



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 18, 2019

No. 121

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

O Lord, our God, You soar on the wings of the wind. May our lives delight You. As our lawmakers seek to fulfill Your purposes, impart to them Your wisdom. Lord, pursue and overtake their enemies so that Your will may be accomplished on Earth. Show our Senators Your loving kindness, enabling them to serve You faithfully. Sustain us all with Your love, for we find our joy in You. Show mercy to the merciful, purity to the pure, and justice to the upright.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 1 minute.

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

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, with the record rainfalls and the negotiations of Chinese tariffs going on, our

farmers are hurting, but we can give them some certainty by passing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement on trade.

In my home State, 86,500 Iowans in farming depend upon agricultural exports to Canada and Mexico, adding \$10.3 billion to our State's economy. Manufacturing and services are also going to have a big boom out of this agreement being agreed to. Every third row of Iowa soybeans are exported, and this trade deal will ensure that these farmers continue to have duty-free access to our North American neighbors.

The U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement also provides new export opportunities for American dairy farmers, poultry, and egg producers.

Let's give a boost to our farmers and all the jobs related to farming and in cities and also give a boost to the entire country, by passing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement and do it very soon.

I yield the floor.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MCCREARY COUNTY AND DEPUTY SHERIFF DUSTIN WATKINS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, first, this morning I would like to join Kentuckians in McCreary County in breathing a sigh of relief. Deputy Sheriff Dustin Watkins was responding to a routine call on Tuesday evening when

he was shot and needed to be airlifted to a hospital. Fortunately, we heard yesterday afternoon that Deputy Watkins is in stable condition. I understand that last night he was able to sit up for the first time—all good news.

With Sheriff Randy Waters, I wish to extend sincere thanks to the doctors, nurses, and hospital staff who are caring for this brave Kentuckian and will support his recovery. My best wishes go out to Deputy Watkins, his family, and his colleagues. We thank them for their service to our Commonwealth as we are reminded once again of the sacrifices they make every day to keep us safe.

TREATIES AND HOUSE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, this week the Senate has attended to one of this body's unique responsibilities relating to foreign affairs—the ratification of treaties. We have ratified bilateral tax agreements with four trading partners: Spain, Switzerland, Japan, and Luxembourg. Measures like these bring clarity, certainty, and fairness to international commerce. They ensure U.S. citizens and businesses have a level playing field without duplicative tax burdens, and they make the United States a more inviting destination for foreign investment.

These newly ratified treaties will provide immediate and much needed relief to employers in every corner of our country. They will reinforce support for hundreds of thousands of jobs including many in my home State of Kentucky. This is a significant bipartisan accomplishment.

Now, standing in stark contrast to the Senate's productive, bipartisan week is what the Democratic House of Representatives has chosen to prioritize. We have seen plenty of partisan theatrics and high drama for the television cameras. We have seen the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S4923

majority spend plenty of time attacking the President and members of the administration, but virtually nothing in the way of bipartisan legislation to actually make progress for the American people.

The problem seems to be that so many Democrats have moved so far to the extreme left that they literally could not pass commonsense legislation even if they wanted to.

A case in point is the chronic difficulties and consternation that we have seen over in the House when it comes to the seemingly straightforward task of condemning anti-Semitism and efforts to delegitimize the Jewish State of Israel.

Back in March, remember, House Democrats had their hands full dealing with one of their freshman members who had trotted out age-old anti-Semitic tropes—dual loyalties, support for Israel being driven by money, the kind of language you would think the House could have condemned pretty easily.

But instead, after days of internal Democratic strife, all the House leadership could drum up was a watered-down resolution that sort of—gestured vaguely at the problem. All the while, Senate-passed legislation that would actually do something about anti-Semitism has been languishing over in the House without a vote.

For more than 5 months and counting, the House has refused to act on S. 1, the foreign policy legislation that we here in the Senate passed back in February. This bipartisan bill included a provision to take on the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions movement, an economic form of anti-Semitism that targets Israel.

Here in the Senate, taking action against BDS was a bipartisan goal. I am a passionate opponent of the BDS movement. I know my friend the Democratic leader opposes BDS as well, and S. 1 earned 77 votes here in the Senate back then.

But apparently it is a bridge too far for this Democratic House. Even a milder resolution simply condemning BDS—not doing anything about it, but condemning it—has become a lightning rod for the far left this very week.

Reports indicate that “senior progressive Democrats are urging House leaders” to walk away from the resolution condemning BDS—a resolution, not the thing that we passed, which is much stronger. So the House will not take action against it, and now it seems they can’t even merely condemn it. They can’t even condemn it. In fact, the far left wants to defend BDS. Let me say that again. The far left in the House wants to defend BDS.

I guess this is where we are. Elected members of the Democratic Party are openly urging their leadership not to make them vote on condemning anti-Semitism. Let me say that again. Elected members of the Democratic Party are openly urging their leadership not to make them vote on con-

demning anti-Semitism—a watered-down version of what we sent them back in February—because, for some reason, it is just too tough a vote. What a sad and bizarre situation we find in the House.

I urge the Speaker of the House to do the right thing. Don’t let these far-left voices run the show. At long last, bring S. 1 up for a vote—the comprehensive legislation that sailed through the Senate with 77 votes. Bring it up for a vote, Madam Speaker. Let them vote. I bet we would see a pretty good outcome and show anti-Semitism the door.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, earlier this week, I spoke about the economic pain that many Americans felt under the last administration’s leftwing policies and all the Trump administration and Republicans in Congress have done to turn the page.

Today we see the lowest unemployment in nearly 50 years, way more job openings than job seekers, and an all-American recovery that isn’t limited to just a select few places and industries.

My home State of Kentucky has hit and sustained our lowest unemployment rate ever recorded—ever recorded. Two thirds of Americans now say they feel optimistic about where their finances will be a year from now.

But we know the effects of bad policy are hard to erase. So my colleagues and I are continuing to fight for the places that are still struggling to pick up the pieces.

Unfortunately, my home State of Kentucky offers a particular case study, because nothing shows the difference between the last administration and this one more clearly than in the case of affordable energy and the coal industry.

For more than a century, coal has been a reliable and low-cost energy source that has helped fuel America. Coalfields in both Eastern and Western Kentucky have provided good jobs and served as critical drivers of our economy.

Back in 2009, the industry directly employed more than 23,000 Kentuckians. It provided more than 90 percent of our electricity. It brought billions of dollars in revenue into our State. So we were especially vulnerable when a Democratic administration came to Washington that didn’t even try to hide its hostility toward Kentucky coal.

Speaking in San Francisco, then-Senator Obama pledged to bankrupt any new coal-fired plants and declared that under his plan “electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket.” His Democratic leader of the Senate said, “Coal makes us sick.”

So clearly, the elite disdain for fossil fuel in places like New York City, Chicago, and San Francisco was going to become the law of the land. Sure enough, the Obama administration de-

clared a War on Coal. It hurt Kentucky badly. Plants closed. More than 10,000 miners were let go—10,000 unemployed miners. And then these mass layoffs strained local social services. Entire communities went into a tailspin. Unsurprisingly, many of these places experiencing economic distress subsequently became ground zero in the opioid and substance abuse crisis as well.

I, and Republicans generally, did all we could to fight. But when we passed bills repealing the worst regulations, President Obama vetoed them. When I urged his EPA Administrator to hear from Kentucky families, she turned me down.

The policies had been dreamt up in places like New York City and San Francisco for places like New York City and San Francisco. Places like Kentucky? We were just the collateral damage. So it is no surprise that all kinds of Americans elected President Trump and Republican majorities in 2016. And we hit the ground running.

One of the first bills we sent the President was a bill I introduced to repeal the stream buffer rule, a burdensome part of a series of regulations designed to make coal prohibitively expensive to mine or to use. We halted some of the worst regulations, like the waters of the United States, eliminated the so-called Clean Power Plan, and replaced them with policies to support American energy dominance.

For former miners and for the industry, the damage can’t be unwound overnight. This very month, we have seen two more major coal producers in Kentucky move toward bankruptcy. Clearly, even now, all is not well. That is why my colleagues and I are focused on lending a helping hand. When healthcare benefits for thousands of retired coal miners and their families were at risk, I led the effort to secure a permanent extension and protect coal communities in States like Kentucky.

Congressman HAL ROGERS and I established the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Economic Development Pilot Program, which aims to revive old mine sites into economic drivers again. That program includes everything from helping dislocated miners develop the skills they need to transition to a new career, to delivering resources to strengthen our water infrastructure, to improving the infrastructure and tourist attractions to draw new visitors and money into Appalachia.

With each program and many others, we are working to revitalize communities and repair the damage. But many of our Democratic colleagues are itching to take us right back to the bad old days. The most prominent voices in the Democratic Party are openly calling to restart a Big Government assault on fossil fuels and on so many Americans’ livelihoods.

We all remember several months ago when many Democrats embraced an unabashedly socialist proposal called

the Green New Deal that would have made the Obama-era War on Coal look like child's play. Among all of its other craziness, it sought to end all production of American oil, coal, and natural gas within a decade. How ridiculous. How absurd.

We had a vote on it in the Senate, and lest we think this was just some extreme view that only the fringe subscribes to, only 4 of 47 Democrats could bring themselves to oppose the Green New Deal in the Senate—only 4 of 47 Democrats could bring themselves to oppose the Green New Deal in the Senate. There were 43 of 47 Democrats who couldn't vote against this thing. Fortunately, Republicans voted it down.

But last week, not to be deterred, a number of Democrats rolled out yet another far-left environmentalist manifesto. This new resolution calls for—here we go again—a managed phaseout of the use of oil, gas, and coal to keep fossil fuels in the ground—a managed phaseout of the use of oil, gas, and coal to keep fossil fuels in the ground. Of course, this means a whole lot more intrusive Big Government.

The bill calls for a “massive-scale federal mobilization of resources”—a “massive-scale federal mobilization of resources.” Just imagine what that would entail. And get this: The new manifesto dictates that our Nation model ourselves after Europe, Canada, and liberal enclaves like New York and Los Angeles. You just can't make this stuff up.

The contrast is clear. Republicans are working overtime to rebuild the conditions for middle-class prosperity, and we are working overtime to help those who were hit hard in the Obama years. But Democrats are working to resurrect the same bad ideas that caused much of that damage and implement them yet again, this time on steroids. The good news is, as long as this Republican Senate has anything to say about it, none of these radical job-killing manifestos have a chance of becoming law.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Clifton L. Corker, of Tennessee, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

CONSUMER PRIVACY

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, these days, there is an online component to

almost everything that Americans do. Were you at the beach last weekend? You undoubtedly posted pictures on Facebook and Instagram. You probably used Google Maps or Waze or another map app to find your way there. You undoubtedly booked a hotel stay on one of the myriad hotel booking sites, and you transmitted your credit card information online to pay for it. During your stay, you probably took advantage of the hotel's free Wi-Fi, whether you were uploading pictures or watching a show on Netflix. If you had dinner at a restaurant while you were there, there is a good chance you used the internet to make a reservation. If you booked an excursion while you were there—maybe a fishing trip or a boat tour—chances are good you made that reservation online as well.

I could go on, but you get the idea. The internet and mobile internet-enabled devices like our phones and watches have resulted in an explosion of opportunity and innovation. Information is more accessible than ever before. We can communicate more swiftly and easily than ever before. We can shop without leaving our house, strike out confidently into the unknown without a map and still find our way back, turn on the air conditioner or heater with a simple voice command, and see who is knocking on our door while we are 600 miles away on vacation.

With the convenience and opportunity of the internet revolution comes serious privacy concerns. Every time we book a hotel, navigate a new town, buy movie tickets, or buy groceries online, we are putting a lot of personal information into the hands of a lot of different companies: banking information, health information, information about our location, our preferences, our habits. All of this information is likely used in some form or fashion by some of the world's most successful internet businesses to personalize our search results on Google or to deliver the content that we see on Facebook or Instagram.

As a member and former chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, I have gotten an up-close look at the issue of consumer privacy. I believe that developing bipartisan consumer privacy legislation needs to be a priority in Congress.

Last year, as chairman of the Commerce Committee, I convened hearings into consumer data privacy and the accessing of millions of Facebook users' personal data by the political intelligence firm Cambridge Analytica. I also led a hearing to discuss the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation and California's new privacy-related law. I have continued to focus on consumer privacy this year as chairman of the Commerce Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet.

A few weeks ago, I convened a hearing to look at the use of persuasive technology on internet platforms like

Facebook and YouTube. Sites like YouTube and Facebook use algorithms and artificial intelligence driven by user-specific data to tailor just about everything you see on their platforms, from ads to the video that plays after the YouTube video you searched for. These algorithms can be useful. If you searched for Paul Simon's “Diamonds on the Soles of Her Shoes” on YouTube, you probably will not mind hearing “Graceland” next. If you are shopping for a new computer, you might find it useful to see an ad for the latest HP or Apple laptop.

These algorithms can also be deployed in far more troubling ways. For example, in June, the New York Times reported that YouTube's automated recommendation system was found to be automatically playing a video of children playing in their backyard pool to users who had watched sexually themed content. Algorithms can also be used to limit what news stories and other content people are exposed to.

As we learned from a witness at the hearing on persuasive technology, a former Google employee named Tristan Harris, these algorithms have the potential to be used to influence the thoughts and behaviors of literally billions of people.

For all of these reasons, I believe that transparency needs to be an essential part of the conversation. Americans should be clearly informed about how their personal data is being used and how companies influence and control what Americans see online.

Obviously, users have an obligation to exercise personal responsibility, but companies also need to provide greater transparency about how content is being filtered.

Given the ever-increasing size of our digital footprint and the increased privacy dangers that come along with that, the question isn't whether we will have Federal privacy legislation; it is what that legislation will look like.

I believe that any final bill should be bipartisan and should set a single national data privacy standard so that companies and consumers don't have to navigate 50 different sets of rules. We need to make consumer data privacy a priority while also preserving the ability of companies to innovate and deliver the cutting-edge services we rely on.

I also believe, as I mentioned, that any bill should include transparency provisions that give consumers a clear understanding of what is being done with their data. I believe consumers have the option to engage on internet platforms without being manipulated by algorithms powered by their own personal data.

This isn't the first time Congress has tackled new and emerging privacy concerns. Over the last few decades, Congress has acted to protect children online, protect sensitive healthcare information, and to modernize how institutions use consumer data.

I believe we can follow in that tradition by developing a new consumer privacy law, and that is why I am committed to working with colleagues from both parties to develop legislation to meet the privacy challenges we are facing today. I am confident that we can arrive at a strong consumer privacy bill for the digital age, and I will continue to make Americans' privacy a priority of mine here in Congress.

I yield the floor.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, last night, we saw the President of the United States, who has spent years maligning America, continue to malign Americans. The President once again whipped up a toxic brew of racism, xenophobia, and nativism, with his crowd chanting "send her back" about a duly elected Member of Congress and a U.S. citizen—one of the oldest and ugliest racist attacks against Americans of color.

The way the President appeals to the worst instincts of people and what was shouted and chanted at the rally last night without the President's upbraiding them was despicable and eerily familiar to what happens in dictatorships.

We all know that the only way President Trump will stop this is for Republicans—his own party—to demand it. The only way President Trump will stop is when Republicans on the other side have the honor, the decency, and the courage to tell him to stop. All we hear is silence and diversions from Leader McConnell.

So, America, if you don't like what the President says, if it gets you upset and makes your hairs stand on end, say: This is not the America I know and love. Whatever your political views, call your Senators and tell them to tell President Trump to stop this.

Argue the merits, argue the issues, but stop this appeal to the worst instincts—the worst instincts. And our Republican friends are silent.

History will show this. This is a moment. There is no John McCain anymore. When this kind of bitter racism emerged in his townhall meeting, he rejected it publicly when somebody used it against then-Candidate Obama. It went down in history as one of his finest moments. Where are the fine moments of my colleagues? There are 53 of them on the Republican side, and not one has spoken out strongly enough—not one.

They are quiet on everything else, too—things that matter to average

Americans to help make their lives better. Where are our Republican friends on the substantive issues that can help Americans of all colors and creeds—all colors and creeds—help Americans whether their families have been in this country for 11 generations, as some of my friends have been, or are new immigrants, as some of my friends are? In New York, we have everybody.

Here are some of the things our Republican friends can do. The House has passed legislation to improve our healthcare system and intervene in the lawsuit against eliminating protections for Americans with preexisting conditions, but Leader McConnell—once again silent—sent the bill to his legislative graveyard. The House has passed legislation to close loopholes in our gun background check system. This is no longer controversial. Ninety percent of Americans are for it—90 percent. Leader McConnell has sent that bill, too, to the legislative graveyard. Climate change, voting rights, pay-check fairness for women—all are in the legislative graveyard.

Where are my Republican friends on those issues? Why aren't they standing up and saying that we should at least debate them here in the Senate? Democrats have had to petition for weeks to even be allowed amendment votes on issues of importance to the American people.

It is a sorry state of affairs here in the Senate. I believe it has frustrated many of my Republican friends—I hear it from them privately—as well as us Democrats, because while we may not always agree on legislative solutions to a problem—we are not all supposed to agree; this is not a dictatorship—we want to debate the issues. We want to make forward progress.

My Republican colleagues know that they didn't come here just to rubberstamp an assembly line of the President's nominees, judicial and executive, and neither did we, but under Leader McConnell, legislative progress is the lowest and often last priority.

H.R. 1327

Madam President, for example, yesterday, my colleague Senator GILLIBRAND asked unanimous consent to reauthorize the Victim Compensation Fund for the brave first responders who got sick after working on the pile after 9/11. It is as unobjectionable a piece of legislation as you can imagine. These are the people who rushed to the towers after 9/11. They got all kinds of gunk in their lungs and in their gastrointestinal systems and later developed cancer. Many of them are now gone, some of them are people I became friends with, like Ray Pfeifer and Detective Alvarez. And all we want to do is what we do with our soldiers when they are on the battlefield and get illnesses and wounds. We want to help them. That is all. Nothing more. Yet, over the course of the last several years, again, our Republican friends, aided and abetted by Leader McCon-

NELL, have either blocked this legislation or diluted it. But now it seems there is a breakthrough.

In the House, this bill passed with I think only 12 Republicans objecting. Conservative Members like MARK MEADOWS, who is head of the Freedom Caucus, Leader MCCARTHY, and Whip SCALISE all voted for it. Why can't we just bring it to the floor and vote on it here? We should.

My colleague from Kentucky, RAND PAUL, objected. Bring it to the floor. Bring it to the floor. Give him an amendment, but let's not just have this one lay in the legislative graveyard as well. I am hopeful it will not because as soon as it passes the Senate—and we don't want to amend it because that will send it back to the House, and who knows what will happen in the back-and-forth—if we just pass the bill as is and defeat an amendment that is not intended to help or improve it, it will go to the President's desk, and he will sign it. Even if he doesn't, there are veto-proof majorities in both Chambers to overcome it.

Senator GILLIBRAND, my friend and colleague who has done so much on this issue, will try again today to get this Chamber's consent to pass the bill. If the junior Senator from Kentucky again blocks the bill, I strongly urge the senior Senator from Kentucky, Leader McConnell, to put the bill on the floor. It is unacceptable that once again we are dealing with delays on legislation to help our brave 9/11 first responders, some of whom are gone, many of whom are ill, and many more of whom will get ill in the future from the diseases they acquired because of their bravery and selflessness on 9/11.

FACEAPP

Madam President, on another matter, over the past couple of days, millions of Americans have been downloading FaceApp—a viral tool that applies a little AI technology to a selfie to make your face look younger or older or add a beard. That seems like a benign new social media fad, but it actually may not be benign at all.

Who is the parent company of this app? Wireless Labs. It is based in, of all places, St. Petersburg, Russia. It also came to light that the app not only takes your picture but retains the right to access all your photos, your search history, and gives "perpetual, irrevocable, and worldwide" license to use your photo, your name, and your likeness. This is a breathtaking level of access—all too common in murky apps like these—that raises very substantial privacy concerns.

After everything we learned about Russia's unrepentant cyber aggression in 2016, the nexus of facial recognition, digital privacy, and a shadowy Russian company based in St. Petersburg, where so much of the Russian interference in our elections and interference with the internet emerged from, what happened with this app from Wireless Labs called FaceApp should set off alarm bells for all Americans.

At the very least, we need to know more about what the heck is going on here. I have called for the FTC and the FBI to investigate FaceApp to see if private information of millions of Americans could wind up in the wrong hands and used for very bad purposes. We need more than the assurances; we need the facts. The potential for our facial data and the data from all of our friends and families contained in our photos to fall into the hands of something like Russian intelligence or the Russian military is really troubling. I strongly urge the FTC and the FBI to get to the bottom of FaceApp.

BORDER SECURITY

Madam President, on one more issue, over the last few months, Americans have seen for themselves the awful conditions that migrant children are enduring at the Southern border. Faultless kids—many traveling alone, many very young—are subject to inhumane conditions, without the proper healthcare, nutrition, hygiene, or space. People have different views on immigration—we know that—but no one should want to see these kids treated so inhumanely. All they are doing is fleeing for a better life.

This weekend, I am leading a visit to the border with a number of my Democratic colleagues to investigate, inspect, and evaluate the latest conditions at these facilities. We hope—desperately hope—that the conditions have improved over the last several weeks. We will certainly report to the American people and to the Senate on what we find.

I yield the floor.

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. Kaine. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, I rise today to talk about an experience that I had on Sunday. Sunday was the day, July 14, that President Trump had preannounced that massive deportation and immigration raids were about to begin. It looks like those raids maybe didn't start on Sunday, but the communities of immigrants in Virginia and elsewhere, who have been experiencing tremendous fear, had that fear dramatically accelerated by the announcement.

On Sunday, my wife and I, who live in Richmond, went to a town called Kilmarnock, about an hour and 10 minutes away from us, where my wife's parents are in a nursing home. They are 95 and 93 years old. We went down to spend the day with my in-laws and to take my mother-in-law to church at the local Episcopal church where she has long been a member.

I was struck by the readings. It was a day of fear for many immigrant com-

munities, and the readings that occurred in the Episcopal church, which are readings that are delivered in Catholic and Presbyterian and other churches on a set schedule, struck me as I was thinking about the fear in these communities.

For the Old Testament reading, normally, in most churches around the globe, Catholics and Episcopalians read from Deuteronomy, but for some reason, the pastor of this church—it was his goodbye ceremony, and he was leaving after serving for an interim—had switched the Old Testament reading and instead put in a reading from the Old Testament Book of Amos, Chapter 7, verses 7 through 9.

This is what he showed me: The Lord was standing by a wall that had been built true to plumb, with a plumbline in his hand. And the Lord asked me, "What do you see, Amos?"

"A plumbline," I replied.

Then the Lord said, "Look, I am setting a plumbline among my people Israel; I will spare them no longer."

A plumbline is a device used when you are constructing something. It is just a weight on a string, nonmagnetized, and it will show up and down so that you can build something that is square and that has a solid foundation.

It is a reading about principles and values and what is a solid foundation.

The Gospel reading that we heard in our tiny church in Kilmarnock and around the world was the Good Samaritan story. Jesus is being pestered by a lawyer: What do I do to inherit eternal life?

And Jesus said: You know the answer. Tell me the answer.

And the lawyer does. He is smart.

Love God and love your neighbor as yourself.

Jesus says: Fine. You know the answer. Just live that way.

But the lawyer, either to trap Jesus or because he was confused or he was trying to figure it out, says: But who is my neighbor?

And then Jesus tells the story of a person beaten on the road to Jericho and lying at the side of the road. Some passed by pretending not to notice, though they do notice. Some noticed and sort of half go over to help but don't do anything. But one person, a Samaritan—and in the Bible, Samaritans were despised minorities because they didn't worship like other people did—actually is the one who actually goes and helps.

As everyone knows, in the story he takes care of the person who is beaten. He takes him to an inn and pays the innkeeper and says: I will even pay you more. I will settle up. Make sure that you nurse him back to health.

This Samaritan was the one who was the neighbor. When Jesus then goes back to the lawyer and says: Which was the one who was the neighbor to the person who was beaten, the lawyer was so infected by the prejudice of his day that he can't even say "the Samaritan." Again, Samaritans were despised people, much like refugees or migrants

or migrant kids seem today to be despised people. The lawyer couldn't even make his lips say the word "Samaritan." Who is the neighbor to the person who was beaten? He can't even answer the question—the Samaritan. But he does know the answer, and instead he says: The one who showed him mercy.

Those were the readings that we heard—that the Lord will set a plumbline to try to determine whether the nation—in that instance, Israel—was behaving properly or not, and in terms of what the plumbline is, what is the moral standard. The Lord is encouraging us to be neighbors, and not just to the people like us, not just to the people who are our next-door neighbors but even to people who are down on their luck, beaten, despised, and hurting.

Sunday was also another day. It was Woody Guthrie's birthday. Woody Guthrie was a great American songwriter known for "This Land is Your Land" and so many other songs that are part of who we are as a people.

Woody Guthrie wrote a song in 1948 called "Plane Wreck at Los Gatos," and the song is more commonly known by the name "Deportee." We lived this history before.

In 1948 in California, there was an effort to deport so many people. There are times when we desperately want immigrants here to do the work, and then there are phases where they get deported.

Woody Guthrie was listening to the radio. This is a man born on July 14, the day that the President announced that the deportation raids would start. Woody Guthrie was listening to the radio in January of 1948, and he heard a story about a plane that was taking deportees back to Mexico. The plane crashed in Los Gatos Canyon, near L.A., and the pilot and some others were killed, and 32 deportees were killed.

Woody Guthrie was struck that when the story was told on the radio, they mentioned the names of the pilot and the copilot and the others who were working on the plane, but as for the 32 deportees who were killed, their names weren't mentioned. They were "just deportees."

Here are the lyrics to the Woody Guthrie song written based on an incident in January 1948, but our history repeats itself.

The crops are all in and the peaches are rott'ning,

The oranges piled in their creosote dumps;
They're flying 'em back to the Mexican border

To pay all their money to wade back again
Goodbye to my Juan, goodbye, Rosalita,
Adios mis amigos, Jesus y Maria;
You won't have your names when you ride the big airplane,

All they will call you will be "deportees"
My father's own father, he waded that river,
They took all the money he made in his life;
My brothers and sisters come working the fruit trees,
And they rode the truck till they took down and died.

Some of us are illegal, and some are not wanted,

Our work contract's out and we have to move on;
 Six hundred miles to that Mexican border.
 They chase us like outlaws, like rustlers,
 like thieves.
 We died in your hills, we died in your deserts,
 We died in your valleys and died on your plains.
 We died 'neath your trees and we died in your bushes,
 Both sides of the river, we died just the same.
 The sky plane caught fire over Los Gatos Canyon,
 A fireball of lightning, and shook all our hills,
 Who are all these friends, all scattered like dry leaves,
 The radio says, "They are just deportees."
 Is this the best way we can grow our big orchards?
 Is this the best way we can grow our good fruit?
 To fall like dry leaves to rot on my topsoil
 And be called by no name except "deportees"?

Along with several other colleagues earlier this week, I filed a bill called the Stop Cruelty to Migrant Children Act. It is a bill that has 40-plus cosponsors. It would do a number of things. It would set safety, health, and nutrition standards in these facilities whose pictures we are seeing—pictures that set an embarrassing example of a nation that should want to set a good example.

It would set minimum standards for food, nutrition, and healthcare. It would guarantee that children in these facilities would receive three meals a day and that the meals would be of adequate nutritional value. It would end the practice of family separation, unless ordered by a court, so the presumption would be that families could not be separated. It would provide additional resources for lawyers so that people can follow the rule of law and present evidence and present a case for asylum or refugee status, if there is a case to be presented. It would allow the restart of programs like the Family Case Management Program, which was a successful program that enabled people to be placed in community settings, not cages or jails or institutions, and have management to make sure that they then come to court dates on time.

The bill has a number of provisions that I think are worthy, but the thing that is the most important about the bill to me and why I agreed to cosponsor it is that I just think it puts our country in a position where we are setting the right example, not the wrong example. It puts our country in a position where if the plumbline of right and wrong is applied to us, we are on the right side of that judgment. It puts us in a position where as we are being directed to be good neighbors—including to people who are hurting, including to people who are suffering—we would be able to look ourselves in the mirror and look the world in the eye and say: The United States believes that we are good neighbors, and we are behaving in a neighborly way toward people.

These issues are of massive importance to the individuals involved. There was a story earlier this week about a border agent inquiring of a young girl: You are going to be separated. Your parents are going to be separated, and you have to decide whether you go with your mother or your father.

Why make a child of tender years make that choice? The young girl's name was Sofia. Many of us know the Virginia author, William Styron, and his book "Sophie's Choice." Sophie is forced to make an existential choice between her children in a concentration camp in Poland during World War II. That is the choice. That is the existential choice in the heart of that novel.

When tiny Sofia is being told: We are separating your mother and father, and you have to choose between them, should a child have to do that? None of us would tolerate that for our own family members. None of us would tolerate that for a member of our community. So is it fair to do that to a child of tender years because she happens to be somebody who has come from Central America?

These issues are of immense importance to those involved, to the Sophies, to the father and daughter who tried to get across a river a few weeks ago and drowned as they were trying to do it. They had come thousands of miles, and they were so close. All they wanted to do was apply for asylum legally: Can you accept my application? We are not trying to sneak across. We want to apply legally and have the laws of your country apply to us if we can justify that we should come. Please do that.

When they reached the border, we are taking so few applications now that they waited and they waited and they waited, and they eventually tried to cross a river and were drowned in the process—that heartbreaking picture of them having come so far and being so close that they could touch the bank. They almost got to touch the bank of this Nation they had dreamed might offer them a better life.

Their case, had they been able to apply, may or may not have been accepted. There is no guarantee they would have met the standards, but all they wanted was the opportunity to apply to enter this greatest Nation on Earth.

So I will just conclude and say I hope, in the days ahead—and I know there are discussions going on between Members of this body and between Members of this body and the White House about what we might do. I just want us to do something we can look in the mirror and be proud of. I want us to do something that we can use as an example for ourselves and for others. I want the plumbline that separates good and bad behavior and foundations that are morally strong versus those that are shaky and weak to judge us fairly. I want us to be neighborly. I want us to be neighborly in the best

traditions of whom we have always been.

With that, I yield the floor.

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. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

DEBT CEILING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, according to the Treasury, since 1960, Congress has acted 78 times to raise the debt ceiling. Let me run that past you again. Since 1960, we have had 78 debt ceiling increases, under Republican Presidents, Democratic Presidents, Republican Congresses, and Democratic Congresses. There has been a steady increase over and over again with the debt ceiling.

The debt ceiling was originally designed to provide a moment of fiscal restraint for Congress, a moment for Congress to look at the debt and determine whether to increase debt again or to determine how to restrain ourselves.

Going back to post-World War II, we had an enormous debt left over after World War II. That was the triggering mechanism for them. Throughout the Korean war, for instance, they didn't raise the debt ceiling. They found ways to find fiscal restraint because they had so much debt.

That doesn't even seem to be the conversation anymore. Now debt ceiling conversations are about what bill will we get it into to make sure it passes so we can just keep going. That moment of determining how we can deal with fiscal restraint seems to be gone.

Let me state just how severe this has become. Right now, our current debt to GDP—that is, gross national product—our debt compared to our gross national product is at 78 percent. That is an enormous number. That means, if you take all of the American economy, every single person in the entire country, group it all together, what they receive in pay, what they make, and put it all together, it would take 78 percent of every single person in the country to pay off our debt for an entire year.

If we were to maintain that debt-to-GDP ratio at 78 percent, just not get worse than where we are at \$22 trillion right now, we asked the Congressional Budget Office how much we would either have to raise in taxes or cut in spending each year to not make it worse. The answer that came back from the Congressional Budget Office was \$400 billion, but the hard part about that—not that \$400 billion is not bad enough—we would have to cut or raise in taxes \$400 billion every single year for 30 years in a row. That is not the original \$400 billion but a new \$400 billion every year for 30 years in a row just to keep us at a debt-to-GDP ratio of 78 percent.

That is not going to happen. There is not the will in this Congress to reduce

\$400 billion this year much less do it every single year for 30 years in a row.

So my simple push is this. We have to get to a real conversation about what we are going to do about our debt and how we are going to respond to this.

I have committed, around any kind of debt ceiling conversation, that the conversation should not be about just raising it and going on; it should be about how we are going to address our debt. I cannot support a debt ceiling that just raises the debt ceiling without any consideration about what we are going to do to actually pay off that debt or how we are going to get on top of it.

We have a broken process. We are not dealing with debt when we talk about debt ceilings anymore, and we are facing a September 30 deadline. There is already an ongoing rumor and conversation around the hallways about could we have another government shutdown.

In the last 40 years, we have had 21 government shutdowns—21—under Republican and Democratic Presidents and under Republican and Democratic Congresses—21 government shutdowns. The one that happened earlier this year was the longest one in history, but that doesn't mean it is the longest one that will ever happen. There may be a longer one coming. The challenge is, how do we solve this issue about debt? How do we deal with some of the simple processes like government shutdowns and how do we stop those?

Government shutdowns actually cause more spending to happen because it costs so much to prepare for it. When it happens, there is a greater cost, and when restarting it, there is greater cost again. All of that is lost money. It is just a waste.

So Senator MAGGIE HASSAN, the Democratic Senator from New Hampshire, and I have worked together to put a simple proposal together to stop government shutdowns. This is not rocket science. Most Americans can't leave their work and walk away, especially if they are small business owners. They can't walk away from their jobs unless the job is done. That is just the nature of it. So our simple idea is this. If we get to October 1—and the end of the fiscal year ends on September 30—and the work is not done on all the appropriations bills, we would have what is called a continuing resolution kick in. The funding would continue to go the same as it did the year before. It basically is putting everybody on hold but is still moving. That would protect Federal workers and make sure Federal workers and their families are not affected by the government shutdown. It would protect the taxpayers, making sure they are not having to deal with "I can't get a permit" and "I can't get an answer on the phone from a government agency because there is a Federal shutdown." So the Federal workers and American people would be held harmless, but Mem-

bers of Congress, our staffs, and the staff of the White House Office of Management and Budget, in both the House and the Senate, would all be here in Washington, DC, with no travel.

Now that may not seem like a big issue. You may say: So what. It would mean we are in session every weekday, every weekend, and cannot leave to go back and see our families. We cannot do our work that has to be done in the States, and we have work to do in our States as well. We cannot go on any kind of codel travel. We cannot take any other travel of any sort, and every day we have what is called a mandatory quorum call in the Senate and in the House. We are in session weekdays and weekends continually until the budget work is done.

I had folks say: Well, that doesn't seem like that big of an incentive.

I can assure you, the most precious commodity to Members of the House and Senate, our staff, and to members of the Office of Management and Budget is the same precious commodity every American has. It is time—time.

If we lose the time so we can't do all of the other things we need to do until we get the budget work done, we will get the budget work done because there are a lot of things on our schedule, but our first priority should be the budget work that needs to be done.

This puts us in a position to basically do what my mom did to my brother and me. When my brother and I had an argument, my mom would lock the two of us in a room and say: You guys work this out. When you are done, you can come out of the room, but you guys keep talking until you settle it. Quite frankly, my mom would be a pretty good role model for this Congress. Lock us in the room, keep us debating until we solve it.

We had the longest shutdown in American history this past time, and it started right before Christmas. What did the Members of Congress do? They left. They left. They went home for Christmas. They went away. While Federal workers did not have their paychecks coming in, Members of Congress left town.

It is as simple and straightforward as this: Federal workers should be held harmless, and Members of Congress should be kept to stay and work it out.

Senator HASSAN and I continue to work through this. We gained wide bipartisan support. It went through the first of two committees—10 to 2 as it passed the committee. Now it has a second committee to go through before it comes here. We want to build bipartisan support to say: We will have disagreements on budget. We will have disagreements on spending. But we should keep debating until we solve it. But do not loop the Federal workers and their families into this, and certainly don't harm the taxpayers in the process.

We look forward to trying to get some things resolved in this place and to keeping the debate going until we do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to ask my colleagues a simple question. There is a lawsuit that is proceeding through the court system right now that has succeeded the district court level, that has had a hearing at the appellate court level, and may be speeding toward the Supreme Court. It is a lawsuit that was brought by 20 Republican attorneys general. It is a lawsuit that is being supported by the Trump administration. It is a lawsuit that many of my colleagues have gone on record saying they support. It is a lawsuit to undo the entirety of the Affordable Care Act, to throw out insurance for 20 million Americans and to end protections for people with preexisting conditions. It is an attempt to do through the court system what this Congress refused to do, which is to obliterate the Affordable Care Act and all the insurance it provides for people without any plan for what comes next.

I have served in both the House and the Senate, and I listened for a long time to my Republican colleagues say that while they don't like the Affordable Care Act, they certainly understand that there has to be something else, and that something else should be just as good as the Affordable Care Act. In fact, the President himself said that whatever plan he supported in substitute of the Affordable Care Act would have better insurance, cheaper insurance, and would insure more people.

Republicans never came up with that plan. In fact, the replacement they jammed through the House of Representatives in 2017 was much worse than the Affordable Care Act. The Congressional Budget Office said that 24 million people would lose insurance because of that piece of legislation and rates would potentially skyrocket for people with preexisting conditions.

There has never been a replacement for the Affordable Care Act. The only plan from the beginning has been to repeal it. Now that Congress has said it won't repeal the Affordable Care Act—why? because Americans do not want the Affordable Care Act repealed with nothing to replace it—now that Congress won't do it because the American people don't support the repeal of the protections for sick people in the Affordable Care Act, Republicans are trying to get the courts to do it.

We are perhaps 60 days away from the Sixth Circuit invalidating the entirety of the Affordable Care Act. Likely, if that is the case, the judgment will ultimately be rendered by the Supreme Court. But that could come as soon as the beginning of next year. We could still be months away from a humanitarian catastrophe in this country in which the entirety of the Affordable Care Act is invalidated and what to do about it is put back before Congress.

It would stand to reason that if your plan is to try to get the entire Affordable Care Act thrown out in Congress, you would maybe start thinking about what would replace it. As far as I can tell, Republicans have no plan for what happens if the Affordable Care Act is overturned. As far as I can tell, my Republican colleagues have spent no time thinking about what would happen if they actually end up catching the car they have been chasing.

What happens if the lawsuit succeeds? What happens if the Affordable Care Act is struck down? What comes next? We can't accept—and I don't think my Republican colleagues would want to accept—millions of people losing coverage overnight or insurance companies being able to discriminate against you because your child has a history of cancer or an insurance company being able to go back to capping the amount of insurance you get on an annual or lifetime basis.

It is mere fantasy to think that we can reproduce the protections in the Affordable Care Act if we are not talking about it ahead of time.

I am coming back on the floor today, as I have several times in the last few months, to ask my Republican colleagues to either withdraw your support for this lawsuit, stop the administration from being able to pursue it in court, or start a serious discussion about how you are going to protect care for everyone who has it today—not a handful of people who have it today but all the people who have it today—while this lawsuit is moving through the system.

My Republican colleagues have been queried as to whether they support this lawsuit. The answers are all over the map, which tells you once again that nobody on the Republican side has really thought this one through.

One Republican Senator says: I actually don't think the courts are eventually ever going to strike it down.

Another says: I am ready for the lawsuit to succeed. I would love to go back in and actually deal with healthcare again.

Another one says: Do I hope the lawsuit succeeds? I do.

Another says: I can't say I hope it succeeds. I think the strategy from here on that I have adopted in my own mind is repair.

Another says: My hope and belief is we won't strike the law down.

The answers are all over the map. That is fine. The Republicans can have a varied set of opinions on whether the lawsuit should succeed, but none of those individuals who are quoted giving various opinions as to whether they would like the lawsuit to succeed have a concrete plan for what comes next.

Let's just be honest. It is mere fantasy to think that a divided Congress is going to be able to, in an emergency, come up with a plan to keep 20 million people insured and keep preexisting conditions protections for the 133 million Americans who depend on them.

We can't pass a budget through Congress. We have trouble passing a Higher Education Act reauthorization or the Violence Against Women Act. How on Earth are we going to pass a reordering of the American healthcare system when it is blown to bits by a Supreme Court decision that no one is ready for?

That is why I am down on the floor today. I am going to keep on bringing this up because I just can't accept this world in which we live today in which half of this Chamber is just sort of boxing their ears and closing their eyes to this legal strategy. If it succeeds, as many Republicans hope it does, all we are going to be talking about here is healthcare. Overnight, we will be consumed by this topic, and we will not be able to come up with a solution that involves the same amount of protections that exist today.

Why repeal it? Why not continue to work on making the system better without holding hostage all of the Americans who rely on it today? That is a much better path of action. Keep the Affordable Care Act in place. Work together on ways that we can fix the existing healthcare system. Don't create a chaotic situation with the wholesale repeal of the entire act, putting lives in jeopardy.

There is no plan on behalf of the Republicans as to what to do if the ACA is overturned. I feel that we need to remind the country of that over and over again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

REMEMBERING CORPORAL BENJAMIN KOPP

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, 10 years ago today, CPL Benjamin Kopp's spirit departed from this world, but he remains with us in far more than memory.

Ben was raised in Minnesota, where his mother described him as a boy's boy. He played in the dirt with toy trucks and revered his great-grandfather, a decorated veteran from World War II.

Then came 9/11, which changed Ben's life forever, just as it changed the lives of so many Americans. Ben was only 13—little more than a boy—but on that day of tragedy, he felt the call of duty to his country. Moreover, he sensed a rendezvous with destiny. Remembering his great-grandfather, the heroic veteran, Ben enlisted in the U.S. Army at the age of 18, shipping off for basic training at Fort Benning not long after his high school graduation. There, he grew into a man and an Army Ranger. He was assigned to fight with the Army's famed 75th Ranger Regiment.

He served two deployments in Iraq and then went to Afghanistan in 2009. There, Ben and his buddies were exposed to heavy combat, as Rangers usually are. On June 10, 2009, they were engaged in an hours-long, intense firefight with Taliban insurgents in Helmand Province. Ben was leading a machine gun crew, providing suppressive fire for a group of Rangers amid

enemy onslaught. Ben exposed himself and was shot behind the knee right in an artery. He was evacuated from the battlefield and placed in an induced coma.

Despite the surgeon's best efforts, Ben never recovered from the loss of blood and cardiac arrest he had suffered. Eight days later, on July 18, 2009, at the age of only 21, at Walter Reed Medical Center, Ben Kopp returned home to the Lord. Yet Ben is with us still. The heart of this Ranger beats on even today. Let me explain.

Before deploying, Ben did a lot of paperwork, as all soldiers do. On one form, he checked the box to be an organ donor. Where it asked which organs he wished to donate, he simply wrote "any that are needed." In death, as in life, Ben lived up to the Ranger creed. He shouldered more than his share of the task, "one-hundred-percent and then some." So just 2 days after Ben's heart stopped beating, it beat anew in the chest of Judy Meikle, an Illinois woman who waited 7 months just to get on the organ donation list. "How can you have a better heart," Judy said as she recovered. "I have the heart of a 21-year-old Army Ranger war hero beating in me."

Ultimately, scores of people came to benefit from the sacrifice of this young soldier in Minnesota from his very blood and bones. Four lives were saved, all told, because Ben gave his all, his very body, for their sake. Ben departed 10 years ago, but his legacy lives on in the patients whose lives he touched and through the brave work of his mother, Jill, who has devoted her life to veterans' causes. This year, she organized the second annual Freedom Walk to the Wall and challenged America to walk 1 million miles in honor of our fallen heroes.

The tragedy of Ben's loss has touched Jill in unexpected ways as well. She has remained close with the Army Rangers who served alongside Ben and even with those who had never met him. Just recently, two freshly minted Rangers from Minnesota reached out to speak with Jill. You could say that she lost her son but gained a family of Rangers.

In Genesis, it is written that the Lord God created Eve in the rib of Adam, the first man. When God brought her to Adam, He said, "This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh." That mysterious passage takes on new meaning when we reflect on stories like Ben's.

Thanks to his willing sacrifice, Ben connected with scores of his countrymen in one of the most intimate ways imaginable. For all time, they will remain bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh. Rangers lead the way. That is what new Rangers learn at Fort Benning. In life and in death, CPL Ben Kopp led the way, and his story will inspire us for many years to come, for, indeed, he is with us still.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON CORKER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Corker nomination?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 216 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Alexander	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Burr	Inhofe	Sasse
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (SC)
Collins	Kennedy	Shelby
Cornyn	Lankford	Sinema
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	
Fischer	Perdue	

NAYS—39

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Bennet	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Harris	Sanders
Cortez Masto	Isakson	Stabenow

The nomination was confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination. The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lynda Blanchard, of Alabama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Slovenia.

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

Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina. Madam President, 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 Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 217 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeben	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	McConnell	Sullivan
Cruz	McSally	Thune
Daines	Moran	Tillis
Enzi	Murkowski	Toomey
Ernst	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NAYS—40

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Tester
Carper	Leahy	Udall
Casey	Manchin	Van Hollen
Collins	Markey	Warner
Coons	Menendez	Warren
Duckworth	Merkley	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wyden
Feinstein	Peters	
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—6

Booker	Harris	Sanders
Cortez Masto	Isakson	Stabenow

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

TRADE

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, something I want to talk about today is

something that you and I both care a lot about, and that is farming families and trade. For those of us who grew up on or near farming families, we know that there are a lot of things that are beyond the control of families who farm. For farming and ranching families, the only real certainty is uncertainty.

The only thing you know for sure, if your mom or dad is a dairy farmer, like my mom and dad were, is that you don't know anything for sure. You don't know about the weather. You don't know absolutely for sure that all of your equipment is going to work exactly like you need it to and at exactly the time you need it to.

In some farming situations, you don't know whether the help you need is going to be available the day you need it. The watermelons can't wait. The strawberries can't wait. The tomatoes can't wait. But you can't have a staff on all the time, ready to pick the watermelon the 2 weeks they need to be picked, or whatever those farmers have to deal with.

Uncertainty is part of farming. That is why trade agreements with other countries are so important to America's agriculture. This is a part of our economy that not only feeds our country but goes so far toward feeding the whole world. Trade agreements can provide a little bit of certainty about markets and the opportunities people have to sell the products they are able to grow.

In Missouri, agriculture is an \$88 billion industry. It employs nearly 400,000 people in our State. Missouri farmers and ranchers export more than \$4 billion worth of products every year.

Trade deals that lower tariffs that are paid by Missouri farming and ranching families are a good deal now. I could go a long way beyond this, too, because not only does the agricultural sector impact people who make agricultural products but seeds and chemicals that we need fewer and fewer of all the time because people who make and repair machinery get more effective all the time. So both in the seed and chemical area but also people in transportation, people in insurance, people who run the local coffee shop, people whom the school district depends on for those property taxes are all benefited by a strong agricultural sector.

We make lots of other things in our State too. We make airplanes. We make pickup trucks. We make cars. We make beer cans. We make all kinds of things that are impacted by trade, but I say to the Presiding Officer, particularly when you and I are out talking in our neighboring States with the communities we deal with in agriculture, trade is a top-of-the-line issue.

It is just an important part of the economy of most of our States, frankly. Because of our location, where we live, infrastructure is critical. We are also the hub for products that go all over North America. Integrating that infrastructure—water, rail, cars, and

trucks—makes a difference in how we compete.

Canada and Mexico are our two biggest trading partners in, I am sure, our State and in the country. In recent months, Mexico has become the biggest trading partner we have. Canada is the next biggest trading partner we have. These are not inconsequential relationships.

When the United States signed the North America Free Trade Agreement 25 years ago, it did a lot to open those markets for our products and to not only strengthen our economy but to strengthen the neighborhood. Our exports of food and agricultural products to Canada and Mexico quadrupled under the NAFTA agreement. The treaty also helped to strengthen ties among our countries.

You know, a strong Mexico is actually good for us. We have these problems at the border right now that Mexico is trying to help us solve. Almost nobody is coming from Mexico; they are coming through Mexico. And why aren't they coming from Mexico like they did 25 years ago? Because the Mexican economy is an economy that works for people who live there. A strong Canada is good for us. The daily trade over that Canadian-U.S. border—things passing back and forth—is incredible and has been for a long time, but it is also much stronger than it used to be. Keeping these connections strong is essential.

Trade increases our economic security, but it also increases our national security. Living in a good neighborhood is what we all want to do, and that is the value we have seen out of this agreement for the last 25 years. The agreement could have been better, and the President has made it better. The USMCA is going to be better than NAFTA. No NAFTA would be a bad thing; NAFTA replaced by USMCA would be a good thing.

It is time that we begin to build on what we have learned in those 25 years and move into this century with a new agreement that works for farming families, for ranching families, for workers, for people who make automobiles, airplanes, and other things. This leads to more American jobs, and it leads to great benefit for us economically.

But, again, let me repeat, the national security impact of having two neighbors that want to work with us. What we just saw the President negotiate with Mexico, where they are helping secure that much narrower border at the southern tip of Mexico more than we would be able to do at the much bigger northern border, that is helpful. Where they are working to help people stay there as their cases are being heard, that is helpful to our country. It is easier to keep people there and have their cases heard than let them disperse throughout the entire United States.

Certainly, we hope to gain from the new USMCA treaty, but we hope our neighbors also benefit from that treaty

and know they will. The three countries all signed this agreement in November. Mexico has ratified it already. The Prime Minister of Canada says they stand ready to call their Parliament back into session to ratify it. As soon as it is clear, they are going to.

Trade is essential. All three of our countries agree on that. Democrats and Republicans agree on that. Members of the House and Senate agree on that. Now what we need to agree on is how to have a time to vote and approve this deal. Let's give our economy the boost it needs. Let's give our neighborhood the strength we have seen develop over the last 25 years.

We hope our friends in the House bring this to the floor. It will be a bipartisan vote. It will be a comfortably passed vote. But you have to decide to have a vote for that to happen, and I hope we are close to that moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BROWSER ACT

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, today I rise and seek my colleagues' support for the BROWSER Act, which is a bipartisan piece of legislation that will protect consumers' data privacy and offer tech companies the freedom they need to innovate.

This is something we are hearing so much about. How do you protect your privacy online, or do you have privacy online? The BROWSER Act is the bipartisan solution to that.

Innovation really puts the words and the wisdom of the world at our fingertips. Think about it. A click of a mouse, a touch of the screen, and everything you want to know appears right there in front of you. Now that we have all downloaded a myriad of apps and we are using search engines every single day, it is commonplace. But what we have learned and what people are aware of now more than ever is that in the process of doing this, they have given away something vitally important and precious; that is, their privacy and their information. I call it your "virtual you" because it is you, your presence, that is right there online.

As your transactional life has grown online—you pay your bills, you do your shopping, you order your groceries, you order dinner to be delivered—every time you do that, you are giving these apps a peek into your privacy, into your habits, and there is really quite a battle going on. Who owns the "virtual you"? Is it you or the bank or the insurance company or the app that is providing that service?

Data is the bedrock of most tech companies' revenue streams. The higher the quality of that data, the more money they are going to get for the ad space they sell. The more money they get for the ad space they sell, the more profit they are going to put into their pocket.

When you look at all these apps—Facebook, YouTube, Instagram,

Google, Snapchat—all of these apps are taking your information. They mine your information, and it gets sold—sold for those that are placing ads on your screen.

There is a reason companies provide convoluted, pages-long disclosure, full disclosure and privacy policies in tiny print so small you can't read it. It is the same reason that watchdogs warn consumers that if the service is free, you are the product. If the service is free—take a look at these—you are the product. You are because it is your information that they want.

Now, I will tell you this: We have come to a season in our society where we have a different story just about every single day of some type of bad behavior from one of these companies. The current story today is about FaceApp, and I think that if I went around the room and asked those who are younger if they have used any of these face-altering apps, they would probably say: Yeah, we downloaded one. They are really a lot of fun to play with.

Here is the danger: That app—these face-altering apps and FaceApp—is not limited to just bits of personal information that are going to be appended to a data set. It could be your image used publicly—with your consent, of course, if you agreed to the fine print by clicking "download" or "get." With that, you give your privacy away.

Consumers have really grown accustomed to clicking the "get" button. They say: I don't have time to read all of this. It would take too long. I don't understand what it means. I just want to use this app. It is convenient.

A quick scroll through an average Instagram feed this morning revealed post after post of artificially-aged faces, all thanks to FaceApp, which now owns those images and can do whatever it wants with those images because you unintentionally, when you clicked "get," gave them the permission to use them.

This is one of those things where you have to say: Buyer beware and know what you are getting into. Ask anybody who downloaded that app last night, and I bet you they have a little bit of buyer's remorse going on, and they probably wish they hadn't done it and opened those photos to being used by people they will never ever know.

Over the past few years, we have watched tech companies lose control of their own narrative, and that is for good reason. Customers feel invaded and are demanding a more satisfying response to the current parade of controversy—something more than just "Oh, we are going to do better in the future." It is clear that the tech company can no longer regulate itself. Big Tech does not have the appetite for self-regulation.

That is why I welcome my colleagues on each side of the aisle to sign on to the BROWSER Act. This bill really has been years in the making. I first introduced it in the House of Representatives during the 115th Congress, but my

work on the issue began long before that, as I chaired the Privacy Working Group in the House.

What this legislation, the BROWSER Act, would do is it would set up a Federal compliance framework that tech companies would use as a guide. It would require companies to secure a clear opt-in from you, the consumer, before collecting sensitive information about your health, your finances, or your Social Security numbers—things that are important and personal to you. They would have to get your explicit permission in order to use those. For less sensitive information, like an IP address or your browsing history or your search and your purchase history, companies would have to give customers the opportunity to opt-out so that they would not have the permission to share that.

Companies won't be able to deny service to anyone refusing to waive their privacy, but the Federal Trade Commission will keep the playing field level by applying the rules equally across the entire internet ecosystem.

To recap that, you would have opt-in for sensitive information and opt-out for nonsensitive information and one set of rules, with one regulator, for the entire internet ecosystem and a tech platform that would not be able to throw you off because you said: Hey, I want to protect myself and my family.

I think it is important, too, to realize that the BROWSER Act does not over-regulate the industry, but what this does is it says: Let's have guidelines. Let's have some guardrails up here. Let's have a light-touch regulation that is going to protect the consumer and allow the consumer to protect their "virtual you," their presence online.

Lately, what we have seen is some blowback from some very public mistakes that have chased some of these big tech companies into the arms of the regulators, making them all too happy to accept government-mandated rules in lieu of internal standards. You have heard it. You have heard some people like Facebook saying: Oh, my goodness. We will accept regulation now. We want the Federal Government more involved. What they are trying to do is block out innovation and competition and new startups because they control the marketplace.

Google. Ninety percent of search is done by Google.

Recently, Facebook got a \$5 billion fine from the Federal Trade Commission. I said that actually wasn't enough. It should have been more like \$50 billion when you look at the business Facebook has built and the valuation they have built. They are a big advertising company. They have this platform. They get you on that platform. They build their valuation off the number of eyeballs they capture to that, the users they have and, remember what I said earlier, the high quality of the data. That is money in their revenue stream, and it is profit in their

pockets. Their bad behavior will not change unless we change the way they are going to be able to do business.

Understanding the business of Big Tech is half the battle. I have been at this for years, going back to my days in Tennessee, my home State, as we looked at film and entertainment and music and moving from analog to digital in the economy, coming to Congress, working in the House on this issue.

I will state that the ins and outs of this industry is not something that can be learned in a day or something you can be briefed on and then all of a sudden you are an expert in that area. If you think you know it all—what I have learned in tech is, the more you learn the less you know, and you have to keep working on it if you are going to properly regulate the industry.

I thank my colleague Senate Judiciary Chairman LINDSEY GRAHAM for recognizing the need for institutional knowledge by this body and for asking me to lead the committee's new technology task force. This is a bipartisan group. We will meet regularly with leaders in the tech industry, and we will talk a good bit about data, privacy, competition, prioritization, censorship, and other issues that will arise. Our first meeting is actually going to be later today. I would encourage my friends in the Senate to use this time and use this task force as a resource and study up because these issues are not going to go away. It is time for us to do something on the issues of privacy, data security, censorship, and prioritization.

To my colleagues who are really very skeptical that we can use a lighter touch in regulating Big Tech, I want to say this: Washington is historically very bad at culture change. They are very bad at it. What we do know is, when looking at the technology that now underpins every single industrial sector in this country, that technology goes through a life cycle, if you will, in about 18 months. We know there cannot be heavy-handed regulation. We know we cannot regulate to a technology. We know that the guidelines need to be put in place, and the guardrails need to be laid down.

We need to make certain businesses are looking at their consumers, and they are saying: You can trust us to be a good steward of your information. Consumers, citizens—Tennesseans, in my case—need to know I have asked the tech companies to work to restore the trust and confidence that is needed by the online consumer and to move away from having it understood by people—understood in the negative—that if the service is free, you are the product.

Let's join together, in a bipartisan fashion, and give the American online consumer the ability to control and to own their virtual "you," which is them and their presence online.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNT).

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ONE SMALL STEP TO PROTECT HUMAN HERITAGE IN SPACE ACT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, 50 years ago, more than 650 million men, women, and children from nearly every corner of the Earth gathered around radios and televisions with wide eyes and quickly beating hearts. They gathered to witness one of the greatest triumphs of ingenuity and cooperation in human history. Scrawled across television screens were the words never seen before: "Live from the Moon."

I remember that moment vividly. I was 10 years old, and I was in France with my mother and my French family, my grandma and grandpa, and we huddled around a little black and white TV in my grandma's home on July 20, 1969. It was evening in France when the landing occurred. Our eyes were glued to the screen and we saw this grainy video, and there was little prickly audio broadcast of Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin as they were attempting to do what no human had ever attempted to do before.

Almost 2 hours after the landing, as we held our breath and saw the landing, Commander Armstrong created the first human boot print not on planet Earth. In that moment, I remember thinking that the astronauts on the Moon didn't just represent America at that moment. They also represented my family who lived in France and their excitement. They really represented everybody around the world. They were representing humanity and what is achievable when you dream big.

I have come to the floor today to honor the incredible achievement of Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Michael Collins, as well as the 400,000 people around the world who made the *Apollo 11* landing possible. Among those were NASA's now-famous "Hidden Figures"—African-American women pioneers—including Katherine Johnson, Mary Jackson, and Dorothy Vaughn, who were responsible for calculating trajectories to get Apollo astronauts to and from the Moon.

Ultimately, this achievement was the result of the perseverance of countless individuals and, of course, the American taxpayers who, after numerous high-profile failures, including the loss of the very first Apollo crew, continued to support the Apollo Program.

Over the last few months there have been celebrations of this anniversary around the world because the achievements of Apollo were achievements for humanity. Here in the Senate I was

proud to introduce legislation with Senator TED CRUZ that would establish the first of its kind of Federal protections for the Apollo landing sites. Our One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act would permanently protect the Apollo landing sites from intentional and unintentional disruptions by future Moon missions. It would ensure that any activities destined for the Moon and licensed by the U.S. Government would have to follow NASA's preservation guidelines for the Apollo sites.

In recent years, a number of countries and private companies have announced plans to send spacecraft to the Moon. For example, India just recently delayed a launch of a spacecraft that is destined for the Moon, and China has announced plans to establish a permanent presence on the Moon.

Our legislation will set an example for other countries to protect these sites for their historical, archaeological, scientific, and engineering value and to help ensure that future lunar activities do not disturb these sites.

I am pleased that last week we were able to pass the One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act out of the Senate Commerce Committee, thanks to the leadership of Chairman ROGER WICKER and Ranking Member MARIA CANTWELL and their staffs.

Today I ask the Senate to take one small step in passing this legislation—a first of its kind conservation measure to honor and preserve human heritage in space.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 152, S. 1694.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1694) to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct activities in outer space to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On July 16, 1969, the Apollo 11 spacecraft launched from the John F. Kennedy Space Center carrying Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. “Buzz” Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins.

(2) July 20, 2019, will mark the 50th anniversary of the date on which the Apollo 11 spacecraft landed on the Moon and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin became the first humans to set foot on a celestial body off the Earth.

(3) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft and humanity's first off-world footprints are achievements unparalleled in history, a direct product of the work and perseverance of the

more than 400,000 individuals who contributed to the development of the Apollo missions on the shoulders of centuries of science and engineering pioneers from all corners of the world.

(4) Among the thousands of individuals who have contributed to the achievements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (in this section referred to as “NASA”) are African-American women such as Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughn, Mary Jackson, and Dr. Christine Darden, who made critical contributions to NASA space programs. Katherine Johnson worked at NASA for 35 years and calculated the trajectory of the Apollo 11 landing and the trajectories for the spaceflights of astronauts Alan Shepard and John Glenn. Katherine Johnson, together with many other individuals the work of whom often went unacknowledged, helped broaden the scope of space travel and charted new frontiers for humanity's exploration of space.

(5) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft was made on behalf of all humankind, and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin were accompanied by messages of peace from the leaders of more than 70 countries.

(6) The lunar landing sites of the Apollo 11 spacecraft, the robotic spacecraft that preceded the Apollo 11 mission, and the crewed and robotic spacecraft that followed, are of outstanding universal value to humanity.

(7) Such landing sites—

(A) are the first archaeological sites with human activity that are not on Earth;

(B) provide evidence of the first achievements of humankind in the realm of space travel and exploration; and

(C) contain artifacts and other evidence of human exploration activities that remain a potential source of cultural, historical, archaeological, anthropological, scientific, and engineering knowledge.

(8) On July 20, 2011, NASA published the voluntary guidance entitled “NASA's Recommendations to Space-Faring Entities: How to Protect and Preserve the Historic and Scientific Value of U.S. Government Lunar Artifacts”.

(9) In March 2018, the Office of Science and Technology Policy published a report entitled “Protecting & Preserving Apollo Program Lunar Landing Sites & Artifacts”.

(10) Space-faring entities based outside the United States have the capacity to land on the Moon.

(11) The licensing requirements under this Act are applicable only to United States-based lunar activities and therefore have limited efficacy for protecting the Apollo 11 landing site, other similar historic sites, and lunar artifacts from disturbances caused by space-faring entities based outside the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) as commercial enterprises and more countries acquire the ability to land on the Moon, it is necessary to ensure the recognition and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site and other historic landing sites in acknowledgment of the human effort and innovation the sites represent;

(2) the Apollo 11 landing site, other similar historic landing sites, lunar artifacts, and the environment surrounding such sites and artifacts merit legal protection from disturbance to prevent irredeemable loss of sites and artifacts that are of archeological, anthropological, historical, scientific, and engineering significance and value; and

SEC. 3. LICENSING REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC LUNAR LANDING SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, any Federal agency that issues a license to conduct a lunar activity shall require each applicant for such a license—

(1) to agree to abide by the recommendations described in subsection (b); or

(2) in the case of a lunar activity that requires a license from more than one Federal agency, to

certify under penalty of perjury as provided in paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable, of section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, that the applicant has submitted an application for a license for such activity to another Federal agency that satisfies paragraph (1).

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS DESCRIBED.—The recommendations described in this subsection are—

(1) “NASA's Recommendations to Space-Faring Entities: How to Protect and Preserve the Historic and Scientific Value of U.S. Government Lunar Artifacts” issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on July 20, 2011, and updated on October 28, 2011; and

(2) any successor heritage preservation recommendations, guidelines, or principles relating to the protection and preservation of Government lunar artifacts issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—A Federal agency issuing a license described in subsection (a) may, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, exempt specific lunar activities of an applicant from the historic preservation agreement or certification under subsection (a) if such bona fide activities are determined to have legitimate and significant historical, archeological, anthropological, scientific, or engineering value.

(d) AUTHORITY TO ASSESS PENALTY FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal agency issuing a license described in subsection (a) may assess a penalty fee on the holder of such license for conduct that violates one or more terms of the license relating to the agreement under subsection (a)(1).

(2) AMOUNT.—The penalty fee amount assessed under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) commensurate with the nature and extent of the violation; and

(B) sufficient to deter future violations.

(e) LUNAR ACTIVITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “lunar activity” means an action or endeavor in space that—

(1) is intended to be lunar in nature, including lunar orbit, landing, and impact; or

(2) has a greater likelihood than not of becoming lunar in nature, including unintentional orbit and impact.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Peters' amendment to the committee-reported substitute amendment be considered and agreed to, and the substitute, as amended, be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The amendment (No. 927) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the sense of Congress with respect to collaboration with other countries)

In section 2(b), strike paragraph (3) and insert the following:

(3) the President should work with other countries to develop best practices to ensure the protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. PETERS. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the bill?

Hearing none, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1694), as amended, was passed.

S. 1694

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “One Small Step to Protect Human Heritage in Space Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On July 16, 1969, the Apollo 11 spacecraft launched from the John F. Kennedy Space Center carrying Neil A. Armstrong, Edwin E. “Buzz” Aldrin, Jr., and Michael Collins.

(2) July 20, 2019, will mark the 50th anniversary of the date on which the Apollo 11 spacecraft landed on the Moon and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin became the first humans to set foot on a celestial body off the Earth.

(3) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft and humanity’s first off-world footprints are achievements unparalleled in history, a direct product of the work and perseverance of the more than 400,000 individuals who contributed to the development of the Apollo missions on the shoulders of centuries of science and engineering pioneers from all corners of the world.

(4) Among the thousands of individuals who have contributed to the achievements of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (in this section referred to as “NASA”) are African-American women such as Katherine Johnson, Dorothy Vaughn, Mary Jackson, and Dr. Christine Darden, who made critical contributions to NASA space programs. Katherine Johnson worked at NASA for 35 years and calculated the trajectory of the Apollo 11 landing and the trajectories for the spaceflights of astronauts Alan Shepard and John Glenn. Katherine Johnson, together with many other individuals the work of whom often went unacknowledged, helped broaden the scope of space travel and charted new frontiers for humanity’s exploration of space.

(5) The landing of the Apollo 11 spacecraft was made on behalf of all humankind, and Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin were accompanied by messages of peace from the leaders of more than 70 countries.

(6) The lunar landing sites of the Apollo 11 spacecraft, the robotic spacecraft that preceded the Apollo 11 mission, and the crewed and robotic spacecraft that followed, are of outstanding universal value to humanity.

(7) Such landing sites—

(A) are the first archaeological sites with human activity that are not on Earth;

(B) provide evidence of the first achievements of humankind in the realm of space travel and exploration; and

(C) contain artifacts and other evidence of human exploration activities that remain a potential source of cultural, historical, archaeological, anthropological, scientific, and engineering knowledge.

(8) On July 20, 2011, NASA published the voluntary guidance entitled “NASA’s Recommendations to Space-Faring Entities: How to Protect and Preserve the Historic and Scientific Value of U.S. Government Lunar Artifacts”.

(9) In March 2018, the Office of Science and Technology Policy published a report entitled “Protecting & Preserving Apollo Program Lunar Landing Sites & Artifacts”.

(10) Space-faring entities based outside the United States have the capacity to land on the Moon.

(11) The licensing requirements under this Act are applicable only to United States-based lunar activities and therefore have limited efficacy for protecting the Apollo 11

landing site, other similar historic sites, and lunar artifacts from disturbances caused by space-faring entities based outside the United States.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) as commercial enterprises and more countries acquire the ability to land on the Moon, it is necessary to ensure the recognition and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site and other historic landing sites in acknowledgment of the human effort and innovation the sites represent;

(2) the Apollo 11 landing site, other similar historic landing sites, lunar artifacts, and the environment surrounding such sites and artifacts merit legal protection from disturbance to prevent irremediable loss of sites and artifacts that are of archeological, anthropological, historical, scientific, and engineering significance and value; and

(3) the President should work with other countries to develop best practices to ensure the protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

SEC. 3. LICENSING REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC LUNAR LANDING SITES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, any Federal agency that issues a license to conduct a lunar activity shall require each applicant for such a license—

(1) to agree to abide by the recommendations described in subsection (b); or

(2) in the case of a lunar activity that requires a license from more than one Federal agency, to certify under penalty of perjury as provided in paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable, of section 1746 of title 28, United States Code, that the applicant has submitted an application for a license for such activity to another Federal agency that satisfies paragraph (1).

(b) RECOMMENDATIONS DESCRIBED.—The recommendations described in this subsection are—

(1) “NASA’s Recommendations to Space-Faring Entities: How to Protect and Preserve the Historic and Scientific Value of U.S. Government Lunar Artifacts” issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on July 20, 2011, and updated on October 28, 2011; and

(2) any successor heritage preservation recommendations, guidelines, or principles relating to the protection and preservation of Government lunar artifacts issued by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(c) EXEMPTIONS.—A Federal agency issuing a license described in subsection (a) may, in consultation with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, exempt specific lunar activities of an applicant from the historic preservation agreement or certification under subsection (a) if such bona fide activities are determined to have legitimate and significant historical, archeological, anthropological, scientific, or engineering value.

(d) AUTHORITY TO ASSESS PENALTY FEES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A Federal agency issuing a license described in subsection (a) may assess a penalty fee on the holder of such license for conduct that violates one or more terms of the license relating to the agreement under subsection (a)(1).

(2) AMOUNT.—The penalty fee amount assessed under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) commensurate with the nature and extent of the violation; and

(B) sufficient to deter future violations.

(e) LUNAR ACTIVITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term “lunar activity” means an action or endeavor in space that—

(1) is intended to be lunar in nature, including lunar orbit, landing, and impact; or

(2) has a greater likelihood than not of becoming lunar in nature, including unintentional orbit and impact.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I further ask that the committee-reported amendment to the title be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported title amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct lunar activities to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, and for other purposes.”.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague Senator CRUZ for helping me develop and advance this legislation.

Thanks, as well, to my colleagues on the House Science Committee, Chairwoman JOHNSON and Ranking Members HORN, LUCAS, and BABIN for their leadership and support in the House of Representatives.

Fifty years ago, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin left a plaque on the lunar surface. On that plaque is a map of Earth and the following words:

Here men from the planet Earth first set foot upon the Moon. July 1969 A.D. We came in peace for all mankind.

Our grandchildren’s grandchildren should have an opportunity to observe this plaque.

I thank my colleagues for taking this small step with me to ensure that the opportunity will remain for generations to come and that the spirit of Apollo—of ingenuity, of cooperation, and of peace—will inspire generations to come.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, this week marks an extraordinary milestone in the history of humanity.

Fifty years ago, on July 16, 1969, the entire world watched in awe as the *Apollo 11* mission took off from Cape Canaveral. Four days later, on July 20, again the entire world held its breath as the lunar lander made its descent and as Neil Armstrong and then Buzz Aldrin both stepped onto the surface of the Moon.

As Neil Armstrong famously said, “It’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind.”

On Saturday, 50 years will have passed since man first stepped onto the Moon. We are celebrating that as a nation, and we are celebrating that across the world—the 50 years that have passed since. We are also looking

forward, with hope and optimism, to the next 50 years of space exploration and America's continued strong leadership in space.

I thank my friend Senator PETERS for his leadership on this legislation that we have just passed through the Senate. It is legislation that ensures that those artifacts, those footprints, made by those historic pioneers for humanity will not be disturbed, will not be violated, will not be destroyed but, rather, that they will be preserved for future generations so that decades and centuries from now those shrines to the incredible imagination and the unstoppable potential of the human spirit will be preserved for all of history.

This is a time of partisan division on many, many issues. Yet I am encouraged when it comes to space and America's leadership in space that we continually see the bipartisan cooperation of Democrats and Republicans working hand in hand.

I also commend NASA, in particular, for announcing the Artemis Project. Artemis, as you know, is the twin sister to Apollo in Greek mythology, and Artemis will be the next journey to the Moon that the United States will be undertaking.

I am particularly grateful that the Administrator of NASA has committed that when we, once again, land on the surface of the Moon in the coming years, among those astronauts to land on the Moon will be the first woman ever to set foot on the surface of the Moon. As the father of two young daughters, after 50 years, I say it is about time that we land a woman on the Moon. I am particularly proud that it will be an American astronaut whose boots will return to the Moon and that we will continue to make history together.

This is a moment to celebrate American leadership, but this is a moment, even more fundamentally, to celebrate what mankind can do—the frontier spirit of discovery and exploration. It is a spirit that should unite us all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the rollcall vote scheduled for 1:45 p.m. start at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Tapia nomination?

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), 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 66, nays 26, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 218 Ex.)

YEAS—66

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blackburn	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hassan	Roberts
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Burr	Hoeven	Rosen
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cardin	Inhofe	Rubio
Carper	Johnson	Sasse
Cassidy	Jones	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Coons	King	Shaheen
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Leahy	Sinema
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Murphy	Young

NAYS—26

Baldwin	Heinrich	Schatz
Bennet	Hirono	Schumer
Blumenthal	Kaine	Smith
Brown	Klobuchar	Tester
Cantwell	Markley	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murray	Warner
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	

NOT VOTING—8

Booker	Isakson	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Moran	Warren
Harris	Sanders	

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to move to proceed to nominations reported out of the Armed Services Committee today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 374.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, Joni Ernst, Kevin Cramer, Ben Sasse, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Mitch McConnell.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Stephen M. Dickson, of Georgia, to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the term of five years.

James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, Joni Ernst, Kevin Cramer, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Mitch McConnell.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 nomination of Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Bill Cassidy, David Perdue, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Braun, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Kevin Cramer, Pat Roberts.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Chuck Grassley, John Cornyn, Tom Cotton, David Perdue, Ron Johnson, Joni Ernst, Mike Braun, Martha McSally, John Boozman, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham, Shelley Moore Capito, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 1327

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the men and women who responded to the horrific events of September 11, 2001, are among the great heroes of American history. Whether fighting the deadly flames, rescuing people who were injured or dying, or removing the destructive debris from the 9/11 attack sites, the 9/11 volunteers and rescue workers displayed the courage and the sacrificial service that has earned them universal respect and admiration.

Tragically, their heroism came at a cost. Their heroism, at exactly these same dangerous sites we are describing, earned them, in addition to great respect, also health challenges in the years since.

In 2001, in response to those challenges, Congress established the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund to compensate both the survivors of the attacks and also the residents who lived near the site. It was authorized for 2 years, and it paid out about \$7 billion in benefits and then closed.

In 2011, Congress revived and expanded the program to cover a larger universe of victims and responders, and

it authorized that fund to spend \$2.7 billion over 5 years.

In 2015, citing a growing need, Congress reauthorized the fund for another 5 years and an additional \$4.6 billion. Of that \$7.4 billion authorized since 2011, the fund has now paid out \$5.2 billion.

With money getting tight, in February of this year, the fund began temporarily reducing the claimants' benefits until Congress reauthorized and replenished it until such time as we can make those beneficiaries whole.

I support that effort. I support it wholeheartedly. The bill before us today authorizes the program not for 2 years, as it was in 2001, or for 5 years, as we did in 2011 and 2015, no, it authorizes the program for an additional 72 years and does not specify a dollar amount.

In Washington, this is a recipe for trouble. As we all know, finite authorizations are how Congress ensures that taxpayer money actually gets to its intended beneficiaries and not simply lost in government bureaucracy somewhere. It is how we make sure this is about protecting those who are supposed to benefit rather than government bureaucrats themselves.

Since 2011, the 9/11 victims fund has always had finite authorizations, and, by all accounts, it has had an excellent record of avoiding waste and abuse. These two things are not coincidental. They go together, and 9/11 survivors and first responders deserve no less moving forward. They deserve no less than to make sure the program created in their honor for their benefit, in fact, benefits them. This is why I would like to offer a simple amendment to this bill that would authorize \$10.2 billion in additional funding for the 9/11 victims fund over the next 10 years. That is the amount the Congressional Budget Office has estimated is necessary for covering all valid claims between now and 2029.

My amendment would further authorize an additional \$10 billion beyond that time. My amendment would not block or delay the bill's consideration, let alone its passage.

This is something we could vote on in a matter of minutes, 15 minutes or so, and then move on to final passage. We could, in fact, accomplish this today before we adjourn for the weekend. This is, in fact, what I prefer. I think finishing our work on this bill to protect victims and first responders is worth 15, 20, 30 minutes of our time. That is what I prefer.

I have had conversations with my colleagues, including colleagues across the aisle. In order to accommodate requests from some of my colleagues, I have agreed, with their mutual assent, to negotiate a different arrangement—one that would make sure we get to final passage on this bill and that we consider my amendment and that of Senator PAUL's within the next few days.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, on or before Wednesday, July 24, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 153, H.R. 1327; that the only amendments in order be Lee amendment No. 928 and Paul amendment No. 929 to be offered; that there be up to 2 hours of concurrent debate equally divided between the leaders or designees; that the Senate then vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with no second-degree amendments in order prior to the votes; that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to each vote; and that each amendment be subject to an affirmative 60-vote threshold. I further ask that upon disposition of the amendments, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on H.R. 1327, as amended, if amended, all with no intervening action or debate, notwithstanding rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

I am grateful that we now have this agreement on timing so that we can get to the floor next week and have an up-or-down vote on the 9/11 first responders bill and the healthcare they desperately need.

I just want to go to the merits of Senator LEE's amendment because I think there is a misunderstanding. I understand that there is a concern about 72 years and that my colleague believes it is a recipe for trouble, but the truth is, the timing is limited for this bill because these men and women aren't going to survive. So many of them are already sick and dying, and all they care about is just being able to provide for their families.

There is nothing about this bill that is trying to play politics with the lives of men. There is going to be no fraud. There is going to be no disuse. This is literally all that is necessary for families to survive during these horrible times when their loved ones are dying.

I will not support my colleague's amendment because it will cap the bill needlessly, and it will mean that if there are survivors who still need healthcare, they will have to come back and walk these halls again. The gravest concern I have is that we dare ask these brave men and women to do this all over again. To watch someone come to the Capitol with an oxygen tank, in a wheelchair, unable to breathe or talk properly because of their cancer and their illness, is something I cannot accept.

I am grateful that we now have a time agreement for Wednesday, and I am grateful that we now have a chance to get an up-or-down vote and to get this done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I will not object. First, I just want to thank both my colleagues from New York and Utah for working out this agreement with the leader and me.

What this does is it paves the way, finally, for what we have been waiting on for a very, very long time—an up-or-down vote on H.R. 1327. There will be two amendments offered. We will oppose them. I don't think they have much of a chance of winning, but there is a right to offer them.

I want to thank my colleague from Utah for moving forward here, as well as, of course, my colleague from New York for the great work. Right now, for the first time, we can not only see the light at the end of the tunnel, we are getting very close to getting out of the tunnel. I expect that by Wednesday, we will be out of that tunnel, the bill will head to the President's desk, having already passed the House, he will sign it, and our first responders can go do the job they have been intending to do all along, which is to take care of themselves, take care of their loved ones, and take care of their brothers and sisters who have these injuries or who will get these injuries.

It has been a long, long and hard, hard struggle for over a decade, but now, finally—finally—it looks quite certain that this bill will pass the Senate, go to the President's desk, and at long last become law, and those first responders who made this happen more than anybody else will not—will not—have to come back again.

I do not object to the offer by my colleague from Utah.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Democratic leader and to both Senators from New York for working with me on this and for getting this, along with my amendment and Senator PAUL's amendment, set up for a vote.

To be very clear—I want there to be no ambiguity—I would be willing to vote on this right now. There is no reason we should have to delay that. I am taking into account scheduling requests that were made by other Members of this body. As far as I am concerned and, as far as I am aware, as far as Senator PAUL is concerned, we would be happy to vote on these immediately. There is no additional reason for delay.

This is how the Senate is supposed to work. Each Member is supposed to have the opportunity to bring forward amendments to offer up improvements to legislation, to make sure that they happen and that they happen right.

I respectfully but strongly disagree with my colleagues on the merits of

some of the issues we have been discussing. We will debate those more in the coming days.

I would reiterate that it is not unreasonable to suggest that a program that takes the unprecedented step of authorizing funding for something until 2092—that, coupled with language authorizing the expenditure of such sums as may be necessary, creates problems. It is one of the reasons we opt to vote on this amendment and one of the reasons I believe in this amendment.

In any event, this is the kind of thing that ought not to be difficult. When any Member of any political background sees a potential weakness or defect in a piece of legislation, the rules of our body are such that we are supposed to be able to offer that up and cast an amendment. In this circumstance, I am pleased that it worked out the way it did, and we will be able to get votes on these amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, just another day on Wall Street and just another news story. The New York Times' headline today was "Big Banks Are Earning Billions of Dollars. Trump's Tax Cuts Are A Big Reason."

So Congress can continue to do tax cuts for Wall Street. Congress can continue to weaken rules on Wall Street. Congress has forgotten. They have this collective amnesia about what happened 10 years ago when this country's economy almost imploded because of Wall Street greed. So now Congress—because of the tax cut and because of continued relaxation of Wall Street financial stability safety rules, Wall Street is doing really well again.

However, Congress can't pass an overtime bill—I mean, sorry. Congress can't pass a minimum wage bill. The last minimum wage increase in this Congress was signed by President Bush in 2007. President Obama never did it, and President Trump continues to oppose a minimum wage increase.

President Trump has rolled back an overtime rule, which in the State of Indiana—the Presiding Officer's State—almost 100,000 workers were going to get a raise because of the overtime rule we passed a couple years ago. So people, if they work more than 40 hours, they ought to get paid for more than 40 hours—President Trump rolled that back—and 130,000 workers in my State alone would have gotten a big bump in their wages because they were working 45, 50, or 60 hours a week.

This Congress will not pass an infrastructure bill. Look at the conditions of the roads in Cleveland, Toledo, Mansfield, Findlay, Akron, Youngstown, Gallipolis, Chillicothe, and Portsmouth, in my State, and all kinds of communities in Indiana, which the Presiding Officer represents. Congress can always find the time and can always find the money to help the richest 1 percent and help the big banks, but we can't turn around and do what

we ought to do on the minimum wage, what we ought to do on the overtime rule, and what we ought to do to expand the earned income tax credit. I do appreciate the Presiding Officer's interest, especially in the earned income tax credit—what he has tried to do there. We just simply can't find the time to do that.

We always help the people who have much in this society, and we just never get around, in this Congress, to helping the people who need a break.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Texas.

TEXAS VETERANS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I am proud of the fact that 1 out of every 10 persons who wears the uniform of the U.S. military calls Texas home. It is no surprise that with more than a dozen military installations in the State, many servicemembers choose to live in Texas when they return to civilian life. We have the second highest veteran population of all of the States, with an estimated 1.6 million veterans living in Texas.

As you might suppose, in having the honor of representing these 1.6 million veterans, I talk to them quite a bit and hear from them often. I hear about the challenges they face when they transition back to civilian life. Whether the challenges are the big ones or the little ones, whether the challenges are of navigating complicated trails of paperwork, getting the timely healthcare they need, or finding employment when they return to civilian life, I am eager to help them identify solutions.

Over the last few years, we have made some major progress. In the last Congress, for example, we passed the historic VA MISSION Act, which modernized the veterans' appeals process and the electronic health records system. The bill reformed GI benefits, improved accountability within the VA Administration, and provided the largest funding increase in history for veterans' care and services.

We have also passed other bills to help veterans transition from military service. For example, our Jobs for Our Heroes Act made it easy for veterans to get commercial driver's licenses. Believe it or not, it is hard for the private sector to find the truckdrivers it needs. After somebody has driven a large vehicle in the military as part of his daily duties, you can imagine that his transitioning to a commercial driver's license would be a relatively simple thing. Given the paperwork and the bureaucracy and the challenges of one's applying for a commercial driver's license, we were able to pass legislation to facilitate that transition.

We also passed the American Law Enforcement Heroes Act, which ensures that veterans get hired by local law enforcement agencies. If you think about that, it is a skill set that many learn in the military, whether they served in the military police or otherwise. If you talk to one of your local

police departments, one of the things the department is short on is the number of people who work for local law enforcement. That is also true for Federal law enforcement agencies, particularly for the Border Patrol. Many military servicemembers come out of the military with the very skills that are needed most by the police agencies that work to keep our communities safe.

To improve the educational opportunities that are available to these men and women, in the last Congress, we passed a bipartisan bill called the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act, also known as the Forever GI Bill. President Trump signed it into law in August of 2017. With a stroke of a pen, he enhanced and expanded education benefits for veterans, servicemembers, and their families.

The Forever GI Bill made much needed updates for veterans who face school closures while they are enrolled. It expanded work study activities. It also created a scholarship program for students who pursue degrees in science, technology, engineering, and math, the so-called STEM fields.

It established the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship, which provides student veterans with an additional 9 months of GI bill eligibility to ensure they have the time and the financial assistance they need in order to complete their studies in some of our most needed fields. We later learned that there is an issue, though, that prevents many students from taking full advantage of that program. The current law mandates that students must be enrolled in a STEM program for more than 128 credit hours, but the Department of Veterans Affairs found that there are only three States in which the average STEM degree exceeds that minimum. That places many students in an unfair position of either picking from a limited list of schools or forgoing the scholarship money, which can provide up to \$30,000 in financial assistance. That is a Hobson's choice for our veterans, and it is time for Congress to fix that error.

To ensure that all veterans who want to take advantage of the Nourse scholarship are able to, on a bipartisan basis with several of my colleagues, I recently introduced legislation called the Veteran STEM Scholarship Improvement Act, which would lower the 128 credit hour requirement to the more common 120 credit hour requirement. Now, changing a number from an eight to a zero may not seem like a big deal, but for the veterans who have been frustrated by this impediment that prevents them from using the benefits they were promised, it can be life-changing. This would ensure that Texas's veterans who are interested in pursuing STEM programs that are offered in their communities are able to do so while they receive their GI benefits.

I just want to say a word about the GI bill because it is personal to me and

my family. My dad, who was a B-17 pilot in the Army Air Corps and was stationed at Molesworth Air Force base in England, flew a total of 26 bombing missions over the English Channel into the industrial heartland of Germany to try to end that terrible, terrible war. Unfortunately, he was shot down and was captured as a prisoner of war on his 26th mission, and he served the last 4 months of World War II as a prisoner of war. Thankfully, he survived that experience.

To my point here, when he came back to Corpus Christi, TX, he took advantage of the GI bill so he could continue his education. He received a 2-year associate of arts degree from, as it was called then, the Del Mar Community College. He also met my mother at about that time, and they married. Lo and behold, he ended up deciding, I think I want to go to dental school. So, after he had been shot out of the sky by German anti-aircraft guns, maybe a nice, placid dentist's life sounded pretty good, and that is what he chose.

It was thanks to the GI bill that the whole generation of that so-called "greatest generation" was able to come back from the war and get the tools and the education they needed in order to contribute to our country and help make our economy and our country as strong as we inherited it and welcome it today.

Even for this next greatest generation of veterans who fought in Iraq and Afghanistan and for those who still serve today, it is important for us to keep this opportunity of the modern GI bill benefits when they take off the uniform as Active-Duty servicemembers and transition to civilian life.

I thank my colleagues—particularly Senators RUBIO, CRUZ, MANCHIN, and SINEMA—for supporting the STEM bill I described a little earlier. The House passed the legislation this last month, and I hope the Senate will do the same soon so we can get this bill to the President's desk for his signature.

In addition to this legislation, I am eager to vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020. Last month, the Senate passed our version of the bill with broad, bipartisan support. As a matter of fact, only eight Senators voted against it. It is hard to find many things that are that bipartisan in the Senate or in Washington, DC, today.

In addition to investing in military modernization and in providing the largest pay raise in a decade for our troops, this legislation also included other provisions to support our veterans.

A bill I introduced with Senator BALDWIN, of Wisconsin, called the HAVEN Act, was included as a provision of the NDAA. This bill would shield VA and Department of Defense disability benefits in bankruptcy proceedings in the same way Social Security disability is exempted. Veterans shouldn't be penalized for receiving

disability compensation that they are rightly due.

I hope this provision will be included in the final version, which will follow the conference committee on the national defense authorization bill. The House passed its version of the NDAA last week, and I hope the conference committee will quickly iron out the differences between the two bills so we can approve this legislation.

Like all of my colleagues, I am grateful for the dedicated service and sacrifice of millions of men and women across our country who defend our freedoms. I want to make sure, as we all do, that their transitioning to civilian life after their military service is as smooth as possible.

By improving access to healthcare, employment, and education, the Senate is working hard to support America's veterans, and we are demonstrating in a country that has an all-volunteer military that we will keep our commitments to our military members while they wear the uniform and keep our commitments to our veterans when they transition to civilian life. This is an important part of our continuing to recruit and retain the best and brightest to serve in the U.S. military.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I start this afternoon with a topic we are all talking about—the horror that we saw and heard last night at a rally when there was a chant over and over again—we have seen the footage of it—of “send her back.”

I condemn this—as I did earlier today—in the strongest possible terms, and I want to reiterate my condemnation of that chant. I know that condemnation is widely shared on both sides of the aisle. I hope folks in both Chambers and both parties will condemn and reiterate the condemnation of that kind of chant but also what is underneath it. It is racist, for sure, and it is not who we are. That is not America.

I am glad the President said that if it happens again, he will try to stop it. I wish he had done that in real time last night, but let's see what happens at the next rally.

There is no excuse for any public official to do anything other than condemn that kind of language. Representative OMAR is a Representative in the Congress of the United States who came here as a child, and for anyone to utter those kinds of words against her or anyone else, of course, should be condemned.

Fortunately, I think most Americans agree with me, and we have to be very clear when we have that kind of senti-

ment expressed, especially when it is repeated across the country, as we saw last night.

I want to talk about our asylum system, a legal asylum system that was established in the wake of the horrors of World War II. We as a Nation—the United States of America—vowed after that conflict to do better, to be better, to serve as a refuge for those fleeing violence and persecution in their home countries.

Today, families from Central America are arriving at our southern border, hoping to avail themselves of this system because of the violence in their home countries. The three we have heard so much about—Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador—rank in the top 10 countries in the world for homicide—homicide. According to a report issued by Doctors Without Borders in 2017, Northern Triangle countries, these three countries, are experiencing—and this is a direct quote from the Doctors Without Borders report, 2017—“violent displacement, persecution, sexual violence, and forced repatriation akin to the conditions found in the deadliest armed conflicts in the world today.” So said Doctors Without Borders.

In the face of violence and other such circumstances, the choice to move in search of opportunity and safety is one that the vast majority of families would make, even when that journey can further subject them to violence and danger.

Late last month, the Nation was horrified—indeed, the world was horrified—by a photograph of a 2-year-old girl and her father, her small arm clinging to her father as they lay facedown in a river, dead.

That is not the picture I am showing here. We all know that picture. I don't need to show it again. So many Americans, so many people around the world remember that picture.

But the picture I put up is a picture of that little girl and her father as they lived, a picture of the two of them that appeared in the Washington Post in an article dated Thursday, June 27, 2019, on page 3.

Here is the article that the picture was taken from. The headline reads, “Pair who died at border were desperate for a better life”—desperate for a better life.

That is the story of so many of these families—desperate for a better life, free from violence or the threat of violence, free from or at least distant from death threats, and free from poverty, grinding poverty, the likes of which so many of us have never had to experience. That is what they are desperate for when they say “desperate for a better life.”

Rather than simply focus on this father and his daughter and how they died and the picture of them facedown in a river, I wanted to make sure we saw their faces, to celebrate their lives but to remind us of our obligation, our enduring obligation, to make sure that

we at least—at least—take steps to reduce the likelihood that we will ever see again a horrific picture like the one of the two of them dead in a river, facedown.

Here is what part of the story is of this little girl and her father. The little girl's name was Valeria. Quoting from the Washington Post story:

Valeria was a cheery child. Not even 2 years old, she loved to dance, play with her stuffed animals and brush her family members' hair. Her father, Oscar Alberto Martinez Ramirez, was stalwart. Nearly always working, he sold his motorcycle and borrowed money to move his family from El Salvador to the United States. Martinez and his wife, Tania Vanessa Avalos, wanted to save up for a home there. They wanted safety, opportunity.

“They wanted a better future for their girl,” Maria Estela Avalos, Vanessa's mother, told The Washington Post.

They traveled more than 1,000 miles seeking it. Once in the United States, they planned to ask for asylum, for refuge from the violence that drives many Central American migrants from their home countries every day. But the farthest the family got was an international bridge. . . . On Sunday—

This would be the Sunday before June 27.

On Sunday, they were told that the bridge was closed and that they should return Monday. Aid workers told The Post the line to get across the bridge was hundreds long.

Then we know what happened next to this father and his daughter.

There was also another story in the New York Times the day before, June 26. The headline read “Girl was Safe but Tried to Follow Father Back.”

I will not go through all of it, but here is what they were facing in terms of their own economic circumstances. At the end of the New York Times story it reads as follows:

Mr. Martinez quit his job at Papa Johns, where he had earned about \$350 a month. By then, his wife had already left her job as a cashier at a Chinese restaurant to take care of their daughter.

The couple lived with Mr. Martinez's mother in the community of Altavista, a massive housing complex of tiny concrete houses east of San Salvador, according to [someone referred to earlier in the story].

Though Altavista is under the control of gangs, the couple was not fleeing from violence, [Ms. Ramirez] told him. Rather, the grind of surviving as a family on \$10 a day had become unmanageable.

So we have a lot of families fleeing for reasons based on violence and death threats and that horror, and then we also have families fleeing because they, in this case, had \$10 a day to live on.

So these families risk danger as they cross through—what could only be said by way of understatement—treacherous terrain. They risk that danger because the graver risk is not to make that journey.

The administration has not sought, in my judgment, to address the root causes of migration, such as what we just talked about: violence, poverty, and corruption. Rather, the administration has repeatedly attempted to walk back our Nation's solemn vow

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.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the nomination of Clifton L. Corker to be a judge for the Eastern District of Tennessee. Had I been able to attend, I would have opposed his nomination.

Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the nomination of Lynda Blanchard to be United States Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia. Had I been able to attend, I would have opposed her nomination.

Mr. President, unfortunately I was unable to attend the rollcall vote on the nomination of Donald R. Tapia to be United States Ambassador to Jamaica. Had I been able to attend, I would have opposed his nomination.●

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I had expected to be able to vote on the confirmations of Mr. Clifton Corker to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, Ms. Lynda Blanchard to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, and Mr. Donald R. Tapia to be Ambassador to Jamaica. Instead, I am in Nevada for a funeral.

On the question of the confirmation of Mr. Clifton Corker to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee, I would have voted no.

On the question of the confirmation of Ms. Lynda Blanchard to be Ambassador to the Republic of Slovenia, I would have voted no.

On the question of the confirmation of Mr. Donald R. Tapia to be Ambassador to Jamaica, I would have voted yes.

Thank you.●

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARKANSAS BROADCASTERS ASSOCIATION

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate the Arkansas Broadcasters Association, ABA, on its 70th anniversary and celebrate the organization's decades of service to radio and television broadcasters in my State.

Established in 1949, the Arkansas Broadcasters formed to help broadcast organizations by educating its members about opportunities available through free, over-the-air broadcast operations and provide technical support, regulatory expertise, and advocacy coordination. The trade association's support and the services associated with it have no doubt been a tremendous asset to broadcasters across the State. Today, the ABA highlights its mission to help members in "Broad-

casting Naturally," which aptly distills the organization's mantra in simple, clever terms.

Arkansas' radio and television broadcast outlets provide vital information and quality programming to communities across our State. They educate, inform, entertain, and communicate with Arkansans in a variety of ways. When we turn on our televisions or radios and perhaps just as much these days by opening our smartphones and tablets or powering on our computers, we have come to expect the content we are looking for will be readily available and accessible.

We are able to find what we are looking for on TV or radio or their technology-enabled apps and online platforms because of the hard work that broadcasters do to ensure their product is meeting the demands and desires of consumers. I believe these broadcasters will be the first people to tell you that the Arkansas Broadcasters Association has played an integral role in their ability to provide that service, adapt to changing technology, and better understand the market they operate in.

It has been a pleasure to work alongside the ABA on legislative efforts that help the organization and its members continue to do the job they want to do as well as they can. I have been a supporter of legislation the broadcasters have advocated for, including the Local Radio Freedom Act, and I was especially honored when the group named me its Arkansan of the Year in 2017 for my work to support the association and its members.

Congratulations to the Arkansas Broadcasters Association and all of its members on reaching the tremendous milestone of seven decades working on behalf of their industry. I applaud them and am confident the ABA will enjoy many more years of success on behalf of the Natural State's television and radio broadcasters.●

TRIBUTE TO MIRIAM HALEY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing Miriam Haley of Silver Bow County for her contribution to the Butte veteran community.

Mrs. Haley, a quilter for over two decades, recently chaired a patriotic quilt show during Butte's Miners' Union Day celebration. The goal of this show was to create quilts for veterans moving into the newly built Southwest Montana Regional Veterans Home. Mrs. Haley ensured these quilts were designed to serve the Butte veterans in their day-to-day needs, whether they be resting or sitting with visitors. Originally, Mrs. Haley had hoped to collect 65 quilts for the veterans, but the show collected double that number. The 130 quilts spread out in proud display for the show acted as a tangible expression of Montana's ability to go above and beyond for its veteran community.

I wish to congratulate Mrs. Haley on her quilt show's success. Her actions

reflect the deep devotion to patriotism ingrained in all Montanans.●

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL DOUGLAS B. GUTTORMSEN

• Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today, I would like to recognize COL Douglas B. Guttormsen on the occasion of his retirement from the Kansas City District Commander for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He has diligently served in this role for 3 years.

After earning degrees from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the University of Missouri at Rolla, the National Defense University, and the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, Colonel Guttormsen went on to lead engineering battalions across the United States and around the world. In addition to these assignments, he served in combat operations in Iraq and the Republic of Korea.

As commander of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District, Colonel Guttormsen has overseen many military and civil works projects throughout the district. From directing construction projects at the region's military installations to ensuring the levees and dams are structurally sound, Colonel Guttormsen has demonstrated able and consistent leadership.

Although his resume boasts many accomplishments, Colonel Guttormsen's work leading the emergency operations center, which plays a vital role in responding to natural disasters whenever and wherever they may occur, is most impressive.

This spring, when facing extensive rainfall and severe flooding, he and the entire Kansas City District staff worked around the clock to respond to levee breaches and assist affected communities. Colonel Guttormsen also participated in the Missouri River Flood Forum that Congressman STEVE WATKINS and I hosted in May, where we saw the extensive flooding at the 4-State Lookout Point in Kansas and then spoke alongside the Department of Agriculture and answered questions from community members.

Colonel Guttormsen is a true professional and has exhibited remarkable leadership during his time as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District commander. I trust my fellow members will join me in congratulating him and wishing him well in the days to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:25 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolutions, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 36. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed transfer to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the

Italian Republic of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 37. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the Republic of France of certain defense articles and services.

S.J. Res. 38. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed export to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of certain defense articles and services.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 736. An act to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain an online portal accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, and for other purposes.

H.R. 748. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

H.R. 1250. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11158 Highway 146 North in Hardin, Texas, as the "Lucas Lowe Memorial Post Office".

H.R. 1526. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Israel Road Southeast in Tumwater, Washington, as the "Eva G. Hewitt Post Office".

H.R. 1844. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 66 Grove Court in Elgin, Illinois, as the "Corporal Alex Martinez Memorial Post Office Building".

H.R. 1847. An act to require congressional notification for certain changes in status of inspectors general, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2325. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Calle Alondra in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building".

H.R. 3305. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the "Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building".

H.R. 3494. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

At 1:52 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 582. An act to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1250. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 11158 Highway 146 North in Hardin, Texas, as the "Lucas Lowe Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1526. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 200 Israel Road Southeast in Tumwater, Washington, as the "Eva G. Hewitt Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1844. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 66 Grove Court in Elgin, Illinois, as the "Corporal Alex Martinez Memorial Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1847. An act to require congressional notification for certain changes in status of inspectors general, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2325. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Calle Alondra in San Juan, Puerto Rico, as the "65th Infantry Regiment Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3305. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the "Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3494. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 736. An act to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain an online portal accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 582. An act to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes.

H.R. 748. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2023. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Single Family Housing Direct and Guaranteed Loan Programs" (RIN0575-AD10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2024. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division,

Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Streamlining Electric Program Procedures" (RIN0572-AC40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2025. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Distribution of Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2018 Purchases From Foreign Entities"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2026. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Raquel C. Bono, United States Navy, and her advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2027. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2028. A communication from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests In, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds" (RIN3235-AM43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2029. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Colorado; Revisions to Regulation Number 4, New Wood Stoves and the Use of Certain Woodburning Appliances During High Pollution Days" (FRL No. 9995-93-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2030. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indian Country: Air Quality Planning and Management; Federal Implementation Plan for the Kalispel Indian Community of the Kalispel Reservation, Washington; Redesignation to a PSD Class I Area" (FRL No. 9996-67-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2031. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Massachusetts: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference" (FRL No. 9996-56-Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2032. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oregon: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference" (FRL No. 9996-69-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2033. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary (International Affairs), Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2034. A communication from the Director of the Office of Textiles and Apparel, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Imports of Certain Worsted Wool Fabric: Implementation of Tariff Rate Quota Established Under Title V of the Trade and Development Act of 2000: Removal of Regulations" (RIN0625-AB13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2035. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Revision of Requirements for Long Term Care Facilities: Arbitration Agreements" (RIN0938-AT18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2036. A communication from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Global Health Innovations for Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2037. A communication from the Acting Executive Secretary, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to seven (7) vacancies in the agency, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2038. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2019-0048 - 2019-0060); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2039. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary for Management, Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2040. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on the Physicians' Comparability Allowance Program"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2041. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act Public Law 107-174: Annual Report to Congress Fiscal Year 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2042. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Inspector General's Semiannual Report and the Management Response for the period of October 1, 2018 through March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2043. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Annual Report to Congress on the Rafael Ramos and Wenjian Lu National Blue Alert Act of 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2044. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary/Director, Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE), Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2045. A communication from the Assistant Director of the Office of Policy, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Board of Immigration Appeals: Affirmance Without Opinion, Referral for Panel Review, and Publication of Decisions as Precedents" (RIN1125-AA58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2046. A communication from the Acting Deputy Director, Executive Office for Immigration Review, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Asylum Eligibility and Procedural Modifications" (RIN1125-AA91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2047. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Fishery; 2019 Atlantic Deep-Sea Red Crab Specifications" (RIN0648-XE900) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2048. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Golden Tilefish Fishery; 2019 Specifications" (RIN0648-XG417) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2049. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Prohibit Directed Fishing for American Fisheries Act Program and Crab Rationalization Program Groundfish Sideboard Limits in the BSAI and GOA" (RIN0648-BH88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2050. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Permit Renewal Applications" (RIN0648-BH43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2051. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory

Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Fishing Restrictions for Fish Aggregating Devices in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-BI37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2052. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Atlantic Fleet Training and Testing Study Area" (RIN0648-BH06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2053. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to the U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Hawaii-Southern California Training and Testing Study Area" (RIN0648-BH29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 17, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-118. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to enact the Military Hunger Prevention Act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 73

Whereas, The Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly known as the Food Stamp Program, provides assistance to eligible low-income individuals and families to buy healthy, nutritious food at a network of participating stores and farmer's markets, and is the country's most important anti-hunger program; and

Whereas, The federal government pays for the cost of SNAP benefits and the program's eligibility rules are primarily set at the federal level, while the costs of administering the program are shared between the federal government and the states; and

Whereas, In a typical month in 2017, the SNAP program helped more than 40 million low-income Americans afford a nutritionally adequate diet; and

Whereas, Most recipients of SNAP who are able to work are working while receiving benefits, which demonstrates the need of many working families, including those with a member in the armed forces, for assistance, particularly during economic downturns; and

Whereas, In 2015, more than \$80 million in SNAP benefits were used to buy food at military commissaries; and many military installations have food pantries or food banks that provide food to military families who are in need; and

Whereas, According to the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey, two percent of active duty military families, or approximately 23,000 families, received SNAP benefits from 2009 to 2012, and six percent of respondents of the Blue Star Family

Lifestyle Survey reported using emergency food relief in 2017; and

Whereas, Military families that do not reside on a military base or installation receive a Basic Housing Allowance (BAH), which is meant to offset the cost of civilian housing for those who do not reside in government-provided housing, and the rate of the BAH depends on location, pay grade, and number of dependents of the service member; and

Whereas, Although the BAH is intended to offset the cost of civilian housing for servicemen and women who do not live on a military base, the amount of the BAH is currently considered as income for purposes of determining eligibility for SNAP, and certain other benefits, pursuant to federal law; and

Whereas, The "Military Hunger Prevention Act," ¹[currently] *previously*¹ pending in Congress as H.R. 1078 and S. 2488, would amend federal law to exclude the BAH when determining eligibility for certain federal benefits, including SNAP; and

Whereas, Among the many economic challenges faced by members of the military are: relatively low pay compared to non-military occupations; infrequent and insufficient pay raises; frequent transfers or deployments, particularly when the transfer is to a region of the country with a comparatively high cost of living; and the difficulty of spouses to find well-paying, long-term employment due to those transfers and deployments; and

Whereas, In order that members of the armed services and their families, who make considerable personal sacrifices to protect and serve the United States, have sufficient and nutritious food on their tables, it is fitting and proper that the law be amended to exclude the BHA from income for purposes of determining eligibility for SNAP and other federal programs; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. The Legislature and Governor of New Jersey respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to ¹introduce and ¹enact the "Military Hunger Prevention Act," ¹[currently pending in both houses of Congress.]¹ so that those members of the armed forces who make considerable sacrifices in order to serve our country, yet face hunger or require assistance, are able to benefit from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and other benefits, notwithstanding their receipt of a Basic Housing Allowance.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly or the Secretary of the Senate to the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of Congress elected from this State.

¹3. *This joint resolution shall take effect immediately.*¹

POM-119. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois urging the United States Congress to enact legislation making United States policy not to start a nuclear war and to prohibit the funding of further development and production of additional nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 61

Whereas, The use of even a small number of nuclear weapons could have catastrophic human, environmental, health, and economic consequences globally; and

Whereas, Approximately 14,000 nuclear weapons still exist in the world and pose an intolerable risk to humanity; and

Whereas, The United States has over 6,000 nuclear weapons, which combined are more

than 100 times more powerful than all the weapons used during World War II; and

Whereas, The United States is currently planning to spend nearly \$2 trillion over the next 30 years rebuilding its entire nuclear weapons arsenal; this is a gross misuse of funds that could instead be devoted to improving security, health, and education; and

Whereas, The United States maintains nearly 1,000 nuclear weapons on high alert so they are ready for launch within minutes of a presidential decision to do so, making them vulnerable to accidents, unauthorized use, cyber attacks, and miscalculations, thereby increasing the risk of nuclear use; and

Whereas, The United States currently reserves the right to use nuclear weapons in response to non-nuclear attacks by Russia, China, or North Korea, nations that could respond by using their own nuclear weapons, resulting in a nuclear war that could have devastating consequences; and

Whereas, The sole purpose of U.S. nuclear weapons should be to deter a nuclear attack on the United States, its forces, and its allies; there is no reason for the United States to ever use nuclear weapons first; and

Whereas, The U.S. President has sole authority to order a nuclear attack without any consultation or input; leaving the decision to one individual increases the chance of a nuclear weapon being used; and

Whereas, A policy renouncing the first use of nuclear weapons would severely constrain the ability of the President to order a nuclear attack, allowing attacks only in response to a nuclear attack; and

Whereas, Americans and all people on the planet should have the right to live a life free from the threat of nuclear weapons; and

Whereas, The United States should immediately change its policies, as well as actively pursue verifiable agreements with other nuclear-armed nations to reduce the number of nuclear weapons and eliminate them from the planet; therefore, be it

Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the One Hundred First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that, as an important first step, we call on the President of the United States to make it the policy of the U.S. that it will not start a nuclear war and therefore will not use nuclear weapons first, and we call on the United States Congress to pass legislation supporting this policy; and be it further

Resolved, That we call on Congress to not fund the development and production of additional U.S. nuclear weapons that can produce a relatively small nuclear explosion, making them suitable for rogue nuclear war-fighting and potentially lowering the threshold to using nuclear weapons first; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution be delivered to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the U.S. Senate Majority Leader, the U.S. Senate Minority Leader, the U.S. Speaker of the House, the U.S. House of Representatives Minority Leader, and all members of the Illinois Congressional Delegation.

POM-120. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urging the United States Congress to reauthorize and fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 343

Whereas, The September 11th Victim Compensation Fund was created in 2001 to compensate individuals for illnesses and deaths due to exposure to toxins at the September 11th attack sites; and

Whereas, the fund was reauthorized in 2011 and then again in 2015, allowing individuals to submit claims until December 18, 2020; and

Whereas, the World Trade Center Health Program was essentially established to diagnose and treat medical issues of September 11th responders and victims; and

Whereas, the \$7.3 billion fund has already paid out approximately \$5 billion to 21,000 claimants and still has approximately 19,000 additional claims; and

Whereas, insufficient money exists to pay current and projected claims at the same levels under current procedures, and claimants that are unpaid will see a drastic cut in payments; and

Whereas, more than 90,000 Americans, including approximately 1,500 residents of this Commonwealth, struggle with illnesses related to the September 11th attacks as of 2018; and

Whereas, the fund should be reauthorized and fully funded through 2090, which will make it last until the 2090 expiration date of the World Trade Center Health Program; Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urge the Congress of the United States to reauthorize and fully fund the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LEE, from the Joint Economic Committee:

Special Report entitled "The 2019 Joint Economic Report" (Rept. No. 116-58).

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 727. A bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROUNDS for Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Mark T. Esper, of Virginia, to be Secretary of Defense.

*Army nomination of Gen. Mark A. Milley, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Mary F. O'Brien, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Bryan P. Fenton, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Ronald J. Place, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Robert T. Wooldridge II, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. David G. Bellon, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. ROUNDS for Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Mark C. Alderman and ending with Denean V. E. Zozo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 29, 2019.

Air Force nomination of Robert K. Rankin, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Judy A. Rattan, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Gaylan A. Gray and ending with Jordan H. Lindeke, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Hans Eric Anker and ending with Brian Douglas Zullo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Air Force nomination of John W. Poulter, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Thomas D. Ausherman, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Edward J. Brennan and ending with Kenneth H. Stremmel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Lauren A. Baker and ending with Jesse W. Johnson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Air Force nominations beginning with Jonathan D. Barnes and ending with Jeremiah P. Sexton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Army nomination of Larry D. Crowder, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Jason B. Bariatti and ending with Mark A. Patterson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Army nomination of Roger M. Lewis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Thelma D. Cummings and ending with Kyungkun Lee, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on June 18, 2019.

Army nomination of Joshua S. Anderson, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Joseph P. Blakeney, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Patrick D. Clary, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Marie P. Corpuz, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Ernest M. Dorema, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Simone M. Edwards, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Luciano G. Mizerani, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Rochelle S. Pressley, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Howard G. Rice, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Virginia L. Egli, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Darren K. Purcell, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Joseph R. Adams and ending with Liang Zhou, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Ryan H. Allred and ending with Anna Yoo, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Army nominations beginning with Keith J. Andrews and ending with Jeffrey T.

Whorton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Marine Corps nomination of Timothy K. Gallagher, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Kyle A. Ugone, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Sean M. Williams, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Christopher D. McLin, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Christopher M. Johnson, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Benny P. Volkmann, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Eric A. Polonsky, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Vincent L. Ackerman and ending with James L. Zimmerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Ricardo M. Abakah and ending with Yu Zheng, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Alexander Aldana and ending with Robert J. Wishmeyer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Timothy G. Boyle and ending with Delicia G. Zimmerman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Aaron T. Allison and ending with Kristin B. Whitehouse, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Ryan B. Bareng and ending with Timothy A. Springer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Kevin L. Albert and ending with James H. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

Navy nominations beginning with Arturo Alvarado, Jr. and ending with Elizabeth M. Zuloaga, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 8, 2019.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Douglas Russell Cole, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Matthew Walden McFarland, of Ohio, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio.

Kea Whetzal Riggs, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

Robert Anthony Molloy, of the Virgin Islands, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands for a term of ten years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 2157. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to expand the use of global payments to hospitals in rural areas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 2158. A bill to improve certain programs of the Department of Health and Human Services with respect to heritable disorders; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2159. A bill to repeal the Act entitled "An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of North Dakota over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Devils Lake Indian Reservation"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2160. A bill to require carbon monoxide alarms in certain Federally assisted housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. LEE):

S. 2161. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for reciprocal marketing approval of certain drugs, biological products, and devices that are authorized to be lawfully marketed abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 2162. A bill to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to annually hire at least 600 new Border Patrol agents, to report quarterly to Congress on the status of the Border Patrol workforce, and to conduct a comprehensive staffing analysis; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2163. A bill to establish the Commission on the Social Status of Black Men and Boys, to study and make recommendations to address social problems affecting Black men and boys, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2164. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1984 to reauthorize grants for and require applied water supply research regarding the water resources research and technology institutes established under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2165. A bill to enhance protections of Native American tangible cultural heritage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. JONES, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2166. A bill to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2167. A bill to require a certain percentage of natural gas and crude oil exports be

transported on United States-built and United States-flag vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. UDALL):

S. 2168. A bill to establish a student loan forgiveness plan for certain borrowers who are employed at a qualified farm or ranch; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 2169. A bill to amend section 3116 of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the applicability of the appointment limitations for students appointed under the expedited hiring authority for post-secondary students; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2170. A bill to amend the Biggert-Waters Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2012 to make reforms to flood mapping programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2171. A bill to amend the Bunning-Bereuter-Blumenauer Flood Insurance Reform Act of 2004 to require insurance agents who sell flood insurance policies under the National Flood Insurance Program to take certain continuing education courses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER:

S. 2172. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to provide relief from surcharges to small businesses and nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2173. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to enhance the land-based unmanned aircraft system program of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 2174. A bill to expand the grants authorized under Jennifer's Law and Kristen's Act to include processing of unidentified remains, resolving missing persons cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. PAUL):

S. 2175. A bill to address recommendations made to Congress by the Government Accountability Office and detailed in the annual duplication report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2176. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Haiti for temporary protected status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ERNST, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. ENZI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2177. A bill to provide taxpayers with an improved understanding of Government programs through the disclosure of cost, performance, and areas of duplication among them, leverage existing data to achieve a functional Federal program inventory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2178. A bill to impose requirements in certain actions for patent infringement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 2179. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2180. A bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2181. A bill to require the disclosure of information relating to cyberattacks on aircraft systems and maintenance and ground support systems for aircraft, to identify and address cybersecurity vulnerabilities to the United States commercial aviation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 2182. A bill to protect consumers from security and privacy threats to their motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2183. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to analyze certain legislation in order to prevent duplication of and overlap with existing Federal programs, offices, and initiatives; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2184. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 2185. A bill to provide labor standards for certain energy jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 2186. A bill to require entities to provide consumers with the opportunity to prohibit the entity from collecting or using certain data concerning the consumer and to request deletion of such data; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2187. A bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. 2188. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the license application process for small business investment companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2189. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to waive the guarantee fee for veterans and spouses of veterans for the Export Working Capital, International Trade, and Export Express programs; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 2190. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to ensure that the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is eligible for certain Small Business Administration programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 2191. A bill to establish the Native American Outreach Program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2192. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide funding assistance to reduce flood risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 2193. A bill to require the Administrator of General Services to issue guidance to clarify that Federal agencies may pay by charge card for the charging of Federal electric motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 278. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding Turkey's purchase of the S-400 air and missile defense system from the Russian Federation and its membership in NATO, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 279. A resolution calling for the designation of Antifa as a domestic terrorist organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention,

torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

S. 285

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 285, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 373

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 373, a bill to provide for the retention and service of transgender individuals in the Armed Forces.

S. 433

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 433, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve home health payment reforms under the Medicare program.

S. 546

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 546, a bill to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2090, and for other purposes.

S. 638

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 638, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances as hazardous substances under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, Liability Act of 1980, and for other purposes.

S. 639

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 639, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the centennial of the establishment of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

S. 640

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 640, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require pharmacy-negotiated price concessions to be included in negotiated prices at the point-of-sale under part D of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 952

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 952, a bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 1081

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1081, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1116

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to require providers of broadband internet access service and edge services to clearly and conspicuously notify users of the privacy policies of those providers, to give users opt-in or opt-out approval rights with respect to the use of, disclosure of, and access to user information collected by those providers based on the level of sensitivity of the information, and for other purposes.

S. 1188

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1188, a bill to promote United States-Mongolia trade by authorizing duty-free treatment for certain imports from Mongolia, and for other purposes.

S. 1273

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1273, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes.

S. 1340

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1340, a bill to authorize activities to combat the Ebola outbreak in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and for other purposes.

S. 1403

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Mary-

land (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1403, a bill to amend the Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 1437

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1437, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to require that direct-to-consumer advertisements for prescription drugs and biological products include truthful and non-misleading pricing information.

S. 1447

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1447, a bill to allow the financing by United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1539

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

S. 1541

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1541, a bill to increase the minimum age for sale of tobacco products to 21.

S. 1590

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1590, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards for thwarting wildlife trafficking linked to transnational organized crime, and for other purposes.

S. 1641

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1641, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income interest received on certain loans secured by agricultural real property.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to sell the Alzheimer's semipostal stamp for 6 additional years.

S. 1764

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1764, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to ensure just and reasonable charges for telephone and advanced communications services in the correctional and detention facilities.

S. 1792

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1792, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to maintain a publicly available list of all employers that relocate a call center or contract call center work overseas, to make such companies ineligible for Federal grants or guaranteed loans, and to require disclosure of the physical location of business agents engaging in customer service communications, and for other purposes.

S. 1850

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1850, a bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to prescribe rules to protect consumers from unfair and deceptive acts and practices in connection with primary and secondary ticket sales, and for other purposes.

S. 1956

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1956, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the qualified contract exception to the extended low-income housing commitment rules for purposes of the low-income housing credit, and for other purposes.

S. 1963

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1963, a bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government.

S. 2028

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2028, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for new markets tax credit investments in the Rural Jobs Zone.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2062

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2062, a bill to prohibit the use of funds for the 2026 World Cup unless the United States Soccer Federation provides equitable pay to the members of the United States Women's National Team and the United States Men's National Team.

S. 2066

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2066, a bill to review United States Saudi Arabia Policy, and for other purposes.

S. 2075

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2075, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require issuers to disclose certain activities relating to climate change, and for other purposes.

S. 2083

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2083, a bill to amend chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, to ensure pay equity for amateur athletes, and for other purposes.

S. 2097

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2097, a bill to amend section 287 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to limit immigration enforcement actions at sensitive locations, to clarify the powers of immigration officers at such locations, and for other purposes.

S. 2102

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2102, a bill to provide funding for programs and activities under the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act.

S. 2121

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2121, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to restrict the use of exotic and wild animals in traveling performances.

S. 2140

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2140, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the rules relating to inverted corporations.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2156. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for S corporation reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THUNE Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2156

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “S Corporation Modernization Act of 2019”.

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. MODIFICATIONS TO S CORPORATION PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME RULES.

(a) INCREASED PERCENTAGE LIMIT.—Section 1375(a)(2) is amended by striking “25 percent” and inserting “60 percent”.

(b) REPEAL OF EXCESSIVE PASSIVE INCOME AS A TERMINATION EVENT.—Section 1362(d) is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1375(b) is amended by striking paragraphs (3) and (4) and inserting the following new paragraph:

“(3) PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME DEFINED.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term ‘passive investment income’ means gross receipts derived from royalties, rents, dividends, interest, and annuities.

“(B) EXCEPTION FOR INTEREST ON NOTES FROM SALES OF INVENTORY.—The term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include interest on any obligation acquired in the ordinary course of the corporation’s trade or business from its sale of property described in section 1221(a)(1).

“(C) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN LENDING OR FINANCE COMPANIES.—If the S corporation meets the requirements of section 542(c)(6) for the taxable year, the term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include gross receipts for the taxable year which are derived directly from the active and regular conduct of a lending or finance business (as defined in section 542(d)(1)).

“(D) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DIVIDENDS.—If an S corporation holds stock in a C corporation meeting the requirements of section 1504(a)(2), the term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include dividends from such C corporation to the extent such dividends are attributable to the earnings and profits of such C corporation derived from the active conduct of a trade or business.

“(E) EXCEPTION FOR BANKS, ETC.—In the case of a bank (as defined in section 581) or a depository institution holding company (as defined in section 3(w)(1) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(w)(1))), the term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include—

“(i) interest income earned by such bank or company, or

“(ii) dividends on assets required to be held by such bank or company, including stock in the Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank, or the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Bank or participation certificates issued by a Federal Intermediate Credit Bank.

“(F) GROSS RECEIPTS FROM THE SALES OF CERTAIN ASSETS.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) CAPITAL ASSETS OTHER THAN STOCK AND SECURITIES.—In the case of dispositions of

capital assets (other than stock and securities), gross receipts from such dispositions shall be taken into account only to the extent of capital gain net income therefrom.

“(i) STOCK AND SECURITIES.—In the case of sales or exchanges of stock or securities, gross receipts shall be taken into account only to the extent of the gain therefrom.

“(G) COORDINATION WITH SECTION 1374.—The amount of passive investment income shall be determined by not taking into account any recognized built-in gain or loss of the S corporation for any taxable year in the recognition period. Terms used in the preceding sentence shall have the same respective meanings as when used in section 1374.”.

(2)(A) Section 26(b)(2)(J) is amended by striking “25 percent” and inserting “60 percent”.

(B) Section 1375(b)(1)(A)(i) is amended by striking “25 percent” and inserting “60 percent”.

(C) The heading for section 1375 is amended by striking “25 PERCENT” and inserting “60 PERCENT”.

(D) The item relating to section 1375 in the table of sections for part III of subchapter S of chapter 1 is amended by striking “25 percent” and inserting “60 percent”.

(3) Section 1042(c)(4)(A)(i) is amended by striking “section 1362(d)(3)(C)” and inserting “section 1375(b)(3)”.

(4) Section 1362(f)(1)(B) is amended by striking “paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (d)” and inserting “subsection (d)(2)”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF S CORPORATION ELIGIBLE SHAREHOLDERS TO INCLUDE IRAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361(c)(2)(A)(vi) is amended to read as follows:

“(vi) A trust which constitutes an individual retirement account under section 408(a), including one designated as a Roth IRA under section 408A.”.

(b) SALE OF STOCK IN IRA RELATING TO S CORPORATION ELECTION EXEMPT FROM PROHIBITED TRANSACTION RULES.—Section 4975(d)(16) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraphs (A) and (B) and by redesignating subparagraphs (C), (D), (E), and (F) as subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), and (D), respectively, and

(2) by striking “such bank or company” in subparagraph (A) (as so redesignated) and inserting “the issuer of such stock”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1, 2020.

SEC. 4. TREATMENT OF S CORPORATION BUILT-IN GAIN AMOUNT UPON DEATH OF SHAREHOLDER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of subchapter S of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 1369. AMORTIZATION OF BUILT-IN GAIN AMOUNT UPON DEATH OF SHAREHOLDER.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A person holding stock in an electing S corporation the basis of which is determined under section 1014(a) (hereafter in this section referred to as the ‘shareholder’) shall be allowed a deduction with respect to the S corporation built-in gain amount. The amount of such deduction for any taxable year shall be determined by amortizing the S corporation built-in gain amount over the 15-year period beginning with the month which includes the applicable valuation date.

“(b) S CORPORATION BUILT-IN GAIN AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘S corporation built-in gain amount’ means the lesser of—

“(1) the excess (if any) of—

“(A) the basis of the stock referred to in subsection (a) as determined under section 1014(a), over

“(B) the adjusted basis of such stock immediately before the death of the decedent, or

“(2) the pro rata share (determined as of the applicable valuation date) of—

“(A) the aggregate fair market value of all property held by the S corporation which is of a character subject to depreciation or amortization, over

“(B) the aggregate adjusted basis of all such property held by the S corporation as of such date.

“(c) ELECTING S CORPORATION.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘electing S corporation’ means, with respect to any shareholder, any S corporation which elects the application of this section with respect to such shareholder at such time and in such form and manner as the Secretary may prescribe.

“(d) APPLICABLE VALUATION DATE.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘applicable valuation date’ means—

“(1) in the case of a decedent with respect to which the executor of the decedent’s estate elects the application of section 2032, the date 6 months after the decedent’s death, and

“(2) in the case of any other decedent, the date of the decedent’s death.

“(e) ACCELERATED DEDUCTION IN CASE OF DISPOSITION OF S CORPORATION PROPERTY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—If the electing S corporation disposes of any property which was taken into account under subsection (b)(2), then the deduction allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any stock, for the taxable year of the shareholder in which or with which the taxable year of the S corporation which includes the date of such disposition ends, shall (except as otherwise provided in this section) not be less than the lesser of—

“(A) the pro rata share of the gain recognized on such disposition, or

“(B) the amount determined under subsection (b)(2) by only taking into account such property.

“(2) OVERALL ALLOWANCE NOT INCREASED.—No deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any stock for any taxable year to the extent that such deduction (when added to the deductions so allowed for all prior taxable years) exceeds the S corporation built-in gain amount with respect to such stock.

“(f) RECHARACTERIZATION OF GAINS AS ORDINARY INCOME TO EXTENT OF DEDUCTION.—If—

“(1) stock of an S corporation with respect to which a deduction was allowed under this section, or

“(2) property which was taken into account under subsection (b)(2) with respect to such stock,

is disposed of at a gain (determined without regard to whether or not such gain is recognized and reduced by any amount of gain which is treated as ordinary income under any other provision of this subtitle), the amount of such gain (or the shareholder’s pro rata share of such gain in the case of property described in paragraph (2)) shall be treated as gain which is ordinary income (and shall be recognized notwithstanding any other provision of this subtitle) to the extent of the excess of the aggregate deductions allowable under this section with respect to such stock for the taxable year of such disposition and all prior taxable years over the amounts taken into account under this subsection for all prior taxable years.

“(g) TERMINATION OF AMORTIZATION.—No deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any stock in an electing S corporation with respect to any period beginning after the earlier of—

“(1) the date on which the corporation’s election under section 1362 terminates, or

“(2) the date on which the shareholder transfers such stock to any other person.

“(h) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS.—

“(1) DISTRIBUTIONS FROM ESTATES OR TRUSTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in the case of a distribution of stock from an estate or trust to a beneficiary, the beneficiary (and not the estate or trust) shall be treated as the shareholder to which this section applies with respect to periods after such distribution.

“(2) CERTAIN TRANSFERS INVOLVING SPOUSES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, in the case of a transfer described in section 1041, the transferee (and not the transferor) shall be treated as the shareholder to which this section applies with respect to periods after such transfer.

“(i) TREATMENT OF INCOME IN RESPECT OF THE DECEDENT.—

“(1) ADJUSTMENT TO BUILT-IN GAIN OF PROPERTY HELD BY S CORPORATION.—For purposes of subsection (b)(2), the fair market value of any property taken into account under subparagraph (A) thereof shall be decreased by any amount of income in respect of the decedent with respect to such property to which section 691 applies. For purposes of subsection (e)(1)(A), the gain recognized on the disposition of such property shall be reduced by such amount.

“(2) ADJUSTMENT TO BASIS OF S CORPORATION STOCK.—For adjustment to basis of S corporation stock, see section 1367(b)(4)(B).

“(j) REPORTING.—Except as otherwise provided by the Secretary, for purposes of section 6037, the amounts determined under subsections (b)(2), (e)(1), and (f)(2) shall be treated as items of the corporation and the pro rata share determined under such subsection shall be furnished to the shareholder under section 6037(b).”.

(b) ADJUSTMENT TO BASIS OF STOCK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1367(a)(2) is amended by striking “and” at the end of subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end of subparagraph (E) and inserting “, and”, and by inserting after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

“(F) the amount of the shareholder’s deduction allowable under section 1369.”.

(2) ADJUSTMENT NOT TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DETERMINING TREATMENT OF DISTRIBUTIONS.—Section 1368 is amended—

(A) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting “(other than subsection (a)(2)(F) thereof)” after “section 1367”, and

(B) in subsection (e)(1)(A)—

(i) by striking “this title and the phrase” and inserting “this title, the phrase”, and

(ii) by inserting “, and no adjustment shall be made under section 1367(a)(2)(F)” after “section 1367(a)(2)”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part II of subchapter S of chapter 1 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 1369. Amortization of built-in gain amount upon death of shareholder.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to decedents dying after the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

SEC. 5. REVOCATIONS OF S CORPORATION ELECTIONS.

(a) REVOCATIONS.—Paragraph (1) of section 1362(d) is amended—

(1) by striking “subparagraph (D)” in subparagraph (C) and inserting “subparagraphs (D) and (E)”, and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(E) AUTHORITY TO TREAT LATE REVOCATIONS AS TIMELY.—If—

“(i) a revocation under subparagraph (A) is made for any taxable year after the date prescribed by this paragraph for making such revocation for such taxable year or no such revocation is made for any taxable year, and

“(ii) the Secretary determines that there was reasonable cause for the failure to timely make such revocation, the Secretary may treat such a revocation as timely made for such taxable year.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to revocations after December 31, 2019.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2180. A bill to provide oversight of the border zone in which Federal agents may conduct vehicle checkpoints and stops and enter private land without a warrant, and to make technical corrections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, “Show me your papers.” Those are words that you should never hear once inside the United States. Unless a government agent has a legitimate reason to stop and search you—a reasonable suspicion or probable cause—Americans should not be subject to questioning and detention for merely going about their daily lives. This is a fundamental tenet of the Fourth Amendment. Yet Customs and Border Protection (CBP) operations are effectively immune from the Fourth Amendment within a broadly defined “border zone.”

And this so-called border zone need not be near the border at all: Seventy-year-old regulations define it as up to 100 miles from any border, land or sea. According to the CBP, southern Vermont is in the border zone, as is the entire State of Florida, and even Richmond, Virginia. In fact two-thirds of the entire U.S. population is in the border zone.

In Vermont, under the Trump administration, the border zone has resulted in highway checkpoints and bus boardings. In May, Customs and Border Protection (CBP) agents set up the first highway checkpoint in a decade. The checkpoint was set up miles from the Canadian border in South Hero, Vermont. It was in operation for hours. We do not know how many hundreds of cars were stopped, but we do know that it did not lead to a single arrest or seizure. Last month, the CBP established a second checkpoint in the same location. This time nearly 900 cars were stopped, and only one individual was detained—for a visa overstay. Border Patrol agents have also boarded Amtrak trains in White River Junction and boarded a Greyhound bus at the Burlington airport, demanding to know whether passengers were citizens.

Today, I am joining with Senator MURRAY in reintroducing the Border Zone Reasonableness Restoration Act of 2019. Our legislation would establish critical privacy protections by reducing the unjustifiably large border zone from 100 miles to 25 miles.

I find it difficult to believe that these checkpoints are an effective use of law enforcement resources. Border Patrol

stations in Vermont are already stretched thin. And just last month the Senate passed a bipartisan \$4.6 billion emergency supplemental appropriations bill to address the humanitarian crisis on the southern border. The Department of Homeland Security’s limited resources should be focused on improving conditions of detention and providing food, appropriate shelter, and medical care to families fleeing violence and dire poverty, not conducting pointless vehicle checkpoints miles from the northern border in Vermont.

The Border Zone Reasonableness Restoration Act is based on an amendment that Senator MURRAY and I successfully attached to comprehensive immigration reform legislation in 2013. The 100 mile “border zone”—and the similar 25 mile zone where many types of warrantless property searches are permitted—predates this current administration, but the actions of this administration have shown just how much we need it. That bill passed the Senate with a bipartisan vote of 68 to 32.

Americans’ right to privacy does not end simply because you are within 100 miles from our land and sea borders. I hope all members of Congress will join us and support this commonsense legislation to ensure that every person in this country receives the constitutional protections to which they are entitled.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 2184. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require certain creditors to obtain certifications from institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2184

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Know Before You Owe Private Education Loan Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE TRUTH IN LENDING ACT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) **INSTITUTIONAL CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), before a creditor may issue any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall obtain from the relevant institution of higher education where such loan is to be used for a student, such institution’s certification of—

“(i) the enrollment status of the student;

“(ii) the student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined by the institu-

tion under part F of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965; and

“(iii) the difference between—

“(I) such cost of attendance; and

“(II) the student’s estimated financial assistance, including such assistance received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070 et seq.) and other financial assistance known to the institution, as applicable.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), a creditor may issue funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection without obtaining from the relevant institution of higher education such institution’s certification if such institution fails to provide within 15 business days of the creditor’s request for such certification—

“(i) notification of the institution’s refusal to certify the request; or

“(ii) notification that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request.

“(C) **LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.**—If a creditor issues funds without obtaining a certification, as described in subparagraph (B), such creditor shall report the issuance of such funds in a manner determined by the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.”;

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (9), (10), and (11) as paragraphs (10), (11), and (12), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) **PROVISION OF INFORMATION.**—

“(A) **PROVISION OF INFORMATION TO STUDENTS.**—

“(i) **LOAN STATEMENT.**—A creditor that issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall send loan statements, where such loan is to be used for a student, to borrowers of such funds not less than once every 3 months during the time that such student is enrolled at an institution of higher education.

“(ii) **CONTENTS OF LOAN STATEMENT.**—Each statement described in clause (i) shall—

“(I) report the borrower’s total remaining debt to the creditor, including accrued but unpaid interest and capitalized interest;

“(II) report any debt increases since the last statement; and

“(III) list the current interest rate for each loan.

“(B) **NOTIFICATION OF LOANS DISBURSED WITHOUT CERTIFICATION.**—On or before the date a creditor issues any funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection, the creditor shall notify the relevant institution of higher education, in writing, of the amount of the extension of credit and the student on whose behalf credit is extended. The form of such written notification shall be subject to the regulations of the Bureau.

“(C) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—A creditor that issues funds with respect to an extension of credit described in this subsection shall prepare and submit an annual report to the Bureau containing the required information about private student loans to be determined by the Director of the Bureau, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.”.

(b) **DEFINITION OF PRIVATE EDUCATION LOAN.**—Section 140(a)(8)(A) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650(a)(8)(A)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clause (ii) as clause (iii);

(2) in clause (i), by striking “and” after the semicolon; and

(3) by adding after clause (i) the following:

“(ii) is not made, insured, or guaranteed under title VII or title VIII of the Public

Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 292 et seq. and 296 et seq.); and”.

(c) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 365 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau shall issue regulations in final form to implement paragraphs (3) and (9) of section 128(e) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)), as amended by subsection (a). Such regulations shall become effective not later than 6 months after their date of issuance.

SEC. 3. AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965.—Section 487(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)) is amended by striking paragraph (28) and inserting the following:

“(28)(A) Upon the request of a private educational lender, acting in connection with an application initiated by a borrower for a private education loan in accordance with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act, the institution shall within 15 days of receipt of the request—

“(i) provide certification to such private educational lender—

“(I) that the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, is enrolled or is scheduled to enroll at the institution;

“(II) of such student’s cost of attendance at the institution as determined under part F of this title; and

“(III) of the difference between—

“(aa) the cost of attendance at the institution; and

“(bb) the student’s estimated financial assistance received under this title and other assistance known to the institution, as applicable;

“(ii) notify the creditor that the institution has received the request for certification and will need additional time to comply with the certification request; or

“(iii) provide notice to the private educational lender of the institution’s refusal to certify the private education loan pursuant to subparagraph (D).

“(B) With respect to a certification request described in subparagraph (A), and prior to providing such certification under subparagraph (A)(i) or providing notice of the refusal to provide certification under subparagraph (A)(iii), the institution shall—

“(i) determine whether the student who initiated the application for the private education loan, or on whose behalf the application was initiated, has applied for and exhausted the Federal financial assistance available to such student under this title and inform the student accordingly; and

“(ii) provide the borrower whose loan application has prompted the certification request by a private educational lender, as described in subparagraph (A)(i), with the following information and disclosures:

“(I) The amount of additional Federal student assistance for which the borrower is eligible and the advantages of Federal loans under this title, including disclosure of the fixed interest rates, deferments, flexible repayment options, loan forgiveness programs, and additional protections, and the higher student loan limits for dependent students whose parents are not eligible for a Federal Direct PLUS Loan.

“(II) The borrower’s ability to select a private educational lender of the borrower’s choice.

“(III) The impact of a proposed private education loan on the borrower’s potential eligibility for other financial assistance, including Federal financial assistance under this title.

“(IV) The borrower’s right to accept or reject a private education loan within the 30-day period following a private educational lender’s approval of a borrower’s application and about a borrower’s 3-day right to cancel period.

“(C) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms ‘private educational lender’ and ‘private education loan’ have the meanings given such terms in section 140 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1650).”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the effective date of the regulations described in section 2(c).

(c) PREFERRED LENDER ARRANGEMENT.—Section 151(8)(A)(ii) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1019(8)(A)(ii)) is amended by inserting “certifying,” after “promoting,”.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 24 months after the issuance of regulations under section 2(c), the Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau and the Secretary of Education shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the compliance of—

(1) private educational lenders with section 128(e)(3) of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1638(e)(3)), as amended by section 2; and

(2) institutions of higher education with section 487(a)(28) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1094(a)(28)), as amended by section 3.

(b) CONTENTS.—The contents of the report described in subsection (a) shall include information about the degree to which specific institutions utilize certifications in effectively—

(1) encouraging the exhaustion of Federal student loan eligibility by borrowers prior to taking on private education loan debt; and

(2) lowering private education loan debt by borrowers.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2192. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide capitalization grants to States to establish revolving funds to provide funding assistance to reduce flood risks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the State Flood Mitigation Revolving Fund Act of 2019 along with Senators KENNEDY and MENENDEZ.

The purpose of our bill is to reduce flood risk and the costs associated with flooding by establishing a State revolving loan program to fund mitigation projects for property owners and communities that participate in the National Flood Insurance Program. By funding projects that reduce risk, such as home elevations, flood proofing, acquisitions, and environmental restoration, the bill also provides an avenue to help middle-income and low-income property owners reduce their flood insurance premiums. It is a proposal that has been endorsed by over 200 local and national organizations, including the Pew Charitable Trusts, Association of State Floodplain Managers, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, the Property Casualty Insurance Association of America, the Na-

ture Conservancy, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the U.S. Resiliency Council, and others.

Flooding is the most costly hazard facing American property owners. With increasing frequency we see news stories of catastrophic flooding in communities across the Nation. According to the Pew Charitable Trusts, seven out of ten Presidential Disaster Declarations in the last ten years have involved flooding, and data from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration show that there were 27 flooding disasters or hurricanes in the last decade that each caused more than \$1 billion in damage.

But the increase in major flooding disasters has also been accompanied by increases in nuisance, urban, and high tide flooding events, which don’t trigger the full complement of Federal disaster assistance but are devastating to every homeowner and community that is affected.

Experts agree that the best way to reduce the cost of flooding is to engage in proactive, not reactive, flood mitigation. The National Institute of Building Sciences’ 2018 Natural Hazard Mitigation Saves study found that every Federal dollar spent on up-front mitigation provides \$6 in national benefits, and investments in flood mitigation yield \$7 in benefits per dollar spent. This is the kind of saving the State Flood Mitigation Revolving Fund Act seeks to promote and leverage.

Modeled on the successful Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, this bill creates a straightforward and easily accessible program through which States can offer low-interest loans to property owners and communities who want to mitigate their flood risk. By creating a revolving fund, the bill will allow States to design and more efficiently implement their own flood mitigation strategies provided that such strategies help achieve Federal objectives such as reducing disaster payments.

Within this construct, the bill gives States the flexibility to undertake flood mitigation projects expeditiously. The bill requires States to provide matching funds and gives them the ability to further leverage Federal dollars, as many already do under the drinking water and clean water SRF programs.

Additionally, the bill ensures mitigation assistance is focused on where the flood risk is greatest and where people are most vulnerable. The bill requires states to prioritize mitigation assistance for low-income homeowners and geographic areas, pre-FIRM buildings, and severe repetitive loss and repetitive loss buildings. Finally, it gives states the option of providing additional subsidization for low-income property-owners and communities that simply do not have the wherewithal to assume additional debt.

Mr. President, as we talk about appropriate investments in infrastructure, mitigation is one place where we

should be investing. I invite the rest of our colleagues to join me, Senator KENNEDY, and Senator MENENDEZ in supporting this bipartisan legislation.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 278—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TURKEY'S PURCHASE OF THE S-400 AIR AND MISSILE DEFENSE SYSTEM FROM THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AND ITS MEMBERSHIP IN NATO, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 278

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Turkey have been North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) allies since 1952;

Whereas NATO exists for democratic nation states to band together to "safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law";

Whereas NATO Member States "seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area";

Whereas the primary threat posed by the Soviet Union that precipitated the formation of NATO continues today, and recent actions by the Government of the Russian Federation have reaffirmed the importance of this alliance to the security of the Member States;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has threatened the peace and security of the North Atlantic area, invading and occupying the territory of its non-NATO neighbors and menacing NATO Member States since 2008;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has interfered and attempted to wreak havoc in the election processes of NATO Member States and continues to do so;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation has maintained and strengthened its ties with the repressive and corrupt regime of Nicolás Maduro in Venezuela in an effort to prop him up in his illegitimate hold over the state;

Whereas the Government of the Russian Federation is strengthening its ties with the Government of Cuba, including a recent port call in Havana with its most powerful warship;

Whereas the government of President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan has taken the Republic of Turkey down a path of authoritarianism and human rights abuses, aligns itself with radical Islamic terror groups, and agitates against regional allies of the United States, such as Israel;

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Turkey has cooperated with the Governments of the Russian Federation and Iran against the strategic interests of the NATO Member States, continues to occupy northern Cyprus, and continues to unjustly detain United States citizens;

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Turkey has supported the Maduro regime with illegal financial transactions;

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Turkey has acquired the S-400 air and mis-

sile defense system from the Russian Federation, which constitutes a direct and dire threat to the security interests of the United States and NATO; and

Whereas the foregoing demonstrates that the Republic of Turkey is consistently contradicting the standards and purposes of the NATO treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares that the Republic of Turkey's receipt of the Russian S-400 air and missile defense system is a significant transaction within the meaning of section 231 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (CAATSA) of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 9525);

(2) calls for full implementation of sanctions under CAATSA;

(3) calls upon the President to consult with NATO Member States, pursuant to Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty, signed at Washington April 4, 1949, based upon threats to the political independence and security of the Parties by the Russian actions described in the preamble; and

(4) calls upon the President, during such consultation with NATO Member States, to review the Treaty with regard to the factors "affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area" described in the preamble, and to consider the continued inclusion of the Republic of Turkey in NATO.

SENATE RESOLUTION 279—CALLING FOR THE DESIGNATION OF ANTIFA AS A DOMESTIC TERRORIST ORGANIZATION

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 279

Whereas members of Antifa, because they believe that free speech is equivalent to violence, have used threats of violence in the pursuit of suppressing opposing political ideologies;

Whereas Antifa represents opposition to the democratic ideals of peaceful assembly and free speech for all;

Whereas members of Antifa have physically assaulted journalists and other individuals during protests and riots in Berkeley, California;

Whereas in February of 2018, journalist Andy Ngo was intimidated and threatened with violence by protestors affiliated with Antifa;

Whereas on June 29, 2019, while covering demonstrations in Portland, Oregon, journalist Andy Ngo was physically attacked by protestors affiliated with Antifa;

Whereas employees of the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (referred to in this preamble as "ICE") were subjected to doxxing and violent threats after their social media profiles, phone numbers, and home addresses were posted on the Internet by left wing activists;

Whereas according to the Wall Street Journal, an ICE officer was followed by left wing activists and "confronted when he went to pick up his daughter from summer camp", and another "had his name and photo plastered on flyers outside his home accusing him of being part of the 'Gestapo'";

Whereas the ICE office in southwest Portland, Oregon, was shut down for days due to threats and occupation by Antifa members;

Whereas Rose City Antifa, an Antifa group founded in 2007 in Portland, Oregon, explicitly rejects the authority of law enforcement officers in the United States, and Federal, State, and local governments, to protect free speech and stop acts of violence;

Whereas Rose City Antifa rejects the civil treatment of individuals the group labels as fascists, stating: "We can't just argue against them; we have to prevent them from organizing by any means necessary."; and

Whereas there is no place for violence in the discourse between people in the United States, or in any civil society, because the United States is a place where there is a diversity of ideas and opinions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls for the groups and organizations across the country who act under the banner of Antifa to be designated as domestic terrorist organizations;

(2) unequivocally condemns the violent actions of Antifa groups as unacceptable acts for anyone in the United States;

(3) expresses the need for the peaceful communication of varied ideas in the United States;

(4) urges any group or organizations in the United States to voice its opinions without using violence or threatening the health, safety, or well-being of any other persons, groups, or law enforcement officers in the United States; and

(5) calls upon the Federal Government to redouble its efforts, using all available and appropriate tools, to combat the spread of all forms of domestic terrorism, including White supremacist terrorism.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 927. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1694, to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct lunar activities to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, and for other purposes.

SA 928. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 929. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 927. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1694, to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct lunar activities to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the *Apollo 11* landing site, and for other purposes; as follows:

In section 2(b), strike paragraph (3) and insert the following:

(3) The President should work with other countries to develop best practices to ensure the protection of historic lunar landing sites and artifacts.

SA 928. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike paragraph (1) of section 2(a) and insert the following:

(1) in subsection (c), by striking “\$4,600,000,000” and all that follows through “expended” and inserting “\$10,180,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2029, and \$10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2030 through 2092, to remain available until expended”; and

SA 929. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1327, to extend authorization for the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001 through fiscal year 2092, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

SEC. 5. SEQUESTRATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the terms “direct spending” and “sequestration” have the meanings given such terms in section 250(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900(c)); and

(2) the term “nonexempt direct spending” means all direct spending except—

(A) direct spending for benefits payable under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.);

(B) direct spending for the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.);

(C) direct spending for net interest (all of major functional category 900);

(D) direct spending for any program administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(E) direct spending for Special Benefits for Certain World War II Veterans (28-0401-0-1-701); and

(F) direct spending for the child nutrition program (as defined in section 25(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1769f(b))).

(b) SEQUESTRATION ORDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For fiscal year 2020, as soon as is practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, and on the dates the Office of Management and Budget issues its sequestration preview reports for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, pursuant to section 254(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 904(c)), the President shall order a sequestration, effective upon issuance, that reduces all non-exempt direct spending by the uniform percentage necessary to reduce the total amount of nonexempt direct spending for such fiscal year by \$2,036,000,000.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—When implementing the sequestration of nonexempt direct spending under paragraph (1), the Office of Management and Budget—

(A) shall follow the procedures specified in section 6 of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 935) and the special rules specified in section 256 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 906); and

(B) shall not follow the exemptions specified in section 255 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Sen-

ate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing pending military nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Douglas Russell Cole, and Matthew Walden McFarland, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Ohio, Robert Anthony Molloy, to be Judge for the District Court of the Virgin Islands, and Kea Whetzel Riggs, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

The Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 18, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Tristan Brown, a member of my staff, be granted temporary floor privileges.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 582 AND H.R. 748

Mr. MCCONNELL. I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the titles of the bills for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 582) to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 748) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will receive their second reading on the next legislative day.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE “APOLLO 11” MOON LANDING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Con. Res. 19.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Apollo 11 Moon landing.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 5, 2019, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 22, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, July 22; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Esper nomination; finally, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, July 22.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 22, 2019, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate,
at 5:09 p.m., adjourned until Monday,
July 22, 2019, at 3 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by
the Senate July 18, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

CLIFTON L. CORKER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED
STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT
OF TENNESSEE.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LYNDA BLANCHARD, OF ALABAMA, TO BE AMBAS-
SADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF
SLOVENIA.

DONALD R. TAPIA, OF ARIZONA, TO BE AMBASSADOR
EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO JAMAICA.