

prove a DNA match. And thank goodness somebody was watching. The results have been horrifying. One in five claims of kinship is fraudulent. That means one in five children who were brought to the border and then funneled into the pilot program was likely being exploited.

I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to say that finally we have had enough and to voice their support for the End Child Trafficking Now Act. This act requires the Department of Health and Human Services, in conjunction with the Department of Homeland Security, to administer DNA tests for all adults accompanied by minors at a port of entry who claim a familial relationship without sufficient legal documentation to prove the connection.

Refusal of the test will be met with immediate deportation. Fabrication of family ties or guardianship will carry a maximum 10-year penalty, and the child will be processed as an unaccompanied minor under current law. Proven family members and guardians, however, will be allowed to move forward with the immigration process.

The tests themselves are simple—a quick swab of the cheek and a quick wait. I say “quick” because we will be using a new form of genetic testing that can analyze a DNA sample in about 90 minutes.

I will tell you that I am aware that the various factions in this Chamber have vastly different approaches to immigration reform. We should be having a serious discussion about the fundamental flaws in our policies and our plans to fix them. I welcome these discussions, and I look forward to the changes, but I know and my colleagues know that no one bill or package will repair what is broken in our current immigration system. There is no viable quick fix.

We owe it to this country and we owe it to the children who are brought here under duress and under false premises to do whatever we can to prevent what experience and pilot testing have proved we can indeed prevent. Let's make certain that children coming to the southern border are with family and that they are protected.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TRIBUTE TO CINDY HASIAK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before we vote, I wish to take a moment to recognize a lifelong public servant, Cindy Hasiak, who will be retiring after 32 years in this Chamber, with the Sergeant at Arms and with the Senate doorkeepers.

Cindy came to the Senate in the spring of 1987. In her time here, she has

seen hundreds of Senators pass through these doors. When particular Senators were nowhere to be found, she was usually the one who would have chased them down.

There is also so much work in the Senate that gets done behind the scenes. So much of it is essential to our operations, and all of it is performed flawlessly, quietly, wonderfully by dedicated staffers who rarely get the recognition they deserve. Truly, the Senate would not function without the quiet dedication and steady excellence of folks like Cindy.

As her days of chasing down Senators come to a close, I wish her all the best as she embarks on a well-earned and well-deserved retirement where, luckily for her, she will be close to her family, friends, and loved ones and far from the frenetic demands of wrangling 100 Senators with 100 different schedules.

We all thank her for her dedicated career in public service. She will always, always, always have the gratitude of this grand institution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Feddo nomination?

Ms. COLLINS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted “yea,” the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted “yea,” and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), 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 85, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 281 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Baldwin	Bennet	Blumenthal
Barrasso	Blackburn	Blunt

Boozman	Grassley	Romney
Braun	Hassan	Rosen
Brown	Hawley	Rounds
Burr	Heinrich	Sasse
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Capito	Hoeben	Schumer
Cardin	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Carper	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Casey	Jones	Shaheen
Cassidy	Kaine	Shelby
Collins	Kennedy	Sinema
Cornyn	King	Smith
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Stabenow
Cotton	Leahy	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	Markey	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Duckworth	Menendez	Udall
Durbin	Merkley	Van Hollen
Enzi	Murkowski	Warner
Ernst	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wicker
Fischer	Peters	Wyden
Gardner	Portman	Young
Gillibrand	Reed	
Graham	Risch	

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—14

Alexander	Isakson	Roberts
Booker	Klobuchar	Rubio
Coons	McSally	Sanders
Harris	Moran	Warren
Inhofe	Perdue	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from Louisiana.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. 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.

UNCLAIMED U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am not going to speak for 10 minutes, but I do want to call attention to an example of breathtaking hypocrisy, and I am not proud of it.

We all understand in a social contract that the price of living in an organized society is giving up some of our hard-earned money. That is why we pay taxes. Nobody likes paying taxes, but we understand that taxes are necessary to pay our teachers, build our roads, defend our country, and help those who are less fortunate than us.

We set up a pretty good apparatus to go after you if you don't pay your taxes. If you don't pay your taxes, or you don't pay them in the right amount, or you don't pay them on time, they have people trained in the IRS—I am not criticizing. They are just doing their job, but they will chase you like a hound from Hades. So you

pay. That is the law, and we are all supposed to abide by it, but what happens when the Department in which the IRS is centered will not follow the same rules? I am talking about the Department of Treasury. The IRS is under the Department of Treasury. Now, what is good for the goose is supposed to be good for the gander.

The U.S. Department of Treasury is sitting on \$26 billion—not million, billion. That is nine zeros of matured, unclaimed savings bonds that belong to the people of this country. They have the names, and they have the addresses. Do you know what they are doing to try to contact these Americans? Nothing. Zero. Nada. Zilch. They just sit there holding on to the money.

We know what a savings bond is. We couldn't have won World War II without savings bonds. A lot of Americans took their hard-earned money, and they bought savings bonds. You know how it works. I am just making these numbers up, but you buy a savings bond. You give the Federal Government 100 bucks. You don't get anything every month. You give up 100 bucks, and in 20 years you go back and redeem your bond and it is now worth \$200. In the meantime, the Federal Government gets this loan to use your money. When that 20 years is up, the bond matures. It doesn't pay interest anymore.

Some people lose their bonds. Some people forget about their bonds. Some people pass on, and their kids inherit their bonds. They are lost, but you can always count on the Department of Treasury to keep a list of who owns bonds and which ones have been redeemed and which ones haven't. The U.S. Department of Treasury has that list, and there are millions of Americans whose names are on that list. They have names and addresses, and they don't do anything to give it back. They just stand there sucking on the teat.

Let me give you some examples. We are talking real money. I will just pick a couple out: New Jersey, \$695 million belongs to the people of New Jersey—not the politicians in New Jersey, not the government, the people—that the Treasury is holding.

Let me see if I can find—Washington State, \$560 million belongs to the people of Washington State—not the big dogs, not the mayors, not the politicians, the real people who get up every day and go to work and pay their taxes. For Hawaii, they have \$113 million. In my State, Louisiana, there is \$337 million. There is \$3 billion belonging to people in California.

We are going to get up in the morning, and the IRS—they are just doing their job. You better pay your taxes. They will take your firstborn. But when they have \$26 billion of the American people's money, you can't find them with a search party. It is not right. It is not right.

I sued them when I was State treasurer, and I got a bunch of other State treasurers to sue them too. I don't like

suing people, but the Department of the Treasury has spent tens of billions of dollars fighting the American people. They just don't want to give the money back—and you wonder why people hate the government.

I have a bill to try to do something about it. It is not personal. I think the world of our Treasury Secretary. I would think a whole lot better of him if he would start writing checks to the American people. I am not going to give up on this issue. All we are asking is that the Treasury Department share the names with the States. Every State has an unclaimed property program. They have a great one in Washington, a great one in Hawaii. Usually it is a State treasurer. They know to give money back to people. They don't charge a fee. Right is right, and this is wrong. The Department of Treasury needs to give the money back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

EMERGENCY FUNDING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, it is not a rhetorical flourish to say that Senate Republicans are being fully obedient to the President of the United States. The evidence of the last few days has confirmed that Republicans are not standing up for American institutions when they are tested, and they will not defend the American people when it counts the most. Through their silence, through their legislative actions, and through their votes, Republicans are allowing funds appropriated to the Department of Defense—funds that address critical military needs in their own home States—to be stolen in order to pay for the President's wall.

Let me explain. The way we do MILCON, military construction, is nonpartisan. It is not bipartisan; it is nonpartisan. That means there is zero politics involved in selecting military construction projects for funding.

The process goes like this: The base commanders decide what projects they need in order to support their missions and military communities. These projects are set up through the chain of command from the base command to the installation command. If the installation command says the project meets the cut and is important enough for military readiness, it is sent to the Service Chief, the Marine Corps Commandant, the Secretary of the Navy, and so on.

From there, each Service Chief decides what projects to present to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and then the Office of the Secretary of Defense racks and stacks these projects. It is a rigorous process, and not a single Member of the U.S. Senate gets to intervene during this process. They figure out which ones get addressed in the fiscal year, and some projects make the cut and others don't. The only thing we get to decide, once the matrix is sent to us, is how much money we have to deal with all of our military construc-

tion needs. Again, there is zero political involvement—no politicians, no side deals, no partisan uniforms. So by the time the Congress receives the final list of projects from DOD, every project has been thoroughly vetted. We recognize that at that point, every project is essential for the safety and security of the Nation, and every Secretary of Defense, every Secretary of the Army, every Secretary of the Navy, and so on looks us in the eye in the Senate Armed Services Committee and in the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee and says: This is essential. There is not a penny out of place. We need this, and we need this badly.

Shame on the Republicans for allowing this argument over whether to build a border wall to do two things; first, to infect the institution of the Department of Defense with politics and to start to undermine the credibility of the Department and its interactions with the legislative branch; second, and very importantly, to diminish funding for critical military projects.

What kind of projects are we talking about? There are 127 projects that are being raided that we funded. We enacted a law, the President declared an emergency, and the Republicans upheld that emergency. Now these projects are being defunded.

Let me give you a couple of examples out of these 127. This is the form that comes in. These are the words of the Department of Defense.

The first project, Fort Bragg, NC, "Butler Elementary School Replacement." There is a section that is called "IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED." In other words, this is what happens if we don't provide this funding. This is what the Department of Defense says:

The continued use of deficient, inadequate, and undersized facilities that do not accommodate the current student population will continue to impair the overall educational program for students. If a new facility is not provided, the substandard environment will continue to hamper the educational process and the school will not be able to support the curriculum and provide for a safe facility.

Let me take this example of the Marine Corps Air Station Beaufort, Laurel Bay, SC. The impact if funding is not provided:

[Fire and emergency service] personnel assigned to Laurel Bay will continue to work from a significantly undersized and unsafe facility. Because the structure does not meet seismic requirements, complete structural collapse is probable during a seismic event, causing death or major injury to emergency personnel, and thus preventing timely response to the [Marine Corps] housing community following the event.

Finally, and this is going to be 3 out of 127 projects rated: Fort Greely, AK, "Missile Field #1 Expansion." These are the ground-based interceptors designed to enhance our missile defense in the case of an attack from North Korea, "IMPACT IF NOT PROVIDED." This one is succinct and scary:

Planned enhancements and capabilities of the BMDS to meet emerging threats will not