

So if you want to see the Nation stronger, dads engage. That is what is going to make the Nation stronger. Every child needs a guide, a role model. They need to see the courage and kindness and strength of a dad.

They need more than just dad jokes. They need a dad present. That is what makes the biggest difference.

Could I just say from my own context, the Scripture is full of conversations challenging dads to love their children, and, quite frankly, children to honor their parents. Let me just give you a couple of them.

In Malachi 4:6.

It says: The role of the Prophet Elijah was to turn the heart of the fathers back to their children and the hearts of the children to their fathers lest there be a curse on the land.

What a clear statement: to turn the hearts of the fathers back to their children and the children to their father; if not, there is a curse on the land.

And how about this one? Just a simple challenge from Paul, who, interestingly enough, was not a dad but was somebody that understood the importance there. Paul in Ephesians 6:4. It says: Fathers don't exasperate your children. Don't just push them, push them, push them.

But instead he said: Bring them up in the training and the admonition of the Lord.

It is a very clear statement to dads to say don't just yell at your kids; train them on how to be able to love God and love people, train them up in the right way because if you want a church and community and a family to be better, dads need to be engaged with their kids.

So happy Father's Day to my dad, happy Father's Day to all the dads that are out there. And if I can make just the most simple cultural challenge, if we really want a stronger nation, there is no vote that we will take in this body today that will make the Nation stronger than just dads loving their kids and spending time with them and helping them know how to be able to walk with God and live a patriotic life and serve their family and community. There is no vote we will take that will help our Nation more than that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### INSIDER TRADING

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, Americans don't appear to agree on very much these days, but there is at least one thing on which the American people can agree; it is this thing that brings the American people together. Our citizens, no matter their politics, don't trust their leaders.

The list of institutions that Americans have lost faith in is long. We know this. We also know that Congress is at the bottom. In fact, over 80 percent of Americans disapprove of the job we are doing in this building.

The legislative branch is the foundation of representative government. It is

urgent, it is essential that we earn the trust of the American people back.

You see, we are charged with putting the interests of our constituents over our own interests. We are their voice. And yet many of the people we represent believe we are failing to honor that basic commitment.

It is no wonder many are losing faith, losing trust. We are their voice. A faith in government has eroded over decades. There are many causes. A lot of fingers can be pointed. There is plenty of blame to go around.

And we know that the task of restoring trust is going to be a long-term project. But I am here today to argue that there is an immediate step that we need to take to restore a measure of trust in this institution, and it is imminently achievable.

We can prevent its Members from using their positions of public trust to enrich themselves, to enrich their families, by banning stock trading among Members of Congress.

You see, as lawmakers, we write and pass bills that significantly impact the market. We do it on a daily basis. We sit on committees of jurisdiction that oversee entire sectors of America's economy. We have access to briefings and updates on a regular basis that provide nonpublic market information.

There is little to prohibit Members of Congress from using such privileged information to guide their personal selection of stocks.

In fact, in the last two decades, Members have made trades conspicuously timed around market-moving events, events shaped by information they had access to or legislation that they helped advance. Of course, this creates a direct conflict of interest between public duty and personal financial interest. And it is also a troubling double standard.

Most people say isn't insider trading a Federal crime for all Americans? And it is, but when it comes to Members of Congress trading on information gained through public service, enforcement is quite rare and very difficult to police.

So it is no wonder many Americans are convinced that the market is rigged for a privileged set of citizens who can manipulate it for their gain.

Now, to be fair, in 2012, Congress made some headway in addressing this unfairness. They passed the STOCK Act. This law, get this, mandates that lawmakers report stock trades over \$1,000 within 30 days of the transaction. But the enforcement mechanism and initial fine of a mere \$200 is virtually toothless.

So, the underlying problem remains, and it should not. Today, roughly 200 Members of Congress own shares in publicly traded companies.

Many of them, most of them, are good people. They are ethical people. They came here for all the right reasons, and many have not lost their way. And among those 200 Members, many sit on committees that craft pol-

icy for and conduct oversight on the very industries in which they invest.

In an era of deep partisanship, most Americans—no matter their political beliefs, their party, their underlying ideology, the geography in which they live, their gender, their age—they see this as a problem. How much of a problem?

Well, according to a survey conducted by the University of Maryland's School of Public Policy, 86 percent of our population supports a prohibition on congressional stock trading.

There aren't many issues like this. In a divided America, this could unify America. Our Congress could be unified by exercising the will of the American people and banning Members of Congress from trading stocks.

What do Republicans say? Mr. President, 87 percent of Republicans think this is a problem, think we should ban Members of Congress from trading stocks. You go across the country, almost 9 out of 10 Republicans you talk to will say we should do it.

And why have we not? What about Democrats? Mr. President, 87–88 percent, rather, of Democrats, almost 9 out of 10. Independents—81 percent.

So, listen, there are two bills that we already have. I don't need to draft a new bill. Let's recognize our colleagues' handiwork and get something important done.

Two bills that would accomplish this in the U.S. Senate: The first bill, the Stop Insider Trading Act, would just prevent Members of Congress, their spouses, and their dependent children from trading individual stocks, and it would strengthen disclosure and enforcement requirements. And unlike current law, the bill would impose meaningful financial penalties for violations. Under this bill, lawmakers who fail to comply with the law's mandates would be fined the greater of \$2,000—probably still not enough but enough maybe to get it passed through the Senate; we can increase it later—be fined the greater of \$2,000 or 10 percent of the investment value, plus the forfeiture of any net gain realized from the sale.

The second bill, the Restore Trust in Congress Act, would prohibit Members of Congress from trading individual stock. It would establish guidelines for Members to divest existing holdings within a defined period. It would also empower congressional ethics offices to enforce compliance through meaningful penalties.

Now, look, there is no easy or quick way to restore complete trust in Congress, faith in this essential institution of democratic government. But prohibiting Members of Congress from leveraging their positions of public trust for personal enrichment would go a long way. I think most Americans would acknowledge that it would be a meaningful step toward that goal.

Passing these bills will ensure stock trading comes to an end in Congress and help restore trust in us, those who

serve. I would even call it—as a personal matter, it would be a gesture of self-respect for politicians to embrace this reform. It is what the people we represent want.

So I just ask my colleagues: Let us be beyond reproach. Let us avoid all appearances of impropriety. Let us not disappoint the American people again. It is time to ban Members of Congress from trading stock.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

IRAN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last night, I read the memorandum of understanding between the United States and Iran. I read it twice. And for what it is worth, here is my conclusion: I think we ought to give peace a chance. And that is all I am saying today. You are entitled to your opinion, but all I am saying today is I think we ought to give peace a chance.

I have—all week long, even before the memorandum came out—I have heard all the speculation about the agreement, the rank speculation. I have listened to people say: Well, I don't like this, and I don't like that; or this is in it and it shouldn't be and this isn't in it and it should be; and if we do this, this is going to happen.

And it is all rank speculation. The people offering these points of view, to which they are entitled, they are not clairvoyant. They are not any more clairvoyant than I am. Just like me, they have to wait for the future, like everybody else.

Here is what I see in the document. The only certainty, the only practical, real consequence of this document is that for 60 days America has removed its blockade of the Strait of Hormuz. And for 60 days, Iran has removed its blockade of the Strait of Hormuz, which means ships containing oil and natural gas and fertilizer can go back and forth just like they were before the conflict started.

The other practical consequence is that Iran will be able to start selling its oil again for 60 days.

The other thing that we are certain of is that, as a result of this agreement, the price of oil is going down. And as a result of that, the price of gasoline is going down.

And as a result of the Strait of Hormuz being opened, the price of fertilizer, for example, and other commodities that go back and forth through the Strait of Hormuz are coming down, and that is a good thing.

And that is all we know. That is all—that is the only practical consequence of this document.

Now, in the document, Iran says that it is willing to negotiate for 60 days to get rid of its fissile material that it can use to make a nuclear weapon, including, but not limited to, its centrifuges that it uses to enrich the uranium.

And in the document, Iran says: We are willing to renounce our desire to have a nuclear weapon.

And in the document, Iran says: For 60 days, we are willing to negotiate some sort of inspection protocol so that the world can go in and make sure that Iran is telling the truth.

They have got 60 days to do it—not 160, not a year. They have got 60 days. And President Trump has said if they don't do it, I think his expression was: I'll start dropping bombs on their head again.

That is the other thing that we know. Now, this might be a good time to say that—as I have said all week and as I have said in another context before—I trust the Iranian Government like I trust gas station sushi.

The Iranian Government—not the Iranian people—the Iranian Government are a bunch of religious nuts. Their religion tells them that if you—if you and I or anybody—don't agree with all the tenets of their religion, that they want to kill you and hurt you the entire time you are dying.

As far as I am concerned, if your religion tells you, in order to be devout, you have to kill somebody, you probably ought to get another religion.

My experience with the Iranian Government—not the Iranian people—is that they lie like they breathe. They lie like fish swim. They learned to lie before they could—before they learned to talk.

But you know what, they have got 60 days to prove otherwise. Sixty days—not 160, not a year. They have got 60 days to prove otherwise. And if they don't prove it, the bombing is going to start again.

I heard President Trump say it last night, big as Dallas, right there on television: They got 60 days. And if they don't do it, if they are jacking me around, I am going to start bombing again.

The other thing that I am certain of today is that Iran is immeasurably weaker than it was a year ago, than it was before the United States and Israel bombed their nuclear facilities last June, and before the conflict that we have watched transpire over the last couple of months—immeasurably weaker.

There are whole swathes of Iran that look like the aftermath of a bar brawl. There are entire regions in Iran that look like something out of "Mad Max" 4. We have bombed the living bejesus out of them. We haven't destroyed all their missiles, but we have destroyed a bunch of them. We have destroyed their weapons production factories. We have destroyed their entire navy. We have destroyed a lot of their drones. We have just given them a curb stomping. Hated to do it, but we did what we have to do.

The private sector—Iran has got—I don't know how anybody is eating or living in Iran. They have got 70 percent inflation, huge unemployment.

In Iran today—and I regret this, but it had to be done. In Iran today, its public and private sectors are held together with spit and duct tape, and all

the President has done is said: OK. For 60 days, I am going to give peace a chance and give you a chance to do what you say you are going to do.

It is 60 days. That is it. I hope it works out, but I have my doubts. The President is taking a big risk here, and he has been roundly criticized by my Democratic friends, which I don't really get.

You know, since the conflict started, my Democratic colleagues have been offering bill after bill after bill to stop the conflict and to take the authority away from the executive branch and prosecute. I don't know how many bills it has been—a squillion. It has been bill after bill after bill. They haven't passed. But now that the President has done it, the Democrats are unhappy.

I was reading the New York Times this morning. I mean, they are just bashing this agreement which they have been asking for. Now, I don't mean any disrespect, but I discount what is in the New York Times because I know the folks running the New York Times, and the folks running the New York Times hate Republicans as much as the Devil loves sin. The New York Times and the people running the New York Times would endorse a dead armadillo over a live Republican if the dead armadillo had a "D" behind its name. That is just the way it is. I get it. They are entitled to their opinion. The New York Times has been called many things—some good, some bad—but they have never been called unbiased. That is just a fact that goes with the turf. Once again, this is America—you are entitled to your opinion.

But I wanted to come down this morning to say that I think we ought to give peace a chance. I think we ought to give peace a chance. It is only 60 days, and we are just going to have to trust the President on this one. We will know soon, and I hope it works. I hope our giving peace a chance makes peace possible.

My work here is done. I can see myself out.

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.

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

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

#### MODERNIZATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND PLANNING FOR BROADBAND FUNDING ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue that is near and dear to the State of Nebraska and to rural America, and that is the issue of closing the digital divide for unserved and underserved communities.

My husband Bruce and I raised our family on a cattle ranch near Valentine, NE, so I know what it means to