on the Udall amendment, No. 883, notwithstanding the passage of S. 1790, and that it require 60 affirmative votes for adoption.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT LEVELS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, BBEDCA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits. In addition, sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments.

The Senate will soon consider S. Amdt. 901 to H.R. 3401, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act, 2019. This measure provides supplemental appropriations to address humanitarian assistance and security at the border. The measure contains spending that qualifies for cap adjustments under current statute.

This measure includes \$4,586 million in budget authority that is designated as being for emergency purposes pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. Of that amount, \$145 million is for spending in the security category and \$4,441 million is for nonsecurity spending. CBO estimates that this budget authority will result in \$1,048 million in outlays in Fiscal Year 2019.

As a result of the aforementioned designations, I am revising the budget authority and outlay allocations to the Committee on Appropriations by increasing revised security budget authority by \$145 million, revised non-security budget authority by \$4,441 million, and outlays by \$1,048 million