

contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (MO-D-QAK).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: MO-D-SAY.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 27, 2019.

As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Morocco—Sustainment for F-16 Fleet

The Government of Morocco has requested a continuation of sustainment support to its current F-16 fleet to include the following non-MDE components: F-16 support equipment, spares and repair parts; personnel training and training equipment; publications and technical documentation; munitions support equipment (for AMRAAM, CMBRE, JDAM, PAVEWAY), support and test equipment; integration and test; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistical support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$250.4 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major Non-NATO ally that is an important force for political stability and economic progress in North Africa.

The proposed sale will improve Morocco's self-defense capability. Additionally, the continuation of sustainment for their F-16 fleet strengthens the interoperability with the United States and other regional allies. Morocco already operates an F-16 fleet and this sustainment case will ensure that they can continue operating their fleet in the future. Morocco will have no difficulty absorbing this support into its armed forces.

The proposed sale will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin Corporation, Bethesda, Maryland. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of additional U.S. Government and/or contractor representatives to Morocco.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, today, I wish to discuss the importance of strengthening the defense industrial base, particularly as it relates to shipbuilding.

On July 21, 2017, the President signed Executive Order 13806, directing the Department of Defense to lead a whole of government assessment of the health of the manufacturing and defense industrial base of the United States. The report was released on October 5, 2018, and outlines current risks in the defense industrial base.

Within the military shipbuilding sector, concerns range from an overreliance on single and sole source sup-

pliers, to a capacity shortfall for maintenance and modernization work, to insufficient competition and unstable demand.

The DoD report said: "Industries involved in the manufacturing of shipbuilding components were among the hardest hit by the global shift in the industrial base over the last 20 years. Of the top ten highest grossing industries in Navy shipbuilding, six are in the manufacturing sector. Since 2000, these industries experienced a combined decline of over 20,500 establishments."

We cannot afford to shrink our military shipbuilding industry any further.

These issues are particularly acute in my State of Virginia. Not only is Virginia home to Newport News Shipbuilding and Norfolk Naval Shipyard, we have hundreds of military shipbuilder suppliers, a number of which are considered by the Department of Defense to be fragile. These companies are essentially national treasures, from Hunt Valve out of Roanoke to Jo-Kell in Chesapeake, KITCO Fiber Optics in Virginia Beach, and Hampton Machine Shop in Newport News.

These companies want stability and predictability in funding; they want to be certain our Nation is serious about a 355-ship Navy.

These are issues that our committee has been working on for some time. In testimony last fall before the Seapower Subcommittee, the Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development, and Acquisition, James Geurts, told our committee that "advanced funding and anything we can do to help the supplier base will drastically reduce risks going forward. What we are seeing in most of our construction programs as a key risk is supplier fragility, either single sources or single producers where we have to ramp up production."

Chairman INHOFE has paid close attention to those concerns, and I very much appreciate how far this bill goes to address the issues outlined in the industrial base report.

This bill authorizes funds for the third year for the submarine supplier base initiative, which is helping critical suppliers across the Nation; authorizes additional funding along with incremental funding authority for both LPD 31 and LHA 9; accelerates the acquisition of LHA 9; adds funding for advance procurement for the DDG program; and requires DoD to assess the savings a multiyear procurement would yield in the LPD program, and the savings we could achieve through a block buy of two LHA's. The bill also reauthorizes CVN 75, the USS *Harry S Truman*. It leaves no room for indecision on the future of this asset.

It is critical that the DOD's current and prospective shipbuilding programs, the Virginia class and Columbia class submarine programs, the new Frigate program, destroyers, specifically take action to maintain the domestic supply base and not allow foreign sources to undercut the pricing of the domestic supply base.

We ask the administration to help us in every way to stay focused on helping our military shipbuilding industrial base meet the Navy the Nation Needs.

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

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I wish to speak about S. 1900, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations for Humanitarian Assistance and Security at the Southern Border Act. I understand there is some important funding in the bill to deal with President Trump's manufactured crisis at the U.S.-Mexico border, particularly funding for the Department of Health and Human Services. However, I cannot in good conscience support a bill that provides additional resources to the Department of Homeland Security at a time when we are seeing this agency commit so many gross human rights violations. I want to make my position clear: I do not support this bill in its entirety, and I would have voted against it.

Both U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, ICE, and U.S. Customs and Border Patrol, CBP, have already benefited from increased funding in fiscal years 2018 and 2019 and, as we have seen, have used that funding to ramp up their inhumane policies. Policies like "metering", which forces migrants to wait in Mexico for weeks, sometimes months, in order to enter the United States and claim their legal right to asylum. We know that "metering" has resulted in the deaths of families seeking refuge, like Oscar Alberto Martinez and his 23-month-old Valeria just this week. Policies like the zero-tolerance policy, which has separated thousands of children from their families and continues to this day. These policies are unacceptable and do not reflect who we are as Americans. Everyone should be outraged as what is happening at the hand of this administration and DHS.

Just last week Donald Trump tweeted that he would begin ICE deportation raids across the United States. At a time when the Trump administration is claiming that it does not have enough money to deal with the humanitarian crisis at the Southwest border, it is puzzling how DHS has enough resources to conduct large-scale raids all across the United States. How is there money for raids that would terrorize communities yet not enough money for providing soap, blankets, and toothbrushes for children in the government's custody?

Repeatedly, this administration has chosen to implement policies that cost more and are less efficient in order to pursue its extreme immigration agenda. If ICE and CBP are in need of extra funding, then they should implement policies that save money, like further utilizing alternatives to detention, ATDs. The government's own statistics

demonstrate that ATDs work and save money.

People are frightened, and they are returning to the shadows. It is weakening the safety of our communities, and it is an affront to the ideals of the United States. I will not support funding which further endangers the lives of immigrants who have every right to remain in this country and those fleeing violence and seeking shelter in our country. Those of us in positions of power have an obligation to stand up for all people and stand against abuses especially at the hands of our government. Instead of rubberstamping additional funding, I will continue to do this and hold this administration accountable. Thank you.

FOREIGN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I want to discuss Russia's sustained campaign of attacks on our democracy and how the President's inability to take these threats seriously harms our national security and the integrity of our elections.

In the run up to his meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin this week at the G20 Summit, the President showed no signs that he planned to warn Russia against interfering in our democratic elections in 2020. In press interviews, he said that he "may" ask Putin not interfere in 2020 and told another group of reporters, "I will have a very good conversation with him . . . what I say is none of your business."

Following today's meeting with Putin, an autocrat who continues to conduct hybrid warfare operations against our democracy, President Trump made light of this threat in a joking manner. In response to a reporter's question, he apparently grinned as he told Putin, "don't meddle in our election."

This is not a joke. This is about deterring the Kremlin from continuing to attack our democracy. He should be using every tool at his disposal to direct a whole of government and whole of society effort to counter these attacks, not emboldening Putin to escalate his aggression. It is exactly the business of the American people to know that our elections are free from interference and that we can trust the President of the United States to deliver tough messages to deter foreign adversaries.

Relatedly the President can't seem to grasp what's wrong with accepting "dirt" on his political opponents from foreign adversaries. In a recent interview with ABC News, the President made it clear that he sees nothing wrong with compromising our national security if it advances his own political interests. When asked if his campaign would accept information on his opponents from Russia, China, or other countries during the 2020 campaign, the President responded: "I think you might want to listen . . . there's nothing wrong with listening."

He denied that this type of assistance from a foreign adversary was interference, adding: "They have information. I think I'd take it." It was only after being heavily criticized that President Trump reversed course, telling Fox and Friends "Of course, you give it to the FBI or report it to the attorney general or somebody like that . . . You couldn't have that happen in our country." But, of course, it already happened. President Trump's inability or unwillingness to recognize it is both completely wrong-headed and dangerous.

The President's response belies the undeniable fact that Russia attacked our democracy in the 2016 election with an information warfare campaign, and tried to do it again in the 2018 mid-terms.

Trump initially made Russia's interference sound like run of the mill, opposition research—"oppo research" he called it—and claimed everyone does it, but this is not about politics as usual. This is about Russia advancing its strategic interests and using tools from its hybrid arsenal, including information warfare and malign influence operation, to do so. Russia seeks to inject itself into our political process to achieve its goals of promoting the candidates favorable to Russia and discrediting those that are not, weakening the American public's faith in the integrity of democracy, and undermining the United States' standing globally.

President Trump's failure to grasp that there is a problem with someone in his high office—or any candidate for public office for that matter—accepting dirt on political opponents from a foreign government or national is troubling on many levels, but importantly, it harms our national security. It undermines our ability as a nation to counter Russia and other adversaries and our ability to protect our elections. The President should be leading a comprehensive, meaningful approach to deter Russia and others who seek to target our democracy. Instead, he is announcing to the world that our elections are open to manipulation.

Some would have you believe that, with the release of the Mueller report, the case of Russian interference in the 2016 election is closed, that our work is done, and that Congress can stop caring about the attack on our democracy and the integrity of our political system. The White House, the Attorney General, and congressional Republican leaders are sending a coordinated message that there is nothing to see here, folks.

But no matter how they try, we can't forget that Russia attacked our democracy in 2016, that Russia tried to do it again in 2018, and that it continues to deploy hybrid operations against us, our allies, and our partners. Just recently, a report issued by the European Union concluded that Russia conducted "continued and sustained" information warfare campaigns against the EU Par-

liamentary elections this spring. We must continue to work to highlight these types of findings including those made by the special counsel and their implications going forward. As Special Counsel Mueller's powerful press statement from his investigation underscored: "there were multiple, systematic efforts to interfere in our election." Mueller added, "And that allegation deserves the attention of every American."

The special counsel's report and related indictments described these operations in great detail. Let's look specifically at key aspects of the Russian information warfare campaign that the report laid out.

First, Mueller makes clear that Kremlin-linked operators sought to help the candidate the Kremlin favored and whose election would serve Russia's interests. The report describes how "A Russian entity carried out a social media campaign that favored presidential candidate Donald J. Trump and disparaged presidential candidate Hillary Clinton." It also found that "[a]s early as 2014, the [Kremlin-linked Internet Research Agency] instructed its employees to target U.S. persons who could be used to advance its operational goals."

Second, Mueller describes in detail the Russian spying operation to steal "dirt" on the opposition candidate and then use that stolen information against her. The report states unequivocally, "[a] Russian intelligence service conducted computer intrusion operations against entities, employees and volunteers working on the Clinton Campaign and then released stolen documents."

Third, the Mueller established multiple contacts by Russian Government officials or their proxies with the Trump campaign to establish relationships. The report states: "[t]he investigation also established numerous links between the Russian government and the Trump campaign."

Finally, the Mueller report definitively concludes that Russia saw its interests as aligned with and served by a Trump Presidency, that Russia conducted a campaign to interfere in the 2016 election for the purpose of helping the Trump campaign, and that the Trump campaign hoped to benefit from the fruits of that foreign election interference. Ultimately, however, the Mueller investigation could not prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the Trump campaign or its associates conspired with the Russian Government in its election interference.

As the report states: "[a]lthough the investigation established that the Russian government perceived it would benefit from a Trump presidency and worked to secure that outcome, and that the Campaign expected it would benefit electorally from information stolen and released through Russian efforts, the investigation did not establish that members of the Trump Campaign conspired or coordinated with