

through thin. The Kurds have been instrumental at every phase of U.S. engagement in Iraq and Syria, every phase.

Going back to the 2003 invasion, Kurdish fighters have been crucial boots on the ground in the fight against Islamic tyranny, and that is just a fact. The parts of Iraq retaken and controlled by the Kurds were strongholds for Western values like democracy and capitalism and multiculturalism. In fact, when allied forces withdrew in 2011, not a single U.S. soldier had lost his or her life in Kurdish territory.

The Kurdish-led Syrian Democratic Forces, better known as the SDF, have been another set of boots on the ground in the fight against ISIS. With the help of coalition supplies, weapons, and airstrikes, the SDF recaptured large parts of Northern and Eastern Syria from ISIS's iron grip.

Four years ago, the Presiding Officer will recall, there were 100,000 ISIS soldiers. Thanks in large part to our Kurdish allies, those numbers today are 5,000. Today, ISIS has surrendered 99 percent of its territory, including its capital in Raqqa. The so-called caliphate fighters are now being held to a small sliver of territory on the eastern border with Iraq near the Euphrates River. Our Kurdish allies deserve much of the credit for these successes.

It is plain to see that the Syrian Kurds have been invaluable in America's fight against jihadists and tyrants in the Middle East. The SDF, Syrian Kurds, controls nearly one-quarter of Syria right now. That is land that doesn't belong to ISIS; that is land that doesn't belong to Assad, a butcher; that is land that doesn't belong to Russia; and that is land that doesn't belong to Iran. More importantly, it is land where the Syrian Kurds know they will be free from persecution and from slaughter.

For a while now, I have been asking my colleagues in the Senate to support my amendment to S. 1. My amendment would promote stability and security for our close friends in the Middle East because it is the right thing to do. It is the moral thing to do, and America's foreign policy has always had a moral component.

My amendment will allow the United States to defend the Kurds in Syria by giving the President—not requiring the President to do anything. It would give the President the authority to use our military as he deems fit to keep our promise and to protect our allies—and all of our allies. After all, the Kurds have contributed to the fight against ISIS, and we owe them some peace of mind as we draw down our presence in the region. As we draw down our presence in the region, it is time to stand up and stand by our friends to make sure the fight stays won.

The threat of U.S. military force has been a major deterrent for the reemergence of jihadists like ISIS and al-Qaida. As the Presiding Officer knows

well, weakness invites in wolves. Our presence has held back Assad, it has held back Turkey, it has held back Russia, and it has held back Iran from gaining stronger footholds in the area. Without assurances of our support, as we wind down our effort in Syria, the Kurds will be left behind to fend for themselves. Without the Kurds, we cannot be certain who will step in to fill the power vacuum in the areas of Syria they currently control. We can only guess, and the answers to those guesses don't look good.

If the Kurds are vulnerable to attack from Turkey or Syrian rebels, they might have to turn to their enemies for protection out of fear. Even if they don't, they can't fight off the Turkish military if the Turkish military decides to attack and pursue the remnants of ISIS at the same time.

To abandon the Kurds now would be unconscionable. To abandon the Kurds now would compromise the security of our allies, Israel and Jordan, and it would risk exposing the region to more turmoil.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to think about the Kurds as they consider how best we can strengthen America's interests and security in the Middle East. It is time we make sure America keeps the promises we made to all of our allies—not just some of our allies, all of our allies—in the Middle East.

Mr. KENNEDY. Toward that end, I hereby offer a second amendment that I am sending to the desk. This second-degree amendment will amend amendment No. 65 proposed by Senator McCONNELL. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator offering the amendment?

Mr. KENNEDY. I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That requires unanimous consent because the Senate is in a period of debate only.

Mr. KENNEDY. I hear no objection. May I ask that my amendment be read?

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Afterward, I would ask that my amendment be read.

Now I would again ask for a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to temporarily withdraw my unanimous consent on my amendment, although I reserve the right to return.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Consent is withdrawn.

The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. 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.

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.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

#### 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Legislative Drafting Service, which we now know as the Office of the Legislative Counsel. In recognition of the anniversary, I would like to make a few comments about the history of the office.

During the first 130 years of Congress, 1789–1918, legislation for Congress was drafted by Members of Congress, congressional staff, Executive agencies, and outside individuals and groups which sometimes led to legislation that was not always clear, consistent, organized, and well written.

In 1911, Columbia University established a Legislative Drafting Research Fund to conduct research and work toward the better drafting of statutes and sent Professor Middleton Beaman and Thomas Parkinson to Congress to demonstrate the feasibility and value of the use by Congress of a full-time staff of professional legislative drafters.

The positive experiences of committees, Members, and staff of Congress, including the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, in working with professional legislative drafters led to the introduction and consideration of legislation to establish a Legislative Drafting Bureau, including S. 1240, 63rd Congress, which was reported to the Senate on June 17, 1913.

During the debate on the establishment of a Legislative Drafting Bureau, Senator Elihu Root of New York argued in favor of establishment citing the use of counsel by the British House of Commons and stating that “[t]he fundamental idea . . . to give the benefit of a trained, experienced student in the preparation of bills. . . . We need trained and intelligent assistance in the drafting of laws.”

On February 24, 1919, Congress enacted section 1303 of the Revenue Act

of 1918, 2 U.S.C. 271 et seq., which established the Legislative Drafting Service.

The House of Representatives and the Senate were initially served by a single office with two branches that received a single appropriation that was equally divided and transferred employees between the branches to meet special needs.

The two individuals who carried out the demonstration by the Legislative Drafting Research Fund became the first Legislative Counsels of the Legislative Drafting Service with Middleton Beaman appointed in February 1919 as the first Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives branch of the Service and Thomas Parkinson appointed in March 1919 as the first Legislative Counsel of the Senate branch of the Service.

In 1924, the name of the office was changed from the Legislative Drafting Service to the Office of the Legislative Counsel.

The House of Representatives and the Senate branches of the Office of the Legislative Counsel began to evolve separately during the 1930s when the Senate branch, while continuing to meet the drafting needs of Senate committees, began to devote a significant part of the resources of the Office to the drafting requests of individual Senators while the House branch continued to limit the services of the branch to committees of the House.

The House of Representatives and the Senate branches of the Office continued to separate in 1958 when, for the first time, the two branches received separate and not equal appropriations and were officially separated in 1970 when a separate charter was established for the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the House by title V of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, 2 U.S.C. 281 et seq.

The first attorneys joined the Office to work only for a session or on a particular project and then moved on to other positions, with Thomas Parkinson, the first Legislative Counsel of the Senate, and John E. Walker, the successor of Parkinson, each serving fewer than 2 years and Frederic P. Lee, the third Legislative Counsel of the Senate, being the first to serve a substantial term of about 8 years.

The career tradition of the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate was established with successors to Frederic P. Lee who served the Senate in the Office for their careers or long periods of employment, including Charles Boots—1922–1961, 32 years; Henry Wood—1926–1943, 17 years; Stephen Rice—1933–1950, 17 years; John Simms—1936–1966, 30 years; Dwight Pinion—1942–1969, 27 years; John Herberg—1947–1971, 24 years; Harry Littell—1947–1980, 33 years; Douglas Hester—1952–1990, 38 years; Francis Burk—1970–1998, 28 years; James Fransen—1975–2014, 39 years; Gary Endicott—1981–2018, 38 years; and Bill Baird—2010–present, 33 years, who served as attorneys of the Office and Legislative Counsels of the Senate.

During the 100-year history of the Office, the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate has served the Senate well by providing a steady, reliable source of nonpartisan and nonpolitical professionally drafted legislation for committees, Members, and staff.

The attorneys and staff members of the Office have established and maintained traditions of professionalism and dedication that have helped to provide to the Senate a sense of continuity and institutional memory.

There has been a dramatic growth in the use of the Office by the Senate where, during the 66th and 67th Congresses—1919–1923–704 requests were drafted by three attorneys for an average of 117 drafts per attorney for both Congresses, to the most recently ended 115th Congress—2017–2018—where 72,106 requests were drafted by 37 attorneys for an average of 1,948 drafts per attorney for that Congress.

To deal with its increasing workload, in 1990, the Office established teams with multiple attorneys per team that were responsible for drafting legislation under the jurisdiction of one or more Senate committees which has provided the Office with the flexibility and resources to respond to and meet the growing demands placed on the Office for ever-changing areas and complexity of active legislation.

Attorneys in the Office and the House Legislative Counsel's Office use a uniform drafting style to improve the quality and consistency of Federal legislation and Federal law, including whenever practicable plain English, brevity, consistent organization and terms, and captions and subdivisions to organize drafts and make the drafts more readable and improve the administration and interpretation of and compliance with laws enacted by Congress.

After the anthrax attacks on the Senate in October 2001, the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate continued to draft legislation for the Senate by working in temporary facilities outside the Office while the Dirksen Senate Office Building was decontaminated for 1 month and has since developed an effective long-term capability to deal with emergencies, reflecting the can-do attitude of the Office.

The role of the Office in the legislative work of the Senate is not often acknowledged, but it is understood and appreciated by all Senators.

The 262 current and former employees of the Office have worked very hard over its first 100 years to provide consistently a high quantity of high-quality legislation for the committees, Members, and staff of the Senate.

As the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate celebrates its 100th anniversary, the Office is well prepared to continue to provide the Senate and its committees and officers quality drafting service and sound legal advice with the spirit of quiet professionalism that has been the tradition of the Office throughout its history.

I know that all Senators join me in congratulating the Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate on the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a listing of the men and women of the current staff of the Office of the Legislative Counsel be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

Legislative Counsel—William R. Baird; Deputy Legislative Counsel—Elizabeth Aldridge King; Senior Counsels—Charles E. Armstrong, Ruth Ann Ernst, John A. Goetcheus, Heather L. Burnham; Assistant Counsels—Amy E. Gaynor, Matthew D. McGhie, Stephanie Easley, Mark M. McGunagle, Kevin M. Davis, Kristin K. Romero, Heather A. Lowell, Kelly M. Thornburg, John A. Henderson, John W. Baggaley, Margaret A. Rose, Allison M. Otto, Kimberly A. Tamber, Vincent J. Gaiani, Kimberly D. Albrecht-Taylor, Margaret A. Bomba, James L. Ollen-Smith, Robert F. Silver, Thomas B. Heywood, Christina N. Kennelly, Christine E. Miranda, Kathryn G. Bonander, Philip B. Lynch, Deanna E. Edwards, Evan H. Frank, Maureen C. Contreni, Patrick N. Ryan; Staff Attorneys—Carol L. Lewis, Larissa Eltsefon, Mark L. Mazzone; Director of Information Systems—Thomas E. Cole; Office Manager—Donna L. Pasqualino; Senior Staff Assistants—Kimberly R. Bourne-Goldring, Diane E. Nesmeyer, Rebekah J. Musgrove, Patricia H. Olsavsky, Daniela A. Navia.

#### CENTENNIAL OF BEAUMONT INN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in Kentucky's oldest town sits a beautiful and historic building on the top of a hill. Beaumont Inn, with its name taken from the French for "beautiful mount," is my State's oldest Southern country inn. The Harrodsburg establishment is a beacon of hospitality with a distinguished history, and I would like to take a moment to mark the centennial anniversary of this treasured Kentucky landmark.

When the main building of today's Beaumont Inn was constructed around 1845, no one could have perceived the incredible future in store, but then again, the location had already had a notable history. An original wooden structure on the site was believed to be the childhood home of John Marshall Harlan, future Kentucky attorney general and Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

For many years afterward, the site served as a series of schools for women, including the Greenville Institute, the Daughters College, and finally as Beaumont College until 1916. The next year, the grounds were purchased by an alumna of the Daughters College, Annie Bell Goddard, and her husband Glave. In 1919, the Goddards opened the new 31-room Beaumont Inn, and the same family has proudly operated this wonderful Kentucky establishment ever since.

Throughout the next century, Glave and Annie Bell's descendants have welcomed countless guests to the inn, preserving this historic building, its picturesque scenery, and the tradition of