

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

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 348 Ex.]

YEAS—73

Alexander	Graham	Roberts
Baldwin	Grassley	Romney
Barrasso	Hassan	Rosen
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Blunt	Hoeven	Rubio
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Brown	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Capito	Jones	Shaheen
Carper	Kaine	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	
Crapo	Moran	Toomey
Cruz	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Daines	Murphy	Warner
Enzi	Paul	Whitehouse
Ernst	Perdue	Wicker
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Fischer	Portman	Young
Gardner	Risch	

NAYS—17

Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Cantwell	Hirono	Schatz
Cardin	Markey	Schumer
Duckworth	Menendez	Stabenow
Durbin	Merkley	Udall
Gillibrand	Murray	

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Warren
Burr	Kennedy	
Cassidy	Klobuchar	

The nomination was confirmed.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William Joseph Nardini, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

John Thune, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Mike Rounds, Lindsey Graham, Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, John Cornyn, Joni Ernst, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, Jerry Moran, Shelley Moore Capito.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of William Joseph Nardini, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

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 North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), 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 yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 3, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 349 Ex.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Gardner	Reed
Baldwin	Graham	Risch
Barrasso	Grassley	Roberts
Blackburn	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hoeven	Rosen
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Braun	Inhofe	Rubio
Brown	Johnson	Sasse
Capito	Jones	Shelby
Carper	Kaine	Sinema
Casey	King	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Sullivan
Coons	Leahy	Tester
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	McConnell	
Cramer	McSally	
Crapo	Moran	Toomey
Cruz	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Daines	Murphy	Warner
Enzi	Paul	Whitehouse
Ernst	Perdue	Wicker
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Fischer	Portman	Young
Gardner	Risch	

NAYS—3

Gillibrand	Hirono	Markey

NOT VOTING—10

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Isakson	Warren
Burr	Kennedy	
Cassidy	Klobuchar	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 3.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Joseph Nardini, of Connecticut, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, with respect to the Hunsaker nomination, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1743

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to express my concern and my disappointment over the decision by the President to formally withdraw the United States from the Paris climate agreement.

Though the President announced this decision over 2 years ago, this past Monday marked the first day his administration could send a letter to the United Nations formalizing the year-long withdrawal process. Of course, we know that they did that.

American leadership on climate action is being ceded to other countries before our very eyes. With this move, the President is betraying the trust of the American people and betraying the trust of our international allies in the fight against climate change.

Climate change is a very real and present threat to our environment, to our national security, to our economy, to our health, and to our very way of life. That is why I introduced the International Climate Accountability Act, to prevent the President from using funds to withdraw the United States from the Paris climate agreement. This bipartisan bill would also require the administration to develop a strategic plan for meeting the commitments we made in Paris in 2015.

We can see on this chart that the House passed legislation over 6 months ago. It has been 188 days since the House passed their legislation, the Climate Action Now Act. Yet in the Senate the majority leadership has refused to call up this bill for a vote.

The administration's withdrawal from the Paris climate agreement and the general refusal to bring climate change legislation to the floor is out of step with the desires of the American people.

Approximately two out of every three Americans believe it is the job of the Federal Government to combat climate change, according to a recent poll from the Associated Press. The same poll found that 64 percent of Americans disapprove of the President's climate change policies.

Unfortunately, the Senate majority leadership continues to refuse to act on climate change. Yet what we hear from our scientists and experts is that they tell us that we need to act and act now on climate change before it is too late. This poll shows us, as others have, that a supermajority of the American public wants us to do just that.

I have come before this body a number of times in the past to highlight the impact of climate change in my home State of New Hampshire. We see very directly the effects of climate change. The farther north you go, the more you see those impacts. Our fall foliage season is shortened. Our maple syrup production season is disrupted. Our outdoor recreation industries are hampered. Our ski and our snowmobiling industries are hampered. Our lobsters are moving north to colder waters. Our moose population is

down 40 percent, and Lyme disease is on the rise.

But today what I really want to highlight are the revelations that have been made clear in recent weeks by our national security experts. A report entitled “Implications of Climate Change for the U.S. Army,” which was commissioned by the current Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Mark Milley reads: “The Department of Defense is precariously unprepared for the national security implications of climate change-induced global security challenges.”

The Pentagon’s “Report on Effects of a Changing Climate to the Department of Defense” reads, as we can see right here: “The effects of a changing climate are a national security issue with potential impacts to Department of Defense missions, operational plans, and installations.”

When former Secretary of Defense James Mattis was before the Senate Armed Services Committee for his confirmation hearing in 2017, his testimony read, in part: “Climate change is impacting stability in areas of the world where our troops are operating today.”

I had the chance to ask him in that hearing: “Do you believe climate change is a security threat?”

He responded this way: “Climate change can be a driver of instability, and the Department of Defense must pay attention to potential adverse impacts generated by this phenomenon.”

He went on to say: “Climate change is a challenge that requires a broader, whole-of-government response.”

I could go on detailing the calamitous conclusions of our national security experts, but, instead, I ask unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President from nearly 60 national security and military leaders be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMERICAN SECURITY PROJECT,
THE CENTER FOR CLIMATE AND
SECURITY,
March 5, 2019.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We write to you as former US national security leaders to offer our support to our uniformed military, civilian national security professionals, and members of the scientific community, who across the past four Administrations have found that climate change is a threat to US national security.

Climate change is real, it is happening now, it is driven by humans, and it is accelerating. The overwhelming majority of scientists agree: less than 0.2% of peer-reviewed climate science papers dispute these facts. In this context, we are deeply concerned by reports that National Security Council officials are considering forming a committee to dispute and undermine military and intelligence judgments on the threat posed by climate change. This includes second-guessing the scientific sources used to assess the threat, such as the rigorously peer-reviewed National Climate Assessment, and applying that to national security policy. Imposing a political test on reports issued by the science agencies, and forcing a blind spot onto the

national security assessments that depend on them, will erode our national security.

It is dangerous to have national security analysis conform to politics. Our officials’ job is to ensure that we are prepared for current threats and future contingencies. We cannot do that if the scientific studies that inform our threat assessments are undermined. Our national security community will not remain the best in the world if it cannot make decisions based on the best available evidence.

When extreme weather hits the United States, it degrades the fighting force. Just last year, Hurricane Florence caused \$3.6 billion in damages to Camp Lejeune, home of the Marines’ expeditionary units on the East Coast. You called Florence “One of the biggest to ever hit our country.” Stronger storms and storm surges have long featured in predictions about a changing climate. Around the world, climate change is a “threat multiplier”—making other security threats worse. Its effects are even used by our adversaries as a weapon of war; ISIS used water shortages in Iraq, in part driven by a changing climate, to cement their hold on the population during their reign of terror from 2014 to 2017.

We support the science-driven patriots in our national security community who have rightly seen addressing climate change as a threat reduction issue, not a political one, since 1989. We support the bipartisan finding of the US Congress, which you signed into law on December 2017, stating that “climate change is a direct threat to the national security of the United States.” We urge you to trust and heed the analysis of your own national security agencies and the science agencies on which their assessments depend, including the 21 senior defense officials that have identified climate change as a security threat during your Administration. A committee designed to undermine the many years of work they have done will weaken our ability to respond to real threats, putting American lives at risk.

Our climate will continue to change, and the threats will continue to grow. We spent our careers pledged to protect the United States from all threats, including this one. Let’s drop the politics, and allow our national security and science agencies to do their jobs.

Sincerely,

Hon. John Kerry, Former Secretary of State; Hon. Ray Mabus, Former Secretary of the Navy; General Gordon R. Sullivan, US Army (Ret), Former Chief of Staff of the US Army; Admiral Samuel J. Locklear III, USN (Ret), Former Commander, US Pacific Command; Admiral James Stavridis, USN (Ret), Former Supreme Allied Commander Europe; Nancy Soderberg, Former Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; Hon. Sharon Burke, Former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Operational Energy; Hon. David Goldwyn, Former Assistant Secretary of Energy and Special Envoy for International Energy Affairs; Hon. Miranda AA Ballentine, Former Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Installations, Environment, and Energy); Leon Fuerth, Former National Security Adviser to the Vice President.

Dr. Geoffrey Kemp, Former Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs; General Paul Kern, USA (Ret.), Former Commanding General, US Army Materiel Command; Lieutenant General John Castellaw, USMC (Ret), Former Chief of Staff, US Central Command; Lieutenant General Arlen D. Jameson, USAF (Ret), Former Deputy Commander, US Strategic

Command; Lieutenant General Norm Seip, USAF (Ret) Former Commander, 12th Air Force; Hon. Sherri Goodman, Former Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Environmental Security); Hon. Chuck Hagel, Former Secretary of Defense; Vice Admiral Richard Truly, USN (Ret), Former Administrator of NASA; Admiral Paul Zukunft, USCG (Ret), Former Commandant of the Coast Guard; General Stanley McChrystal, USA (Ret), Former Commander, US and International Security.

Lieutenant General Donald Kerrick, USA (Ret), Former Deputy National Security Advisor to the President of the United States; Tom Hicks, Former Acting Under Secretary of the Navy and Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Management; Hon. John Conger, Former Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) and Assistant Secretary of Defense for Energy, Installations and Environment; Eric Rosenbach, Former Chief of Staff, Department of Defense, and Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Security; Vice Admiral Dennis McGinn, USN (Ret), Former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Energy, Installations and Environment; Hon. Alice Hill, Former Special Assistant to the President and Senior Director for Resilience Policy, National Security Council; Major General Randy Manner, USA (Ret), Former Acting Vice Chief, National Guard Bureau; General Ron Keys, USAF (Ret), Former Commander, Air Combat Command; Vice Admiral Philip Cullom, USN (Ret), Former Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Fleet Readiness and Logistics.

Lieutenant General Kenneth E. Eickmann, USAF (Ret), Former Commander, Aeronautical Systems Center, Headquarters Air Force Materiel Command; Vice Admiral Robert C. Parker, USCG (Ret), Commander, Coast Guard Atlantic Area; Greg Treverton, Former Chair, National Intelligence Council; Major General Jerry Harrison, USA (Ret), Former Chief, Office of Legislative Liaison, Army Staff; Rear Admiral Leendert R. Hering USN (Ret), Former Commander, Navy Region Southwest; Major General Jeff Phillips, USA (Ret), Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association; Rear Admiral Michael Smith, USN (Ret), Former Commander, Carrier Strike Group 3; Rear Admiral Jonathan White, USN (Ret), Former Oceanographer & Navigator, US Navy; Captain James C. Goudreau, SC, USN (Ret), Former Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Energy); Brigadier General Steven Anderson, USA (Ret), Former Director, Operations and Logistics Readiness, Headquarters, Department of the Army.

Brigadier General Donald Bolduc, USA (Ret), Former Commander, Special Operations Command-Africa; Brigadier General Robert Felderman, USA (Ret), Former Deputy Director of Plans, Policy and Strategy, United States Northern Command and North American Aerospace Defense Command; Brigadier General Carlos Martinez, USAF (Ret), Former Mobilization Assistant, Chief of Warfighting Integration and Chief Information Officer, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force; Joan VanDervort, Former Deputy Director, Ranges, Sea, and Airspace, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Readiness); Commander David

Slayton, USN (Ret), Executive Director, the Arctic Security Initiative The Hoover Institution; Hon. Richard Morningstar, Former Ambassador to the European Union; Major General Richard T. Devereaux, USAF (Ret), Former Director, Operational Planning, Policy and Strategy, Headquarters US Air Force; Rear Admiral Sinclair M. Harris, USN (Ret), Former Commander, United States Fourth Fleet; Rear Admiral Michael G. Mathis, USN (Ret), Chief Engineer to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition); Rear Admiral Fernandez L. Ponds, USN (Ret), Commander, Expeditionary Strike Group (ESG) 3.

Rear Admiral Kevin Slates, USN (Ret), Former Director of Energy and Environmental Readiness Division, US Navy; Rear Admiral David W. Titley, USN (Ret), Former Oceanographer & Navigator, US Navy; Joe Bryan, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Energy); Brigadier General John Adams, USA (Ret), Former Deputy United States Military Representative to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Military Committee; Brigadier General Joseph R. Barnes, USA (Ret), Former Assistant Judge Advocate General of the Army; Brigadier General Stephen Cheney, USMC (Ret), Former Commanding General Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island; Brigadier General Gerald E. Galloway, USA (Ret), Former Dean of the Academic Board, US Military Academy, West Point; Brigadier General Stephen Xenakis, USA (Ret), Former Commanding General, Southeast Regional Medical Command; Colonel Lawrence B. Wilkerson, USA (Ret), Former Chief of Staff to the US Secretary of State.

This letter very directly rebukes the attempt by the President to create a committee within the National Security Council that would undermine military and intelligence judgments on the threats that are posed by climate change. So instead of recognizing those and developing a plan to address them, what the President has been trying to do is to figure out how to undermine those very judgments.

At this time, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be discharged from further consideration of S. 1743 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I am reserving the right to object.

With all due respect to my good friend and colleague from New Hampshire, we both served on the Foreign Relations Committee. The Foreign Relations Committee is, as it has been noted, the committee of jurisdiction on this matter. We are talking about the Paris climate agreement. What Senator SHAHEEN is attempting to do with this—and, again, with all due respect, I understand where she is coming from

on it—is to stop the President from withdrawing from the Paris climate agreement that was made by his predecessor, President Obama.

Let me say, first of all, that the Senator is right that the changes we are experiencing are great. They have large effects. They are of great magnitude. Just as importantly, the changes we make attempting to address this are going to have great magnitude. In a great magnitude, they are going to affect the American people both financially and in the quality of life and the lifestyle they enjoy.

We can't do anything about the changes that are occurring right now, but what we can do is to do something about the way we attack this, the way we make changes to our lifestyle and what we will give up and what people are willing to give up in order to address this.

The way this is done is nations get together to talk about this—the 200 nations get together. They did, and they came up with the Paris climate agreement. Under article II of the U.S. Constitution, section 2, the President is given the power to make treaties with other countries, and that is what President Obama attempted to do with this. However, section 2 goes on to say that the President can make these treaties provided two-thirds of the Senate present concur. So that is a treaty, and that is how ordinarily agreements are made between nations.

Obviously, we can do things ourselves without having a two-thirds vote—with a 60-percent vote in the Senate and a simple majority vote in the House. We can do that amongst ourselves if we want to change U.S. law as to how we are going to change the way we do industry and the way we lead our lives. We can do that with that kind of a vote. If we are going to agree with other countries, on the other hand, it takes a two-thirds vote.

Now, at the time this was negotiated, I disagreed with President Obama, and I disagree with the accord at this time. The reason I do is I really believe this is a bad deal for the people of the United States. I really believe we can get a better deal. I think what we need to do, if we are going to do that, is we need to do it on a bipartisan basis. There is not going to be a two-thirds vote without a bipartisan agreement on this issue.

I would like to see this addressed. I would like to see us, as the Foreign Relations Committee, and us, as the first branch of government, constitutionally protected as such, be a part of this and not just the second branch negotiating and then entering into the agreement.

The President has, No. 1, every right to withdraw from this agreement, just as President Obama had the right to enter into this executive agreement. I, for one, agree that he should withdraw from the Paris accord. In fact, I encouraged him to do so personally when he was running and then when he was elected and continuously since then.

That doesn't mean we should walk away from this by any stretch of the imagination. I think what we should do is do what the U.S. Constitution envisions; that is, you have a negotiation between us, the United States, and other countries, and then the matter is submitted to the U.S. Senate for a vote to see if two-thirds of us can agree that this is the way to do this.

So based on that, with all due respect to my good friend from New Hampshire, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am not surprised by my colleague's objection. I am, however, disappointed, and I have to disagree, to some extent, with the rationale because in fact this was not a treaty. It was a voluntary, non-binding agreement that the United States entered into voluntarily.

I am not saying President Trump doesn't have the authority to withdraw from the agreement. I am saying he is wrong to withdraw because it is not in the U.S. national interest to withdraw from this agreement.

There is an international race to develop clean energy technologies and practices that reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and this race exists, in large part, because of the goals that were established in the Paris climate agreement.

Instead of leading the pack in this race, which the United States should be doing, the President has chosen to put us on the sidelines. We are going to watch our allies and our adversaries clamor to fill the void he has created. After decades of American leadership in clean energy technology innovations, other countries are now poised to develop new low-carbon technologies to help countries throughout the world meet their Paris commitments. Those could be American technologies. Those could be American jobs. Instead of being developed in the United States, too many of these new technologies and the jobs that go with them will be developed outside of our shores. This is a missed opportunity for the United States. It is a setback for the American economy and for American workers.

The scientists are in agreement worldwide. Climate change is the single greatest environmental public health and economic challenge our world has ever faced. Right now, watching this President withdraw the United States from the Paris Agreement, sitting idly by, this Congress is surrendering American leadership in the fight against climate change.

I hope that as time goes by, the President and our Republican colleagues will rethink the position and acknowledge the need to do something to address the climate challenge we are facing and to make sure the United States is in line for those jobs and the new energy economy that is being created.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, first of all, I don't question the sincerity whatsoever of my good friend from New Hampshire. Indeed, she is quite correct that the United States has been a leader as far as developing methods by which we clean up the air and clean up the water.

There is nothing that is happening here today, at this moment, that is going to affect that at all. American companies are going to continue to be on the front edge of this, on a very innovative basis, and I have every confidence that American businesses will rise to the occasion and will continue to actually be the world leader in this regard.

What I object to is making an agreement with other countries that truly binds U.S. citizens by doing it without going through the constitutional process of submitting the agreement that is between our country and others, as is specifically—very specifically provided in article II, section 2.

I think if we did that, I think we would wind up with a better agreement. I think we would wind up with a bipartisan agreement. We all know that when we have a bipartisan agreement, we do substantially better as far as rising to the occasion and all getting behind the effort.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, yesterday a bipartisan group met with seven Fortune 500 companies. They were all on the cutting edge of new energy technologies, and everyone around the table said what they need is to see policies at the Federal level that encouraged the development of new energy technologies and what we can do to address climate change.

I like what my colleague said about being able to work together to address this. I hope we can do that, and I am ready to sit down anytime he is to look at things we might be able to agree on that will help us move forward to address climate change. I appreciate his willingness to work in a bipartisan way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

VETERANS DAY

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise this evening to pay tribute to all the men and women who have worn our Nation's uniform in defense of our freedom. Veterans Day is a deeply meaningful day for our Nation. Our country sets this day aside to honor her servicemembers.

In Nebraska, we remember the sacrifices of our own heroes. We admire the courage required to leave your home in Nebraska and serve America in her hour of need. It was over 100 years ago, at the 11th hour, on the 11th day, during the 11th month of the year that the roar of battle in World War I

fell silent. Since then, Nebraskans and all Americans have come together every year to renew our appreciation for our Nation's heroes. We pledge that no matter how much time has passed, we will never forget their valor, their service, and their selflessness.

In June, it was one of the greatest honors of my life to gather at freedom's altar in Normandy, France, to commemorate the 75th anniversary of D-day. I was overwhelmed with both gratitude and pride for our men and women who ensure that our freedom lives on, and evil is vanquished.

Now, 75 years earlier, minutes from where I was standing, Omaha's own CPL Ed Morrissette arrived at the beaches of Normandy with the 6th Infantry Regiment. As the Omaha World Herald reports, "He leaped over the side of the landing craft into shoulder-deep water, carrying a roll of communications wire."

Morrissette recalled holding the wire and his rifle above the water as he waded through, dodging an onslaught of enemy artillery fire. By the grace of God, he completed his mission, and he survived the Normandy invasion.

Corporal Morrissette continued fighting for our Nation in France and Germany. Following the war, his career as a civilian engineer eventually led him to Offutt Air Force Base. Recently, his courage and his dedication were recognized.

At the age of 96, the Government of France awarded Corporal Morrissette the highest military or civilian medal—the French Legion of Honor. Corporal Morrissette's story inspires all of us to remember that our duty to honor our Nation's heroes is never finished. The responsibility falls to all of us to listen to their stories and to carry them on. Not only do we honor our troops with our words, we salute them with our actions.

Nebraskans have always taken this to heart. It is why you read stories like that of Chuck Ogle from Kearney. He was a pilot in the 498th U.S. Army Medical Corps air ambulance company during the Tet Offensive in Vietnam. Every single day, he carries with him a list of his 14 fellow servicemembers who were killed in action. It is why you see stories of hero flights for Nebraska veterans to visit Washington, DC.

Last October, a plane carried 80 Korean veterans from Hall County to our Nation's Capital to visit the monuments dedicated to their service. This marked the 10th flight for the county's veterans to Washington. Now, every living veteran in Hall County has been given the opportunity to make this trip. It is why over the last few years business leaders and members of the Omaha community rallied around the goal of building a new ambulatory clinic at the Omaha VA hospital.

In response to delays to update the aging Omaha VA facility, I introduced and President Obama signed into law the CHIP IN for Vets Act in 2016. The

bill allows control of VA projects to be placed where it should be—back in the hands of local communities. It allows communities like Omaha to take the lead on new projects by permitting the VA to accept private contributions to ensure VA projects are finished both on time and on budget. Omaha's community and business leaders came up with this idea in the first place, and they have delivered.

Construction began on a new ambulatory center on the Omaha VA campus in May of 2018. After the original cost estimate of \$120 million, the Government Accountability Office released a preliminary report that found that the implementation of the CHIP IN for Vets Act would reduce the total estimated cost to \$86 million. The report projected that the new facility is now \$34 million under budget and it is 4½ months ahead of schedule.

In the same report, a VA official stated that because of the agency's current major construction backlog, the CHIP IN approach allowed work on the Omaha project to begin at least 5 years sooner than it would have under a normal process. Now Nebraska's veterans may get the quality of care they need and deserve earlier than expected. The success of this project is a testament to the deep respect and admiration Nebraskans have for our veterans.

Scripture encourages us to pay our dues wherever they may be. If someone is due respect, show them respect. If honor is due, honor them. The amount of honor and respect our State and Nation owe our veterans is something we can never fully repay. Our country could not live on without their service and sacrifice.

I want to sincerely thank our veterans for their service when our country needed it the most.

Whether it was in the trenches of Europe while liberating a continent from evil or in the Pacific theater during World War II or stopping the threat of communism in Korea or Vietnam or defending our Nation against terrorism in Iraq and Afghanistan, the rescue of human freedom began with you. I can promise you that America will never forget your incredible courage and patriotism, and we will continue to strive to be worthy of the freedom that burns brighter today because of your service. On behalf of all Nebraskans and a grateful country, thank you.

May God bless our Nation's veterans and their families, and may God bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized as in morning business for such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. INHOFE. You know, we don't hear that very often. I just heard the term from the Senator from Nebraska "under budget and ahead of schedule."