

and close the door on refugees and asylum seekers.

Over the past couple of weeks, reports have surfaced of children held in squalid conditions without adequate medical attention, sanitation, or even food and water.

A law professor who spoke with children at a Texas CBP facility was quoted in the *Washington Post* as saying, "It's the worst conditions I have ever witnessed in several years of doing these inspections."

That is a law professor, not a casual observer but someone who has experience and training, recognizing what is happening in these facilities.

In May, the Department of Homeland Security Office of Inspector General issued a report stating that the El Paso Del Norte Processing Center, a facility with a maximum of 125 detainees, was holding 900—capacity 125, holding 900 detainees.

Some migrants were held in standing-room-only conditions for days and weeks with limited access to showers and clean clothing. These conditions were dangerous and posed an immediate risk to both migrants and personnel.

The administration has sought to use inhumane policies like separating families, just one example, as a deterrent—as a deterrent.

They recently canceled English classes, recreational programs, and legal aid for unaccompanied minors at shelters across the country, and an attorney for the Department of Justice argued that the government should not be required to give detained migrant children toothbrushes, soap, towels, or showers.

Does that make any sense at all? Is that consistent with our values?

The administration is seeking to relax standards for holding children, when, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics—also not casual observers but a set of experts on what a child needs to survive and thrive—Department of Homeland Security facilities already do not meet the basic standards for the care of children in residential settings.

Earlier this week, the administration issued an interim final rule that essentially bars Central American migrants from claiming asylum by making them ineligible for asylum, including unaccompanied children who enter the United States at the southern border after passing through another country. This is just the latest in many attempts to restrict our asylum system and bar those fleeing violence, persecution—and for other reasons—from exercising their legal right, a legal right that is not just grounded in United States law but international law, the right to petition the U.S. Government for protection consistent with what we did after World War II because of the horrors we saw in World War II. This wasn't just some concept that was dreamed up. It was meant to deal with the horrors that World War II brought, to say to the world that we are going

to make sure that if someone is fleeing violence and persecution, they will at least have a shot to make their case, to have due process to make their case. Most don't make the case; we know that. Most end up not being successful. But we should let them make the case because we are, on our best days, a nation of laws. We are also, of course, a nation of immigrants, and both of these principles are intertwined and undergird our values.

President Kennedy said it pretty well:

Immigration policy should be generous; it should be fair; it should be flexible. With such a policy, we can turn to the world and to our own past with clean hands and a clear conscience.

It is entirely possible to create an immigration system that reflects not just President Kennedy's vision but our values as Americans—a system that respects the rule of law, that treats all individuals with human dignity, and reflects our values as a Nation.

When we think of not just what our immigration system must be about but what our asylum system must be about, let us think of those families who put their lives at risk because of what they are fleeing, who simply want to make their case.

Let's also remember two people whose faces we didn't see much of except in this one picture—a father and a daughter, little Valeria and her father, Oscar Martinez Ramirez—and remember what they were trying to do. I realize some will debate this: What happens when someone presents themselves at our border based upon poverty? I understand that will be the argument against it, but we are a big enough country and a great enough country to be able to develop a system to make sure that child and that father have a shot to come here.

One of the problems we are having now at the border is that when you tell the world that you want to push people away, by way of rhetoric or by way of extreme policies at the border—inhumane policies, which might be an understatement—and by telling the world, or at least sending the message to the world, that you want to greatly restrict immigration, you are going to have people choosing a different system to try to make their case. We need to fix both. We have a broken immigration system which this body dealt with in 2013—68 votes in the Senate—to fix the system and to deal with all the tough issues. We can't get 68 votes around here to adjourn for lunch or to move on to the next part of the day sometimes. That is only a slight exaggeration—but 68 votes.

What happened? Because there are extreme voices in this town that told the House of Representatives, "Don't even vote on it; just end it right here," the best attempt in maybe decades to secure the border, to deal with citizenship, to deal with the guest worker program, to deal with all the difficult issues with immigration, and with 68

votes here, died in the House. It didn't even get a vote in the House, and this Chamber and the House have done basically nothing since then, at least the way I see it—nothing in terms of dealing with this system, trying to fix this broken system so you have rules and order and certainty, but also based upon and founded upon our values.

Some people say: You can't do it. It is just too hard. Congress isn't equipped for that.

We are the greatest country in the world for a lot of reasons. One of them is because of our values. Another reason is when we are at our best, we tackle tough problems. Fixing this broken immigration system is a tough problem. Many Presidents and many Congresses have wrestled with it, but we got as close to getting to a fix as anytime in recent American history when that bill passed. The faster we get back to something that comprehensive, that bipartisan, and that grounded in fact and law, the better off we will be.

While we are doing that on immigration, we should have a conversation about asylum—how to do it right and how to make sure that system is working so well that it will be an example to the world.

We have a long way to go. We have work to do, but I think these difficult issues are indeed a great mission—a difficult mission, but I think they are a mission worthy of a great country.

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 PROCEDURE

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Tuesday, July 23, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 1327, as under the previous order; I further ask that notwithstanding rule XXII, at 12 noon, the Senate proceed to executive session and, if cloture has been invoked on the Esper nomination, all postcloture time be considered expired and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action. Finally, that following the cloture vote on the Dickson nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and consideration of H.R. 1327 with all debate time considered expired at 2:30 p.m.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

HONORING TROY CHISUM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on August 10, Fulton County Sheriff Deputy Troy Chisum should be turning 40 years old. He should be spending the day watching his daughters play softball, or he should be playing football with his friends and excitedly discussing the upcoming Minnesota Vikings football season.

But, sadly, he won't be doing these things. Deputy Chisum was killed in the line of duty on June 25. I want to honor him today.

Deputy Chisum was answering a call about a domestic disturbance in Avon, IL. He was 4 minutes closer than any other deputy. When he arrived at the scene, he saw the suspect on the porch. As he moved back for safety, he was shot in the back and killed. The suspect barricaded himself in the house for the next 19 hours before the standoff ended.

Deputy Chisum was the fifth law enforcement officer in America in an 8-day period to be shot and killed while on duty. Another police officer has been shot and killed since then. Their deaths are a heartbreaking reminder of the dangers officers face every day.

Troy Chisum loved his community. He always answered the call to help. He worked as a paramedic with the Fulton County EMA and as a firefighter with Northern Tazewell County. He also was a member of the West Central Illinois Special Response Team and the Illinois Law Enforcement Alarm System Weapon of Mass Destruction/Special Response Team, Region Six. He had formerly worked for Lewistown Police Department. He was a consummate public servant.

His family was always his No. 1 priority. He loved any activity with his wife Amanda and his time with his three daughters. He helped inspire his daughter Kyleigh to pursue a medical career. He made his girls so proud.

Deputy Chisum's wife Amanda, their three daughters Kyleigh, Abigail, and Gracie, his father, Phil Chisum, his mother and stepfather, Debra and Mike Wheeler and too many relatives, colleagues and friends to name; they were all proud of Troy.

Deputy Chisum was one of the good ones. His colleagues knew him as the first one in every morning and the last one out every night. His legacy and sacrifice will be remembered.

VERGENNES, VERMONT'S, ROLE IN THE APOLLO 11 MOON LANDING

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this week America celebrates the fiftieth anniversary of a monumental achievement for our country and all of humankind, the *Apollo 11* mission that landed the first human beings on the Moon.

Like families across America and across the world, our family gathered in front of the television in our living room that Sunday night of July 20, 1969, to watch this history unfold. I was State's attorney then, and we lived in a duplex in Burlington.

Our 5-year-old son Kevin asked if he could stay up late to watch, and of course, Marcelle and I agreed. He stretched out on the floor in his PJs. He had nodded off by the time the images from the Moon started to come across, and we roused our little fellow.

We knew this was a night we would always remember.

The next day, I went to court for an arraignment. Then I met with police officers about several matters, and we all had a hard time concentrating as we excitedly discussed what we had seen the night before.

As Neil Armstrong so famously said, his one small step was a giant leap for all of humanity.

As he and other astronauts often noted, that leap was made possible not just by his step, but by the small steps of thousands of men and women across America who participated in the space program, including some from the town of Vergennes, VT.

Today, 50 years ago, the *Apollo 11* mission was hurtling toward the moon, but getting to the Moon is not a matter of just pointing the nose of a craft and igniting the powerful engines. First, the command module had to dock with the lunar expeditionary module, then leave Earth's orbit, then navigate to get into lunar orbit, and then return. Throughout the process, Michael Collins needed to use the craft's engines, known as a burn, to adjust the heading.

But with no option to refuel, these burns had to be precise and effective, and any deviation from the planned fuel usage had to be worked into future plans. Otherwise, there would be no return for America's heroes. This is where Vergennes came in.

Vermont has a long tradition of building precision tools and machinery, and NASA turned to Simmonds Precision of Vergennes, VT, to ensure that the *Apollo 11* crew and Mission Control knew exactly how much fuel they had. The fuel probes and valves had to be as nearly perfect as possible, and they had to perform perfectly in varying levels of microgravity. It was an immense technological challenge, which the engineers and workers in Vergennes met.

Fifty years later, the company is still there. Now operating under the name Collins Aerospace, they still make fuel probes, along with other aerospace technology that seems to be able to do the impossible. When you

enter the factory, along their wall of history, the Apollo Program commands a special place of pride. It is a reminder of how the small steps taken by Americans everywhere, when working together, can accomplish tremendous leaps.

I ask unanimous consent that a recent article about one of the engineers from Vergennes, published by the Burlington Free Press, be printed into the RECORD.

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

[From the Burlington Free Press, July 17, 2019]

VERMONT COMPANY PLAYED KEY ROLE IN APOLLO MOON MISSION

(By Joel Banner Baird, Free Press Staff Writer)

A FORMER ENGINEER WITH VERGENNES-BASED SIMMONDS PRECISION DESCRIBES THE COMPANY'S ROLE IN THE APOLLO SPACE PROGRAM

Something clicked when Dominique St. Pierre heard President John F. Kennedy declare, in 1962, that the U.S. would land men on the moon by the end of the decade.

"It was gutsy," St. Pierre, now 74, remembers.

JFK's challenge prompted St. Pierre, then an 18-year-old in St. Albans, to hone his engineering skills at Vermont Technical College, sign on with Simmonds Precision in Vergennes in 1965 and help design and build a fuel system for the Apollo moon mission.

Three years later, the first-ever astronauts to orbit the moon were measuring their craft's precious propellant with Vermont-made gauges, valves and meters.

His collaboration with more than 200 employees at Simmonds yielded a tool that performed flawlessly throughout the Apollo program, St. Pierre said.

A thrilling, disruptive American decade Simmonds, subsequently bought by Goodrich and then United Technologies, went on to design and build fuel sensors for Boeing and Airbus, among other customers. St. Pierre stayed with the company until he retired in 2019.

But the fast-paced years leading up to the successful moon landing on July 20, 1969—and Apollo 11 crew's safe return—remain vivid for St. Pierre.

The space program offered a welcome, uplifting message for Americans shocked by the Chicago riots of 1968, as well as the assassinations of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert F. Kennedy in that year, St. Pierre said.

"We had a schedule to meet"

Engineers at NASA kept the Simmonds crew very busy and focused, he added: "We worked long, long days. Come hell or high water, we had a schedule to meet."

St. Pierre remembers the dust-free workplace in Vergennes, bustling with technicians in white smocks and surgical caps.

But, despite America's global, cold-war rivalry with the Soviet Union that extended into those countries' space programs, there was little secrecy at Simmonds—beyond the safekeeping of papers that documented test results, St. Pierre said.

Excitement built when NASA flew him to Cape Kennedy (now Cape Canaveral), where he joined hundreds of other engineers in fitting together thousands of interconnected pieces of a never-before assembled puzzle.

"To this day, 50 years later," St. Pierre said, "it's still viewed as the greatest technological achievement of mankind."

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)