



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 2018

No. 103

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who has created humanity in Your image, look upon us and hear our prayers. Today, give our lawmakers the desire to do Your will and the energy to complete the tasks that will glorify Your Name. That which they don't know, reveal it. That which they lack, supply it. And that which they doubt, verify it. Keep them blameless in Your service, so that their lives will be living letters that will cause people to exalt Your Name. Strengthen their minds for Your service, so that Your wisdom will permeate their every endeavor. Remind them to not forget the lost, the lonely, the least, the last, and the left out.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY AND WATER, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 5895, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5895) making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby amendment No. 2910, in the nature of a substitute.

Alexander amendment No. 2911 (to amendment No. 2910), to make a technical correction.

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 2943 (to amendment No. 2910), to increase funds for a nuclear demonstration program.

McConnell (for Baldwin/Portman) amendment No. 2985 (to amendment No. 2910), to set aside funds for cooperative agreements and laboratory support to accelerate the domestic production of Molybdenum-99.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as I discussed on the floor yesterday, returning to regular order in the appropriations process is at the forefront of the Senate's agenda.

Thanks to the bipartisan work of the Appropriations Committee, led by Chairman SHELBY, Ranking Member LEAHY, and the subcommittee chairmen, it is actually becoming a reality. Their efforts have already produced thoughtful legislation for the full Senate to consider, beginning this week with the combined measures for the Legislative Branch, for Energy and Water, and for Military Construction and the Veterans Administration. It is those last components I would like to discuss this morning.

This year, 2018, has already brought significant legislative progress for America's men and women in uniform. Earlier this year, Congress and the President did away with arbitrary funding limits that had eroded our forces' comparative advantage. We delivered the largest year-on-year increase in funding for our troops in 15 years. Now, with the Military Construction-VA funding bill before us this week, the Senate can keep the ball rolling.

The committee's package would deliver mission-critical maintenance and improvements that are needed on installations both at home and abroad. It would support Active-Duty personnel, as well as National Guard and Reserve units. It would allocate significant resources for projects that reinforce key alliances and extend our influence around the world.

In my home State of Kentucky, it would mean major improvements to training facilities at both Fort Knox—home of the Army Cadet, Human Resources, and Recruiting Commands—and at Fort Campbell, where the 101st Airborne Division and Special Operations forces prepare for evolving missions.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4253

But while underpinning the ongoing missions of our Active Forces, the legislation before us would also take critical steps to meet the individual needs of America's warfighters and their families here at home. It would allocate over \$1.5 billion to operate and maintain military family housing facilities. It would provide for vital safety updates at overseas American military schools, part of a system that serves more than 66,000 children. Hundreds of millions in additional funding would go to build and improve the network of military medical facilities, which provide care to nearly 10 million service-members and military families.

Finally, within the Military Construction legislation is important funding to support our veterans. In addition to funding the maintenance and upkeep of VA health facilities, it goes further in allocating targeted resources to address the system's shortcomings.

Especially when we talk about access to prompt, quality care, the status quo is simply not good enough for America's veterans. For the more than 300,000 Kentucky veterans and for the millions of veterans nationwide, we can and we must do better. That is why this bill includes billions of dollars to improve claims processing and to cut down on backlogs. There is funding for treatment, mental health services, and preventing opioid misuse.

There are plenty of good reasons to support this appropriations package, but one of the most compelling is the support it will deliver to our all-volunteer military and those who have served our country in uniform. So let's keep this legislation moving this week.

RESCISSIONS BILL

On another matter, Mr. President, speaking of government spending, we will soon have an opportunity to save some of the money taxpayers entrust to us. Thanks to the hard work of Members, including Senator LEE and Chairman ENZI, we will soon turn to a House-passed bill that acts on the President's request to rescind nearly \$15 billion in previously appropriated money that has gone unspent. This modest belt-tightening would in no way infringe on the bipartisan spending deal that Senators on both sides agreed to earlier this year. This savings package is 100 percent unrelated to that agreement.

Let me say that again. This savings package is 100 percent unrelated to the bipartisan agreement we reached earlier this year. It is totally separate. It simply pulls back a small amount of unspent funds from a variety of government accounts. If we, the people's elected representatives, want to speak seriously about stewarding taxpayer money, surely we can vote to recapture these unspent funds that are not even currently in use.

The President's modest rescissions request is entirely reasonable. It should be without controversy. I look forward to voting for it myself, and I urge my fellow Members to do the same.

TAX REFORM

Now, on one final matter, Mr. President, today marks 6 months since the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act passed Congress. On Friday, it will be 6 months since the President signed it into law. What a 6 months it has been.

Already, Americans have seen their paychecks grow as the IRS withholds less of what they earned. Already, families are reaping the fruits of a new business tax code that gives American employers more ability to increase pay and create jobs. Six months in, these tax cuts have already led employers to issue tax reform bonuses, raises, and new benefits to 4 million workers and counting. That is welcome relief for middle-class families. But what about the long term?

Republicans know that enduring prosperity needs thriving businesses competing to hire American workers. So we designed tax reform to flip the Obama-era script and make America a more attractive place to invest, expand, and create jobs.

For large companies, capital investment might mean breaking ground on new locations or purchasing state-of-the-art technology. If you are a midsize employer, it might mean filling your factory floor with new equipment. If you are a Main Street family business, it could mean expanding into the vacant storefront next door or buying new tools that will transform your day-to-day operations.

In every case, you are placing a bet on your community and on your country. You are betting on American land, American equipment, and, most importantly, the future of the American workforce. You are putting down roots here instead of shipping jobs overseas. This is precisely what we have seen in the past 6 months.

Earlier this year, Apple announced plans to make \$30 billion in capital investments over the next 5 years—new facilities, new data centers, and more than 20,000 new jobs.

Chipotle Mexican Grill announced a \$50 million investment in upgrading and refurbishing their restaurants.

Carpenter Technology is using tax reform to speed up a new \$100 million facility in Redding, PA. Their new state-of-the-art mill will allow them to compete in precision electronics manufacturing. New equipment can't be easily outsourced; neither can the jobs it will create. Sure enough, Carpenter is partnering with a local community college to train a 21st century workforce.

Remember, these businesses aren't just creating new opportunities themselves. These projects also mean prosperity for American contractors and construction crews, and it is not just the big guys.

In West Palm Beach, FL, tax reform means new kitchen appliances for the Don Ramon Restaurant. In my home State of Kentucky, at Glier's Meats, tax reform meant a new quarter-million-dollar machine to speed up production of their famous sausages. For a

small business with fewer than 30 employees, that is a noteworthy opportunity. Everywhere you turn, businesses large and small are going all in on the future of the United States.

There is one more interesting thing the last 6 months have revealed: just how impossible it is for our Democratic colleagues to set aside their outdated, tax-and-spend ideology. Every Democrat in the House and in the Senate voted on party lines to block tax reform. They insisted the law wouldn't help American workers one bit. They said that it would be a disaster. Of course, the facts have debunked those predictions. But are our Democratic friends admitting they were wrong? No. They are doubling down on this silliness.

By now, we are all familiar with the House Democratic leader's comments from January. She laughed at the four-figure bonuses that working families were celebrating and called them "crumbs." Earlier this month, she doubled down:

Hip, hip hooray, unemployment is down. But what does that mean for me?

Well, my Democratic friends seem hopeful they can convince Americans that tax cuts, bonuses, and a stellar job market are nothing to celebrate. Talk about a tall order.

But while those rhetorical gymnastics keep them busy, Republicans will keep up the fight for middle-class families.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that in whatever order you choose, Senators CRAPO, BALDWIN, and WHITEHOUSE each be given a minute, then I be allowed to speak in leader time, and the vote come immediately after that.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Idaho.

AMENDMENT NO. 2943, AS MODIFIED

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, in a few minutes we are going to vote on the Crapo-Whitehouse amendment. I stand to support that amendment and encourage my colleagues all to vote in favor of it.

I first want to thank my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE. He and I have worked together on a number of issues, building bipartisan support to advance our ability to utilize nuclear energy in the United States.

I also thank Senator ALEXANDER and Senator FEINSTEIN for their work to complete this Omnibus appropriations bill and to continue to push to bring our appropriations process to regular order.

Our amendment focuses on the development of fuel sources for our advanced nuclear reactors. The United States currently lacks both the supply of high assay low-enriched uranium, called HALEU, and a process to make HALEU for advanced reactor designs.

Advanced reactor startup cores require a high assay low-enriched uranium containing less than 20 percent fissile content. At the end of naval fuel's life, it contains highly enriched uranium with an average enrichment of 80 percent. Current operating naval reactors have the potential to create a total of 100,000 tons of spent nuclear fuel, and the Department of Energy estimates disposal of this spent nuclear fuel will cost about \$100 billion.

However, advanced nuclear reactors have the potential to reuse this spent nuclear fuel and to reduce the overall disposal cost. HEU repurposing, from materials like spent naval fuel, can be done using hybrid processes that use advanced dry head-end technologies followed by material recovery, which creates the fuel for our new advanced reactors. Repurposing this spent fuel has the potential of reducing waste that would otherwise be disposed of at taxpayer expense, and approximately 1 metric ton of HEU can create 4 useable tons for our new reactors.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, first, let me say what a pleasure it has been to work with Senator CRAPO on these issues.

Our situation is pretty simple. We have a U.S. Navy that generates spent nuclear fuel through its operations; we have a U.S. industry of next-generation nuclear technology that needs that spent fuel in order to test those innovative technologies; and we have extraordinary National Labs with world-class expertise in handling that nuclear material and supporting that innovation.

This amendment brings those three together. It allows the U.S. Navy's spent fuel to be delivered to National Labs so that pursuant to a law we just passed in the Senate recently, the cooperation between the National Labs and the nuclear innovation community can move forward. We have already passed that bill. I hope we will pass this bill.

I will close by saying there is something else in this that I think is worth our consideration. We have an enormous national liability with respect to our existing stockpiles of nuclear waste. Presently, we have no realistic plan for dealing with that. There is a prospect—it is definitely a maybe; I don't want to overpromise anything—there is definitely a prospect and it is the intention of some of these next-generation technologies that we will be able to develop nuclear technologies that will go through our nuclear waste stockpile and turn that into productive electricity generation. If we can get there, that would be a terrific Holy Grail. In the meantime, this is a smart and efficient way to support American innovation in these technologies.

I urge all of my colleagues to vote yes. I, again, appreciate Senator

CRAPO's leadership on this and the extraordinary National Lab that he has in his home State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Wisconsin.

AMENDMENT NO. 2985

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support my bipartisan amendment regarding an essential medical isotope. This amendment that I have introduced, along with Senator PORTMAN, would achieve three simple goals: It would safeguard and improve patient access to critical health screenings, it would promote medical innovations needed for cutting-edge diagnostics and new treatments, and it would move us away from our dependence on foreign sources of medical isotopes, while supporting America's medical innovation industry.

Let me explain quickly why my amendment is needed. The United States does not currently produce the medical isotope our healthcare system uses the most. This isotope is used in medical screenings and helps 50,000 patients per day in the United States by providing early detection and enabling treatment of cancer and heart disease.

U.S. patients are currently relying on supplies of this key isotope that come from Canada, the Netherlands, and South Africa. This raises costs and risks supply disruptions. Mind you, this isotope only lasts for 3 days.

For security in the healthcare system and certainty in patient access to essential medical tests, which are often needed in urgent situations, we must develop a domestic supply of these isotopes. The Department of Energy has been working diligently with the private sector to develop sources that are made in America, and this amendment would dedicate \$20 million to ensure that work continues so we can secure domestic production as soon as possible.

I urge my colleagues to support this important and bipartisan amendment.

I yield back.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am on leader time.

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. President, as the purposeful, cynical, and shameful humanitarian crisis of family separation at the border continues to unfold, the vast majority of Americans are looking to President Trump's administration, which started this practice, to end it.

The Associated Press recently reported that the Trump administration has been sending babies and young children to what they call tender age facilities. It is unconscionable—unconscionable—that the Government of the United States is warehousing babies and toddlers alone in an institutional setting.

The crisis was willfully and purposefully created by this President through

his zero tolerance policy at the border. It can and should be ended by the same mechanism. With the simple flick of a pen, the President can end this policy. If the President wants to borrow my pen, he can have it. He can do it quickly and easily if he wants to. It is on his back.

The administration must end this gratuitously cruel and counterproductive policy that has brought such pain to innocent children and so much shame on this Nation. No law requires the separation of children from their families, no law says you must send babies to detention facilities, and no law is required to end it.

Nineteen Republicans in the Senate have already called on the Trump administration to reverse or suspend this policy administratively, without any congressional action. If our Republican colleagues and the Republican leadership in particular want to solve this problem, they ought to be directing their attention to the other side of Pennsylvania Avenue, to the White House, because that is where it can get done, done well, and get done quickly. This is at the administration's doorstep to stop or sustain. This is President Trump's responsibility. He could fix it this morning if he actually wanted to fix it. Instead, he points fingers of blame, he prevaricates, and he makes things up because he doesn't even want to own this policy. He knows how unpopular it is with the American people, but at the same time, he sort of wants to tell his base: I am with you. I am with you.

It is awful.

There is this idea that Congress could step in and pass legislation to deal with family separation. That is highly, highly dubious and unlikely. When has this Congress ever successfully passed immigration legislation in the last few years? Never. It is an illusion. Color us dubious that Congress—the House and Senate, with Republican majorities and strong rightwing elements who hate any change in immigration—could successfully pass legislation. Here are the problems:

First, would Speaker RYAN agree to pass and put on the floor a narrow bill that just deals with this issue? Has he ever done that before? Never. Never. Even if the Senate passed something, in the House, it would be dragged into a morass.

Second, would the President sign something that—it was reported in the newspaper that Sarah Huckabee Sanders said he would not sign the bill that Senator CRUZ is talking about. So what is the point? We want to solve this problem.

Third, will both Republican leaders, House and Senate, guarantee that a narrow bill will not have poison pill riders that are unacceptable to large percentages of this body added to any legislation?

Let's get those guarantees—no poison pill riders, Senate leadership and House leadership agree, and Speaker

RYAN has the votes to pass something before we move on a legislative path, when there is such an easy alternative path available, which is the President taking his pen and undoing what he has done.

The bottom line, my colleagues, is that there is only one real solution, as much as we would dream for another; that is, for the President to solve this problem. The odds of any legislation being able to pass—without poison pill riders—the House and Senate and be signed by the President is just about zero, while the percentage that the President could solve this problem if he wants to is just about 100 percent.

I have to say one other thing. TED CRUZ—a leading anti-immigration advocate—must be feeling the heat. He has never been for modifying our immigration laws in any way that helps immigrants. Read some of his past statements.

I ask the question, Is something cynical going on with some people? They want to get this off their backs because they feel the heat, but they really don't want to solve the problem, because if they did, Senator CRUZ and the others would do what 19 Republicans have correctly done: Ask the President to solve the problem himself.

TRADE

Mr. President, on a different subject entirely, our trade relationship with China. For too long, China has taken advantage of America's unwillingness to strongly confront its rapacious trade policies. For too long, China has dumped artificially cheap products into our markets, stolen the intellectual property of blue-chip American companies, and denied our most profitable companies access to its markets.

I am heartened that President Trump, after making a debacle of a deal on ZTE, has taken a tougher approach to China in recent days. His instincts to be tough on China are right on the money.

President Trump needs to stay strong. If he backs off at the first sign of trouble, after the first company calls to complain, after President Xi calls to complain, then China will know we are weak and unserious.

China is waiting to see if it can ride this out. We need to show China that America means business because the stakes are too high.

Business relocations to China have costs too many American jobs. The theft of our intellectual property has been called "the greatest transfer of wealth in history" by a four-star general and commander of U.S. Cyber Command. The lifeblood of the American economy is on the line. I urge President Trump to stay strong on China.

Don't mistake my support on this issue for what the President is doing with our allies. The tariffs leveled against Canada and our European allies are misguided and counterproductive. China is the real threat. And China should be the President's focus.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. President, 6 months ago today, the Republican majority jammed through a partisan tax bill that lavished tax cuts on big corporations and the wealthiest few. It is an appropriate time to look back on how the tax bill is fairing.

While the Republican leader, on a daily basis, celebrates vague statistics about business confidence, here are some cold, hard facts.

Since the beginning of 2018, corporations have announced plans to repurchase more than \$475 billion in stock buybacks—a record pace. Meanwhile, the Bureau of Labor statistics report that real average hourly earnings have dropped by 0.1 percent.

According to a recent analysis by Just Capital, only 6 percent of the capital allocated by companies from the tax bill's savings has gone to employees, while nearly 60 percent has gone to shareholders.

Remember, President Trump promised that the Republican tax bill would give a \$4,000 raise for the average American family. In reality, American families are not seeing close to that figure. A recent Washington Post headline sums it up best: "The Republican tax bill's promises of higher wages and more jobs haven't materialized."

The truth is, the tax law has failed to deliver for American workers and American families. Corporations are reaping record profits as a result of the tax bill and are refusing to pass much of those savings onto their workers. And whatever benefits American families are getting from the tax bill—if they are getting benefits at all—are starting to get wiped out by skyrocketing health care costs, the result of Republican sabotage.

All in all, that is why that today, 6 months since it passed, the Republicans' signature legislative accomplishment remains deeply unpopular.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2943, AS MODIFIED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question occurs on agreeing to Crapo amendment No. 2943, as modified.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 87, nays 9, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 132 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Gardner	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Bennet	Hassan	Perdue
Blumenthal	Hatch	Peters
Blunt	Heinrich	Portman
Booker	Heitkamp	Reed
Boozman	Heller	Risch
Brown	Hirono	Roberts
Burr	Hoeven	Rounds
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Isakson	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Jones	Scott
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Smith
Corker	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Tester
Cotton	Leahy	Thune
Crapo	Lee	Tillis
Cruz	Manchin	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Enzi	Moran	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Murphy	Young

NAYS—9

Feinstein	Harris	Sanders
Flake	Markey	Warren
Gillibrand	Merkley	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Cardin	McCain
Duckworth	Shaheen

The amendment (No. 2943), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2985

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on the Baldwin amendment No. 2985.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 30 seconds on the Baldwin-Portman amendment.

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

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, Senator BALDWIN spoke a moment ago about this amendment we are about to vote on.

It is \$20 million to the National Nuclear Security Administration's domestic isotope program. This is something this body voted for back in 2012. CBO says it has no budget authority impact. It is really important because we are getting this all from overseas. We have no domestic source. We want to get away from using highly enriched uranium for national security reasons.

I encourage you to all vote for this.

I yield back my time.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. 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 assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH)

and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent. The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 133 Leg.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Barrasso	Grassley	Perdue
Bennet	Harris	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Portman
Blunt	Hatch	Reed
Booker	Heinrich	Risch
Boozman	Heitkamp	Roberts
Brown	Heller	Rounds
Burr	Hirono	Rubio
Cantwell	Hooven	Sanders
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cardin	Inhofe	Schatz
Carper	Isakson	Schumer
Casey	Johnson	Scott
Cassidy	Jones	Shelby
Collins	Kaine	Smith
Coons	Kennedy	Stabenow
Corker	King	Sullivan
Cornyn	Klobuchar	Tester
Cortez Masto	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Leahy	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Udall
Daines	Markey	Van Hollen
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warner
Durbin	McConnell	Warren
Enzi	Menendez	Whitehouse
Ernst	Merkley	Wicker
Feinstein	Moran	Wyden
Fischer	Murkowski	Young
Gardner	Murphy	

NAYS—2

Flake Paul

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth McCain Shaheen

The amendment (No. 2985) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, I have just returned from South Florida where I went to a detention facility in Homestead, FL. There are 1,000 children in this detention facility, and 94 of 1,000 are children who have been separated from their families.

Despite being the senior Senator of Florida, despite having oversight responsibility of the Department of HHS, despite the fact that in that oversight capacity, we have the funding responsibility for the Department of HHS and one of its components, the Office of Refugee Resettlement—these children separated from their families are handled by that office—despite all of that, the Deputy Secretary of the Department of HHS refused to allow me to enter this facility and said that it was the Department's policy that you have to fill out a form, which we had done, but you have to wait 2 weeks before being allowed to enter the facility.

The question is, Why do they not want the Senator from Florida to get into this detention facility where there are children who have been separated from their parents? It must be that not only is this Department policy, but this is being directed by the President in the White House. They don't want me to see it because they don't want us to know what is going on in there.

I have subsequently found out that in addition to those 94 children, there are 174 children being held in my State of Florida who have been separated from their families. This is the current debate: Children have been ripped apart from their moms and dads, and it has always been an American value to keep families together, even when you are adjudicating the lawful or unlawful status of the parents. You always keep those children together on an immigration question, yet President Trump has now altered that policy.

Despite all the finger-pointing and the deflection, President Trump and his administration know this is their policy; he doubled down on it last night. But there is nothing in the law that requires them to tear parents away from their children. There is nothing in the law that requires the administration to rip an infant from a parent's arms, some young enough still to be nursing.

The decision to enact this quite horrendous and shameful policy was a decision by this administration—and this administration alone. That is why this Senator went to Miami yesterday. I wanted to see it for myself. I wanted to see: Is the facility clean? Are the children sleeping in beds? Are they sleeping on the floor? Do they have adequate care? If they were, I could report that it was a good news story.

I also wanted to be able to talk to the young children, the ones who had been separated. I had already gotten word from Senator VAN HOLLEN, who had been in Texas on Saturday and met a mom who said that her child had been separated from her and that child was in a detention facility in Florida. I wanted to see that child.

I am very proud of all of our colleagues who have come together to support legislation to keep these families together, and 49 of us on this side of the aisle have signed on as cosponsors. The policy of this legislation is simply this: Don't separate families in this question of immigration. It would prohibit the separation of those families. That has been the policy, and all the President would have to do is to say it, but in taking the position he has, maybe the only recourse is for us to pass this law.

I am proud of our colleagues on that side of the aisle who have rightfully stood up and publicly condemned this practice because every American knows that taking children from their parents is just not right. If a family is legitimately fleeing violence, repression, and conditions that most of us cannot imagine, they have a right under American law to present themselves at the border and ask for asylum. Past administrations of both parties have recognized this, which is why they acted with compassion and refused to do what the Trump administration is doing now. It is certainly time that we return to our true American value of keeping families together.

Because the passage of a statute is a long shot, it is really not up to us. It is up to the President. He could say it, and it would be done. No matter what we do here in this Chamber, the power to end this shameful chapter in our Nation's history lies with the President and his pen. He can sign an Executive order today, just as easily as he can sign a law that we pass here in Congress. Either way, it is up to him. He doesn't need Congress to act. He and he alone is allowing this shameful practice to continue, and he alone can stop it right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I first want to respond to something that was said a moment ago. It is not he and he alone who can solve it. Congress is, in fact, the policymaking body within the Federal Government. We are the law-making body within the Federal Government. We can make changes to the law, and we can't lose sight of that fact.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE—H.R. 3

Mr. LEE. Madam President, pursuant to title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, I have a discharge petition at the desk and move to discharge from the Senate Committees on Appropriations and Budget H.R. 3, to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 8, 2018.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to section 1017(b) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, there will now be up to 1 hour of debate on the motion to discharge, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Who yields time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, over the next 10 years, our national debt is set to balloon from \$21.16 trillion today to more than \$33.9 trillion in 2028.

With interest rates set to increase, the payments on the debt will also likely double over the next 10 years as a percentage of total economic output. Consider for a moment the fact we are paying a little more than \$300 billion a year to service our debt. It is not that much more than we were paying a couple of decades ago when our national debt was roughly one-fifth, one-sixth of its current size. The only reason our debt service payments are as low as they are today is that our interest rates are at all-time historic lows. Our Treasury yield rates are artificially, historically, aberrationally, severely low. The situation gets a lot worse if our artificially, historically low interest rates increase or start to return to their historical averages at a pace quicker than has been projected, as is easily possible. For example, if interest

rates were to return just to historical norms—I am not talking about a rebound above the historical average, just a rebound to historical norms—taxpayers would soon be drowning in trillion-dollar annual interest payments just for the interest on our debt, which means just the difference between what we are paying in our debt service payment now and what we would be paying then, possibly a few short years from now. It is more than we spend on the Department of Defense. This is really frightening, and this is why it is such welcome news that there is some movement on this front.

That is why it is such welcome news that on May 8 President Trump sent to Congress a request to rescind \$15.4 billion worth of extraneous spending. This is something Congress used to do all the time. This is something that in decades past would occur dozens, even scores of times, during a single Presidential administration, and it was a bipartisan matter, of course. Returning unused taxpayer money isn't just good government; in a republic, it should be expected, and it should be the norm. In 1981, President Reagan and a divided Congress rescinded more than \$15 billion in Federal spending and another \$16 billion in 1985 and 1986. President Clinton made three rescission requests in 2000, totaling \$128 million.

Now we have the chance to take up the mantle again. President Trump's specific proposals draw back unused funds from expired programs, obsolete programs, and accounts that the Congressional Budget Office says are wildly, needlessly overfunded. In fact, according to CBO, none of the funds in the requested rescissions would alter current Federal programs in any way. For instance, CBO has certified that the \$7 billion CHIP rescission would not affect either outlays or the number of Americans with health insurance. And I should note that Congress has rescinded CHIP funding in every enacted Labor-HHS appropriations bill since 2011, more than \$50 billion in total during that time period.

The spending targeted for rescission is either expired or rendered unattainable by current eligibility requirements. The \$15 billion is just sitting, unused, in agency accounts. So how does it help to cut spending if this money is just sitting there? This is the real sticking point, for Congress has this cute little habit of paying for new spending by raiding these unused funds. It is a budgetary trick, a gimmick, if you will. The money may not be used this year, but it can be recycled into budget gimmicks in future years. Rescinding it now takes the \$15 billion out of circulation for those kinds of shenanigans in the not-too-distant future, and, of course, that is the real reason why it will not pass unanimously.

Now, to its credit, the House of Representatives has stepped up. On June 7, the House of Representatives passed its

own \$14.8 billion rescissions package. Now it is our chance. Now we have the opportunity to do the same. This is the Senate's chance to show the American people that we retain some modicum of attention and of seriousness when it comes to the spending habits of the Federal Government and when it comes to fiscal restraint in Washington, DC.

Cutting spending that isn't actually going to be spent may not be a profile in courage, but it is at least a sign of a pulse, and in Washington that is something. That is something important that we can and we should show today. It is a step toward fiscal responsibility and away from the cynicism and the waste that has turned this city into what is known as "the swamp."

In Congress we face a lot of difficult decisions—gut-wrenching, heart-wrenching decisions—but this is not one of them. President Trump's request is as reasonable as can be imagined. Now, \$15 billion may be a drop in the bucket compared to \$15 trillion or \$21 trillion, but that is a reason to support this legislation, not to oppose it. Congress needs to retrain its atrophied muscles in preparation for the far larger tasks that lie ahead.

If we do not find the will—if we can't somehow muster the willpower necessary to reduce Federal spending ourselves now, long before the laws of mathematics and economics force us to do so—we will regret it. If we wait until those laws catch up with us, it will be a whole lot more painful later than it will be if we start making more modest adjustments now.

Every day that passes without action represents more of our national debt being thrown onto our children's backs—another line item on the fiscal indictment that we are writing, however unwittingly or unknowingly, against ourselves.

We have to change course. This bill provides us with a good chance to take one small step toward sanity.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the motion to discharge.

DISCHARGE PETITION—H.R. 3

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with title 10 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Act of 1974, hereby direct that the Senate Committees on Appropriations and Budget be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3, a bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 8, 2018, in accordance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act 1974.

Mike Lee, Patrick J. Toomey, Ted Cruz, Rand Paul, David Perdue, Jeff Flake, Joni Ernst, Ron Johnson, John Kennedy, Marco Rubio, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Ben Sasse, James Lankford, Tom Cotton, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, James Risch.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I have been in the Senate long enough to think that maybe the Senate can start to go back to being the Senate. A Sen-

ate that votes on things and debates things and reflects the will of the people—not what is dictated from the White House. Perhaps that was wishful thinking on my part, because in just the latest example of the "cut first and ask questions later" policies of the Trump administration, we are now going to vote on a bill that will claw back billions of dollars from children's health insurance, affordable housing investments, infrastructure, rural development, and innovative energy programs. This is the same White House that just forced through Congress a \$1.9 trillion—not billion, but trillion—tax giveaway, most of which goes to billionaires and corporations. Then, they say we have to cut children's health insurance because we have to reduce the deficit. We can give billionaires and corporations \$1.9 trillion, but this might increase the deficit. So we have to cut children's health insurance, affordable housing investments, infrastructure, rural development, and innovative energy programs. That goes beyond laughable. It is unconscionable.

President Trump is seeking to cut \$7 billion from funding for children's health insurance. If you strip this funding from the Children's Health Insurance Program, we leave children unprotected from unforeseen events like a flu outbreak or a natural disaster.

This takes away the ability of Congress should be able to make critical investments in healthcare and education. Even if the money can no longer be dedicated to CHIP, we should reinvest it in other important programs as we have done in the past—programs that support our Nation's children and families. I don't think there is any Member of this body who, when they are campaigning, doesn't talk about how important children and their families are to them. I hope those same families will ask them: How much money did you take out from children and families?

Earlier this year, the Congress did what they were supposed to. Republicans and Democrats came together to direct this funding to the Federal response to the opioid epidemic, the childcare and development block grants, Head Start, and the National Institutes of Health. These are investments in our country. They are not tax giveaways. They are investments in our country. If you strip this funding, it is penny wise and pound foolish.

President Trump wants to claw back billions of dollars from infrastructure programs. I see so many of these photo ops he does, speaking about how we want to have better infrastructure. However, we don't want to pay for it so we will take the money back.

Let's look at what the money is that he wants to take away. It is programs to do everything from supporting loans to helping factories produce more efficient vehicles to building bridges in small communities. These are programs that directly support American jobs. They are not jobs overseas. They

are jobs right here, and now they want to take the money out.

For an administration that is perpetually in “infrastructure week,” it doesn’t make sense if you are trying to cut funding for infrastructure. How do we put “America first” when you strip funds that support Americans jobs?

In a continued push to leave rural America behind, Mr. Trump’s rescission package would cut millions of dollars from rural development programs. Every single Senator in this body has rural areas in their State, and they know that these programs help to ensure that the same basic services are offered in rural areas that we see in urban areas—things that we rely on, like schools or healthcare, for instance, or police stations. Are we saying that only urban areas can have that but rural areas can’t?

In the Appropriations Committee, Senator SHELBY and I have been focused on moving forward through the fiscal year 2019 process. We are trying to return the committee to regular order—something that most Republicans and Democrats in this body say they want. We have successfully kept poison pill riders and controversial authorizing language out of the appropriations bills, whichever side of the aisle they came from, and we passed, by an overwhelming margin, seven bipartisan bills out of our committee.

It has been years since we have seen that happen. Here we have seven bipartisan appropriations bills come out of committee, and almost all Republicans and all Democrats voted for them. Even with the Interior appropriations bill—that is a bill that has been historically bogged down with poison pill riders and usually forced into a massive omnibus appropriations bill because we could not reach an agreement. In the past we had to put it in an omnibus bill because we couldn’t agree on it—guess what happened. We passed it out of committee unanimously. I don’t recall that happening in nearly a decade.

Now, if we go forward with this rescission package, it is going to derail the process.

The rescission bill undermines the bipartisan budget deal that Republicans and Democrats struck just four months ago.

If we go forward with this package, another will fall, and another, and another, even further undermining the agreement.

I will remind everybody that if they haven’t gotten around to reading the Constitution, it does grant Congress the power of the purse, not the executive branch. Congress decides spending priorities, not the President. We ought to actually do our job. We should exercise our right. We should reject this rescissions package. We should uphold the bicameral, bipartisan budget agreement.

So I urge all Senators to reject this rescissions package and to oppose the motion to discharge.

Madam President, I don’t see any other Senator seeking the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided.

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

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TAX REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise in celebration of the 6-month anniversary of passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. I know there were a lot of remarks about the benefits of tax cuts right out of the gate, but many of the benefits from the reform of the old, broken, and outdated Tax Code will accumulate over the long run.

I rise to talk about some of the benefits from the new Tax Code that can be witnessed by hard-working families right now. For example, the typical family of four making the median family income of around \$75,000 a year is right in the middle of the first year of our cuts. Those typical families are going to see their taxes cut by more than half.

We also doubled the child tax credit and expanded its refundability to benefit more working families. The Tax Code also makes filing taxes easier and more straightforward for the typical middle-class family. That is because the standard deduction was nearly doubled.

Taken all together, provisions like these are the reason the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation found that the overall distribution of the new tax bill is directed toward the middle class. This is happening everywhere.

Take my home State of Utah, for example. According to some recent numbers from the Tax Foundation, citizens of Utah can expect, on average, a tax cut of nearly \$1,500, or 2.4 percent of their income.

Take advantage of those hundreds of dollars and start paying off your car a little sooner. Maybe go out to see a baseball game or take your family on a road trip to see some of the beautiful national parks around our country and especially throughout the State of Utah. All of those things are now that much more possible because of our tax reform.

Those direct tax cuts are just a part of the larger picture ushered in by tax reform. More broadly, tax reform has provided a shot in the arm to a long-ailing economy. After cutting the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 21 percent, businesses have been able to reinvest, build new facilities, hire new workers, and start innovating now more than ever.

Recent polls by the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, Gallup, and the National

Federation of Businesses show that optimism, and plans to expand hiring and growth for businesses of all sorts and sizes are at alltime highs. This optimism, along with lower costs of increasing investments and doing business, has already started to result in real changes for the middle class.

Take, for example, the list of more than 100 different utility companies that have cut their rates across the country. According to one compilation, the American people are on track to pocket more than \$2.8 billion just this year off those savings.

Some might also argue that this is a normal period of expansion and growth in the economy. As one journalist recently noted, tax reform has poured “jet fuel” on a growing economy.

According to the most recent reports in June, the total number of workers receiving unemployment benefits is running at the lowest levels in 44 years, and that is just in terms of numbers of people drawing unemployment benefits, not even taking into account the massive population growth since December 1973.

For the first time since record-keeping began in 2000, the number of available positions exceeded the number of job seekers, according to the information from the Department of Labor. This is just the initial boost. I tend to think positive economic outcomes are most often created by hard work and good policy, like our tax reform package.

That is why activity in the labor market has been especially robust, with more than 1 million jobs already created in this year alone. That is why wage growth has been trending upward, and that is why business investment has been robust. More Americans now have access to more of their own hard-earned money. As Republicans predicted, we are already seeing the middle class and the economy generally benefit.

Mark my words, there is a lot more growth we should anticipate coming down the pike as more and more people start to realize how much tax reform actually does, and will, affect their families, their businesses, their communities, and our country as a whole.

As business investment and productivity pick up due to higher expected aftertax returns from investment, wage growth, too, will continue to pick up. All told, these changes are creating a paradigm shift. More than ever before, Americans can expect things to be better tomorrow than they are today.

Personally, I am more excited than ever for my great-grandchildren, my grandchildren, and my children. I am grateful to everyone who has made this possible. After all, major tax reform like this is truly a once-in-a-generation opportunity for all of us.

Just 6 months in, we have seen so many positive results from the tax reform that the list is too long to cover in just one speech. Make no mistake, the list of positives from tax reform for

American families and businesses will continue to grow larger and longer.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

TARIFFS

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I rise to talk about the abuse of authority that is taking place with the administration's use of section 232 of the Trade Act to implement taxes on the American people. Let me say this one more time. The President, and the administration, abusing section 232 of the Trade Act, have decided on their own accord to tax the American people. They have put in place a 25-percent tariff on steel and aluminum and are getting ready to do so on some other products. Yet, this is Congress's responsibility—Congress's responsibility—to generate tariffs or deal with taxes.

The administration, by citing section 232—a national security issue—is taxing goods coming into America from Canada, from Europe, and our allies on a national security basis.

Today I wrote a letter to Secretary Ross, our Secretary of Commerce, because it is my understanding—actually, today, in a hearing with the Finance Committee, he said there were 22,506 requests from companies in the United States asking for exclusions—exclusions—from being taxed for goods that come in to support their companies.

I will say to my friends here, on what basis do we think these exclusions might be granted? We have already had an abuse of authority in using 232. I guess my question to Secretary Ross is, on what basis is he going to be granting these exclusions? Are they going to be friends of the administration who get exclusions? Are they going to deny exclusions to opponents of the administration or are they going to use the national security reason, if you will, to grant exclusions?

I want to say, again, I think this is our responsibility. I realize that when additional tariffs go in place in July—when these other countries retaliate, which is their plan on July 1—my guess is this issue may become more ripe for action, not unlike what is happening at the border right now where people are seeing what is occurring and action is being promoted to solve the problem. I think, once the tariffs by these other companies kick in against us on July 1—because we, in a most unusual way, the administration citing national security against Canada, Mexico, many of our NATO allies and the European Union—I think this issue is going to become ripe. I think it is going to become ripe for Senate action and House action.

Again, I will ask people in this room, knowing they cited 232, which again is an abuse of that authority, are we comfortable with the criteria that the administration is going to be using on the 22,000—actually, let me see here. Maybe that is a low number. It is 26,977

issues that have been dealt with, but 22,506 exclusions have been asked for. In other words, we have companies that are coming to the administration which is abusing its authority. We have companies that are going to the administration, asking that they not be impacted by the taxes that are being placed on their companies, unilaterally by this administration, with no congressional input.

I say to my colleagues, do we not want to know on what basis they unilaterally are going to decide not to tax certain companies? In other words, most companies are being taxed 25 percent. They just decided to do that themselves. Yet they are going to grant exclusions.

I think this issue is going to wreak havoc on our country. It already is wreaking havoc on our relationships with friends that have been with us for many years in defense that have to come our aid, and we have come to their aid. We have had alliances.

Again, I challenge the Senate to take action on this. There is an amendment that is broadly supported by people on both sides of the aisle, with a wide range of ideology, that would say, if we are going to invoke 232, a national security section, we would vote on that. My sense is, as this moves along, people are going to want to vote on that, and I look forward to that day occurring.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

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

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to address the issue that I know folks in both parties of both Houses, and, of course, across the country, are concerned about; that is, the issue of child separation at the border.

This is, unfortunately, an issue that because there is so much outrage, there is, in fact, substantial unity against the policy that is in place right now. I am, like a lot of Americans, vehemently opposed to the policy of what, in essence, amounts to ripping children away from their parents. I, like a lot of Americans, have demanded that the President and his administration end this cruel policy immediately.

We are hearing some reports that there may be an action taken. I don't know what that action will be, but I hope it is an action that will end the policy. Until we know that, we have to continue to urge the President to do the right thing.

Earlier this week, the Department of Homeland Security released data showing that between May 5 and June 9—just a little more than a month—2,342 children were taken from their parents at the border. That is about 70 children per day taken from their parents.

I have received thousands of emails, letters, and phone calls from concerned

Pennsylvanians who are demanding an immediate end to the policy. I never imagined that I would have to stand here today, nor should anyone, to talk about a scenario where the U.S. Government is separating children from their parents at the border. That seems incomprehensible that would ever happen, but it has.

I am reading part of a statement that reads as follows:

Our government is forcibly separating children—including toddlers—from their parents and sending them to detention facilities as a means of sending a message and influencing Congress.

That was a statement not made by a Democratic Senator or a Democratic House Member or a Republican or any politician; that was part of a larger statement made by Thomas Donahue, the president and CEO of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—not someone who is very often lined up on the same side as Democratic Senators. I think that is an understatement.

To say this policy is cruel, inhumane, and an insult to the values of our Nation is to utter an understatement. This is a policy that is straight from the pit of hell, and there is probably worse that we could say about it. It is hard to comprehend that any administration at any time would propose, let alone implement, a policy that would result in children being separated from their parents.

Unlike what the administration has tried to argue, this is not about following the law or securing the border. Neither of those statements is relevant here. This is a conscious decision by this administration, which is contrary to the decisions by the last two administrations—one a Republican administration, the other a Democratic administration—that decided not to separate children from their parents. Unfortunately, this administration decided to do just that.

Many people have heard the statements attributed to the American Academy of Pediatrics. There were several different folks who were quoted on this, depending on which medical organizations they belonged to.

One of the most compelling statements was by Dr. Colleen Kraft, the president of the American Academy of Pediatrics. She is obviously an expert about children and is from an expert organization. Dr. Kraft visited a children's immigration detention facility in Texas earlier this month. She called what she saw there, in the systemic separation of children from their parents, "a form of child abuse." According to Dr. Kraft, once young children are separated from their caregivers or parents, they are likely to develop toxic stress in their brains. The toxic stress disrupts children's brain development and increases levels of flight-or-fight hormones in their bodies. This kind of emotional trauma could eventually lead to children having health problems, such as heart disease and substance abuse disorders.

There is well-documented scientific evidence of the long-lasting harm that policies like this have on children. In the Washington Post yesterday, in an article entitled “What Separation from Parents Does to Children,” a professor of pediatrics at Harvard Medical School, Dr. Charles Nelson, said:

The effect is catastrophic. There’s so much research on this that if people paid attention at all to the science, they would never do this.

It goes on and on and on. I could quote more detail for a long time about what he has said and about what other experts have said, but we don’t have time today. Suffice it to say the research that shows the damage that is done to children when they are forcibly separated from their parents explains why more than 9,000 mental health professionals and 172 organizations signed a petition to urge the President to end the policy of separating families. In this petition, the mental health professionals wrote:

From decades of research and direct clinical experience, we know that the impact of disrupted attachment manifests not only in overwhelming fear and panic at the time of separation, but that there is a strong likelihood that these children’s behavioral, psychological, interpersonal, and cognitive trajectories will also be affected. The National Child Traumatic Stress Network notes that children may develop post traumatic responses following separation from their parents and specifically lists immigration and parental deportation as situations of potentially traumatic separation. To pretend that separated children do not grow up with the shrapnel of this traumatic experience embedded in their minds is to disregard everything we know about child development, the brain, and trauma.

That is from the petition that was signed by mental health professionals across the country—9,000 of them. Those professionals and the professionals at the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Physicians, and the American Psychiatric Association have also issued statements against the policy. Together, these organizations represent more than 250,000 doctors across the country. To support this policy, you would have to assert that a quarter of a million doctors in the United States of America are somehow wrong and that you know better.

If we were to ask the administration, “Before you put this policy in place, did you talk to the American Academy of Pediatrics? Did you talk to child psychologists? Did you talk to the American College of Physicians or other professionals who know something about children and trauma and long-term damage to their brains and to their development?” I am afraid the answer to that question would be no. Yet I await the answer from the administration. I hope the answer will be yes.

I have more here, but I know we have to go, so I will not use all of it. Over the next couple of hours and days, we have to keep insisting that the administration take action to end this policy today, which it could—which the Presi-

dent could, which the Attorney General could. I realize that sometimes here in Washington, people say: Do something right now. Take action today. Take action this week or this month. Yet, in this case, today matters; hours matter; days matter in the lives of those children—more than 2,300 or more, and the projections are just going through the roof about what will happen over the next couple of weeks and month.

Ending the policy today and reuniting child and parent matters a lot because every day that goes by makes it worse for that child. Unfortunately, for some children, it might be too late. That traumatic event and the aftereffects—the hours and the days and even weeks now that they have been separated—might result in permanent damage. I hope I am wrong about this, but days matter here, and even hours matter.

We are hoping that the administration will reverse course on a policy—I will say again and keep saying—that is straight from the pit of hell. It should end today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, our national debt stands at about \$21 trillion. The interest costs on this alone are more than \$300 billion every single year. That is money that can’t go toward shoring up our national defense or shoring up Social Security or Medicare or some other Federal program. That is money that goes to our creditors. Now, it has to, but the scary part is that that is just a drop in the bucket compared to what it could be just a few years from now. The only reason it is even this low is that our Treasury yield rates—the rates at which we pay interest on our national debt—are at an alltime, historic low. As soon as they return to their historic averages, we will see that interest payment increase manyfold. If we wait until that moment arrives, this will be a very difficult process not just for the Federal Government, not just for Congress, but for the entire country.

It is time for us to start taking gradual steps in the right direction now. This opportunity—this rescissions package that has been proposed by the President—provides us with a meaningful step in that direction. I applaud President Trump for proposing these rescissions. It is time for Congress to get back in the practice of taking these things up, of considering them, and of passing them.

I respectfully urge all of my colleagues to vote for this measure.

Mr. President, I yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. 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 question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heller	Roberts
Cassidy	Hoeben	Rounds
Corker	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cornyn	Inhofe	Sasse
Cotton	Isakson	Scott
Crapo	Johnson	Shelby
Cruz	Kennedy	Sullivan
Daines	Lankford	Thune
Enzi	Lee	Tillis
Ernst	McConnell	Toomey
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Flake	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Harris	Nelson
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Brown	Heitkamp	Sanders
Burr	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Jones	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Smith
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Udall
Coons	Manchin	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warner
Donnelly	McCaskill	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wyden
Feinstein	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—2

McCain
Shaheen

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Vermont.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ENERGY AND WATER, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, AND MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AND VETERANS AFFAIRS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—Continued

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the humanitarian crisis that is at our southern border right now. We are living through a moment in history when we are literally sending babies and toddlers into detention camps.

Think about that. Think about what I just said. Our Federal Government is sending babies and toddlers to detention camps. This is immoral. It is wrong.

The AP broke a story last night that left me speechless, and I want the details of this horror recorded and documented in the official Senate RECORD so Americans years from now will look back on us and will see how wrong we were.

I will read this article from the Associated Press, called “Youngest Migrants Held in ‘Tender Age’ Shelters.” It is by Garance Burke and Martha Mendoza.

Trump administration officials have been sending babies and other young children forcibly separated from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border to at least three “tender age” shelters in South Texas, the Associated Press has learned.

Lawyers and medical providers who have visited the Rio Grande Valley shelters described play rooms of crying preschool-age children in crisis. The government also plans to open a fourth shelter to house hundreds of young migrant children in Houston, where city leaders denounced the move Tuesday.

Since the White House announced its zero tolerance policy in early May, more than 23,000 children have been taken from their parents at the U.S.-Mexico border, resulting in a new influx of young children requiring government care. The government has faced withering critiques over images of some of the children in cages inside U.S. Border Patrol processing stations.

Decades after the nation’s child welfare system ended the use of orphanages over concerns about the lasting trauma to children, the administration is starting up new institutions to hold Central American toddlers that the government separated from their parents.

“The thought that they are going to be putting such little kids in an institutional setting? I mean it is hard for me even to wrap my mind around it,” said Kay Bellor, vice president for programs at Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service, which provides foster care and other child welfare services to migrant children. “Toddlers are being detained.”

Bellor said shelters follow strict procedures surrounding who can gain access to the children in order to protect their safety, but that means information about their welfare can be limited.

By law, child migrants traveling alone must be sent to facilities run by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services within three days of being detained. The agency then is responsible for placing the children in shelters or foster homes until they are united with a relative or sponsor in the community as they await immigration court hearings.

But U.S. Attorney General Jeff Sessions’ announcement last month that the government would criminally prosecute everyone who crosses the U.S.-Mexico border illegally has led to the breakup of migrant families and sent a new group of hundreds of young children into the government’s care.

The United Nations, some Democratic and Republican lawmakers and religious groups have sharply criticized the policy, calling it inhumane.

Not so, said Steven Wagner, an official with the Department of Health and Human Services.

“We have specialized facilities that are devoted to providing care to children with special needs and tender age children as we define as under 13 would fall into that category,” he said. “They’re not government facilities per se, and they have very well-trained clinicians, and those facilities meet state licensing standards for child welfare agencies, and they’re staffed by people who know how to deal with the needs—particularly of the younger children.”

Until now, however, it’s been unknown where they are.

“In general we do not identify the locations of permanent unaccompanied alien children program facilities,” said agency spokesman Kenneth Wolfe.

The three centers—in Combes, Raymondville, and Brownsville—have been rapidly repurposed to serve needs of children including some under 5. A fourth, planned for Houston, would house up to 240 children in a warehouse previously used for people displaced by Hurricane Harvey, Mayor Sylvester Turner said.

Turner said he met with officials from Austin-based Southwest Key Programs, the contractor that operates some of the child shelters, to ask them to reconsider their plans. A spokeswoman for Southwest Key didn’t immediately reply to an email seeking comment.

“And so there comes a point in time we draw a line, and for me, the line is with these children,” Turner said during a news conference Tuesday.

On a practical level, the zero tolerance policy has overwhelmed the federal agency charged with caring for the new influx of children who tend to be much younger than teens who typically have been traveling to the U.S. alone. Indeed some recent detainees are infants, taken from their mothers.

Doctors and lawyers who have visited the shelter said the facilities were fine, clean and safe, but the kids—who have no idea where their parents are—were hysterical, crying, and acting out.

“The shelters aren’t the problem, it’s taking kids from their parents that’s the problem,” said South Texas pediatrician Marsha Griffin who has visited many.

Alicia Lieberman, who runs the Early Trauma Treatment Network at the University of California, San Francisco, said decades of study show early separations can cause permanent emotional damage.

“Children are biologically programmed to grow best in the care of a parent figure. When that bond is broken through long and unexpected separations with no set timeline for reunion, children respond at the deepest psychological and emotional levels,” she said. “Their fear triggers a flood of stress hormones that disrupt neural circuits in the brain, create high levels of anxiety, make them more susceptible to physical and emotional illness, and damage their capacity to manage their emotions, trust people, and focus their attention on age-appropriate activities.”

Days after Sessions announced the zero-tolerance policy, the government issued a call for proposals from shelter and foster care providers to provide services for the new influx of children taken from their families after journeying from Honduras, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Mexico.

As children are separated from their families, law enforcement agents reclassify them from members of family units to “unaccompanied alien children.” Federal officials said Tuesday that since May, they have separated 2,342 children from their families, rendering them unaccompanied minors in the government’s care.

While Mexico is still the most common country of origin for families arrested at the border, in the last eight months, Honduras has become the fastest-growing category as compared to fiscal year 2017.

During a press briefing [on] Tuesday, reporters repeatedly asked for an age breakdown of the children who have been taken. Officials from both law enforcement and Health and Human Services said they didn’t know how many children were under 5, under 2, or even so little they’re non-verbal.

“The facilities that they have for the most part are not licensed for tender age children,” said Michelle Brane, director of migrant rights at the Women’s Refugee Commission, who met with a 4-year-old girl in diapers in a McAllen warehouse where Border Patrol temporarily holds migrant families. “There is no model for how you house tons of little children in cots institutionally in our country. We don’t do orphanages, our child welfare has recognized that is an inappropriate setting for little children.”

So now, the government has to try to hire more caregivers. The recent call for proposals by the federal government’s Office of Refugee Resettlement said it was seeking applicants who can provide services for a diverse population “of all ages and genders, as well as pregnant and parenting teens.”

Even the policy surrounding what age to take away a baby is inconsistent. Customs and Border Protection field chiefs over all nine southwest border districts can use their discretion over how young is too young, officials said. And while Health and Human Services defines “tender age” typically as 12 and under, Customs and Border Protection has at times defined it as 5 and under.

For 30 years, Los Fresnos, Texas-based International Education Services ran emergency shelters and foster care programs for younger children and pregnant teens who arrived in the U.S. as unaccompanied minors. At least one resident sued for the right to have an abortion in a high-profile case last March.

For reasons the agency did not explain, three months ago the government’s refugee resettlement office said it was ending its funding to the program and transferring all children to other facilities. This came weeks before the administration began its “zero tolerance” policy, prompting a surge in “tender age” migrant children needing shelter.

In recent days, members of Congress have been visiting the shelters and processing centers, or watching news reports about them, bearing witness to the growing chaos. In a letter sent to Attorney General Jeff Sessions on Tuesday, a dozen Republican senators wrote that separating families isn’t consistent with American values and ordinary human decency.

On Tuesday, a Guatemalan mother who hasn’t seen her 7-year-old son since he was taken from her a month ago sued the Trump administration. Beata Mariana de Jesus Mejia-Mejia was released from custody while her asylum case is pending and thinks her son, Darwin, might be in a shelter in Arizona.

“I only got to talk to him once and he sounded so sad. My son never used to sound like that, he was such a dynamic boy,” Mejia-Mejia said as she wept. “I call and call, and no one will tell me where he is.”

The Presiding Officer has young children. I have young children. I am certain he cannot imagine how horrific it would be for him to give up his child

into the hands of those he does not know and then not know where they will take him or her. I am certain he can't imagine that pain and horror. This body should not allow it. We should stand against it. It is morally wrong. It is outrageous, and it must end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TAX REFORM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, 6 months ago, Congress passed historic tax legislation that fundamentally reformed our Tax Code and provided tax relief to middle-income Americans and also to small business job creators.

At the time, many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle attempted to derail our efforts through a campaign of misinformation and demagoguery. They tried to argue that up was down and that tax cuts were tax increases. They even suggested the bill's passage was a sign of Armageddon.

Of course, such fearmongering was always nonsense. At the time, analysis from the nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation had made it clear that the vast majority of taxpayers across every income group would experience tax cuts. In fact, it made clear that middle-income groups would experience the largest percentage of tax cuts. In even looking at the liberal Tax Policy Center's analysis of the bill, the tax relief for the middle class is unmistakable. Its analysis found that more than 80 percent would experience tax cuts that would average more than \$2,100.

In the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we made good on our commitment to fix our broken Tax Code. It makes filing simpler, provides middle-income tax cuts, and reinvigorates our economy through pro-growth business tax reforms.

The positive effects of the tax cuts began almost immediately with companies announcing bonuses, pay raises, higher retirement contributions, new hiring, and increased investment as a result of the law. To date, the list of such companies has climbed to over 600, with there being more than 4 million employees who are benefiting.

This has included a number of businesses in my State of Iowa, which range from the small, like the Anfinson Farm Store, which has invested back into its employees in the form of \$1,000 bonuses and a 5-percent increase in wages, to the very large, like Wells Fargo, which has raised its base wage from \$13.50 to \$15 per hour and benefited more than 1,300 employees.

Higher wages and bonuses are not the only ways that taxpayers are benefiting from the historic tax relief.

Taxpayers across the country are seeing the benefit in the form of lower electric, gas, and water bills. Nationally, utility customers have experienced more than \$3 billion in savings thanks to lower utility rates as a result of tax cuts.

In my State of Iowa, Alliant Energy has estimated its customer savings to be between \$18.6 million and \$19.6 million for electric and from \$500,000 to \$3.7 million for gas. MidAmerican Energy has estimated between \$90 million and \$112 million in customer savings, and Iowa American Water Company has estimated customer savings to be between \$1.5 million and \$1.8 million.

The hundreds of businesses and utility company announcements were only the beginning of the positive news for American taxpayers. In February, taxpayers began seeing the effects of tax reform directly in their paychecks as less was taken out of their pay by the IRS. In all, about 90 percent of taxpayers are seeing less being withheld from their paychecks as a result of the law.

As it became evident that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was delivering meaningful benefits to working families, our Democratic colleagues were in search of new talking points on the law, considering the fact that their old talking points were not working. They could no longer, with a straight face, argue that tax cuts were really tax increases. Instead, they wanted hard-working Americans to believe that an extra \$50 a week in their paychecks or a \$1,000 bonus was "crumbs."

With all due respect to my colleagues who believe that this is true, they don't have a doggone clue what it is like in the real world where people have to work for a living. That \$1,000 bonus means a lot for a father or a mother whose children need new school clothes or who has a car that could use some repairs or who, simply, wants to take the family on a vacation. For a family on a tight budget, every additional dollar in a paycheck really counts. It means an additional dollar that can be put away for unexpected emergencies or for a child's college savings or, maybe, even for one's own retirement.

As important as the immediate middle-income tax benefits are that have been afforded by the law, the benefits that will accrue for everybody in this country as a result of the long-term, pro-growth effects of the bill are as important, if maybe not more important. Thanks to this historic tax measure, as well as to regulatory relief, Congress and the administration have declared that America is open for business. When Congress delivers historic tax cuts and, particularly, regulatory rollbacks, the American people enjoy the sweet taste of prosperity. That is how the cookie crumbles.

Despite critics in this town calling the tax cuts crumbs, I would invite them to chew on a few facts: National unemployment has fallen to 3.8 percent—the lowest level since April 2000. Wages have risen at the fastest pace since the end of the recession. For the first time on record, the number of job openings has exceeded the number of job seekers. U.S. manufacturers report historically high investment and hiring

numbers as 86 percent report they intend to increase investment, and 77 percent report they plan to increase hiring. Small business confidence has hit record highs. Consumer confidence has reached its highest level in 18 years. All of this good economic news points toward higher economic growth moving forward. This is key to sustainable long-term wage growth, which is the most powerful anti-poverty measure there is. This should be welcome news to all after the years of stagnant wage growth during the Obama years.

With all of this positive news, Democrats have been searching for a talking point that they hope will take hold. They are looking for a big distraction from the prosperity that results from this tax bill. Toward that end, they have lambasted corporate stock buybacks. Their hope is that the American public will disregard all the positive signs they have seen in their paychecks and in the economy generally and be outraged by the benefits accruing to stockholders—more class warfare on their part versus the compassion and social justice that this tax reform brings about. It is a play out of their old playbook, in other words. When all else fails, engage in the historic rhetoric of class warfare. But I have news for some of my Democratic colleagues: That dog no longer hunts either. Millions of middle-class Americans own stock—if not directly, through their 401(k) or pension plan. According to the Tax Policy Center, 37 percent of stock is held in retirement accounts. Thus, the idea of stock buybacks being a boon only to corporate fat cats is hogwash. It is a boon to the millions of middle-class Americans who are longing for secure and comfortable retirements.

Moreover, the Democrats' concerns with stock buybacks demonstrate a fundamental misunderstanding of economics. Stock buybacks are fully consistent with one of the main objectives of tax reform; that is, promoting economic growth through capital formation that makes workers more productive, which in turn leads to increased wages. When a company repurchases stock, that money is not stuffed into a mattress; it frees up dollars that can be reinvested in a growing economy or maybe a new startup small business. This in turn promotes the type of business expansion and capital investment necessary to grow our economy, boost productivity, and increase wages over the long term.

Although the economic landscape looks more promising than ever, there is more work to do. Those of us from Iowa are particularly focused on trade agreements and renewable energy policies that impact our home State.

So I hope overall that our colleagues across the aisle will finally put an end to their tired attacks on the tax bill and begin working with us to promote further economic growth that has already started at a high level as a result of this tax bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I want to join my friend, the Senator from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY, and talk about what has happened with the tax bill—the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, as the President insisted it be called because that is exactly what it was to do.

It has been 6 months since it was signed into law, and it is clear that the country is thinking differently about the future. It is clear that there is more confidence in our economy than there has been in past years. It is also clear, frankly, that a lot of that confidence began after the last election and was reinforced by commonsense regulation instead of out-of-control regulation.

The tax bill, on top of that, as it turns out, is doing the things those of us who voted for it said it would do and does not do the things people who were against it said were going to happen. I remember that nobody was going to get a tax cut—only to find out that 9 out of 10 people who paid income tax last year are paying less income tax this year.

This week, the Gallup poll organization found that the percentage of Americans who are satisfied with the direction of the economy is the highest it has been in almost 15 years.

In May, small business optimism increased among small business owners to the second highest level in the National Federation of Independent Business survey's 45-year history. In fact, there were several records that were broken in May. Compensation increases hit a 45-year high. Positive sales trends reached the highest level since 1995—over 20 years ago. Expansion plans were more robust than they had been at any time in the survey's history. That set a record as well.

The combination of lower taxes and full expensing of new and used equipment has created an additional cash flow incentive that is making a difference.

As of this month, 1 million new jobs have been created since the passage of the tax cut bill. In the last year, Missouri—my State—added nearly 35,000 jobs, and more than 4,000 Missourians who were unemployed just found jobs. Nationwide there are more job openings than people looking for work. In the 20 years that those two things have been measured at the same time—how many people are looking for work and how many job openings there are—it is the first time in 20 years that there were more jobs available than people looking for work.

I said a number of times on the floor as we debated the tax bill that there are two ways to increase people's take-home pay. One is to take less money out of the check they already get. Nine out of ten Americans who paid income taxes last year found that has happened for them. No. 2 is to be sure we have better jobs to start with, have an

economy where people are competing to get workers and competing to keep workers.

As businesses try to attract new employees, they are setting new, higher minimum entry-level skills and minimum job compensation than they have had before. The National Federation of Independent Business found that 35 percent of all small business owners reported increases in their labor compensation. One out of three NFIB employers says they are paying more now than they were 1 year ago.

In addition, the report found that nearly 60 percent of respondents are hiring or trying to hire. When 60 percent of the respondents to a survey are trying to hire, that is pretty good news. It is good news for the economy, but it is also good news for people out there trying to get hired. If you are in an economy where lots of people are looking for workers, you are in a lot better place than if you are in an economy where only a few people are looking for workers.

We need to make sure we have a skills and training match that gets people into those better jobs that are out there. I was all over our State a couple of weeks ago, in 10 different cities over 3 days attending business roundtables and going to manufacturing locations. In my hometown of Springfield, one manufacturing location had 20 available jobs right then. Other people were telling me that they have hired people back whom they had fired in the past, and the approach was: If you want a second chance, I know you know how to do what we do here. If you are ready to give it another try, I am ready to give it another try. That doesn't happen very often in very many economies.

According to the survey the Association of General Contractors released this year, more than three-fourths of the people who responded to that survey said they couldn't find or they were having a hard time finding the qualified workers they need.

In a bill that we will mark up in the Appropriations Committee next week, the subcommittee that I chair—the Labor, Education, Health and Human Services Subcommittee—we are going to continue to build this apprenticeship program in a bipartisan way that Congress has embraced. The President likes this program. We have had a 53-percent increase in just the last couple of years in the training money available for apprenticeships.

Two hundred years ago, apprenticeships were the way everybody learned to do whatever it was they were going to do. If you were going to learn a skill, you were going to learn it as an apprentice.

This is a program that really gives the employers the tools they need to develop the workforce they would like to have. It gives workers an opportunity to earn a salary while they are learning skills. It does that in a way that makes it possible for employers to

do a couple things at the same time: prepare their own workforce, get people ready for work, and put people in a situation where they are suddenly showing up for work every day, learning skills while they are there, learning a lot of things that will get them ready for full-time employment.

For the 9 out of 10 Americans who complete apprenticeship training programs and get a job—and again, 9 out of 10 people who go through those programs get a job, and the average starting salary for those jobs is \$60,000 a year. These are not minimum wage jobs; these are significant opportunities to start at that level and work your way up. I hear from businesses and I hear from unions in Missouri all the time about the need for skilled workers and about the long-term careers that can result from meeting that skilled-worker need.

As we continue to focus on training our 21st-century workforce, we know there are a lot of challenges we have to address. Next week, our subcommittee will consider our bill. Dedicating resources for programs geared toward better preparing and training the next generation of workers is one of our top priorities.

I am pleased that the Trump administration has also taken important steps to strengthen apprenticeship programs. Last year, the administration issued an Executive order that doubled the amount the Federal Government spent on apprenticeship programs. In addition, the order shifted the role of developing government-funded workforce development programs from the Labor Department to private sector entities, such as trade groups, unions, and businesses, which, frankly, are much more likely to produce the workforce they know they need than a government program that is much more likely to produce the workforce we might have needed a couple of years ago.

This is a program that is working. With an economy growing as fast as ours, we need to promote job skills and training that fit the jobs of the future. We need to ensure that opportunities are available for workers in rural areas, suburban areas, and urban areas alike. It is critical that we ensure that Federal programs are designed to continue to take advantage of the apprenticeship model that is working.

Just a couple of years ago, I don't think people would have predicted where we would be with our economy today. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act had a lot to do with that—resetting the foundation of our economy, making it possible for us to compete around the world, going from the highest corporate rate in the world to a rate right in the middle. We are fine in the middle. Nobody is fine, if they are trying to compete, when they give themselves the biggest disadvantage in that field of competition.

It has only been 6 months, but it has been a pretty good 6 months, and I

think we will continue to see the good news we have been seeing as people develop more confidence in their ability to take care of their families and to take care of themselves, and more confidence in the economy is going to make that possible.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, as some of my colleagues mentioned already, today marks 6 months since Congress passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and sent it to the President's desk to become law. When the President signed the legislation, he helped usher in the first major overhaul of the Tax Code in three decades.

Here are some of the results we have seen so far: Over 1 million new jobs have been created since the package of tax reform; at least 101 utilities across the country are lowering rates for customers, including Entergy Arkansas in my home State, as a result of the savings they are seeing from the tax reform bill; and 75 percent of small and independent business owners believe that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will have a positive impact on their businesses, which is leading them to make plans to invest in hiring and increase employees' compensation.

I could go on highlighting the good news related to our overhaul of the Tax Code, but instead I want to spend just a few minutes talking about what I have heard from small business owners and employees—beneficiaries of this historic reform—on a recent visit I made to Arkansas in the south and southwest regions.

Last month, I had the opportunity to travel around Arkansas' Fourth Congressional District with Congressman BRUCE WESTERMAN. We embarked on a tour called the "Talk Small Y'all" Small Business Tour to highlight the importance of small businesses to our State's economy and to local communities where they make such a significant impact. The tour was designed to be an opportunity for us to listen and learn, which is exactly what we did. We visited with business owners, managers, and employees of manufacturing companies, an oilfield and industrial products supplier, a food service distributor, dining establishments, and retail stores.

Everywhere we went, we heard a sense of optimism and excitement in the voices of those we were fortunate to meet. In addition to eliminating burdensome regulations through the Congressional Review Act, the passage of meaningful, historic tax reform—which makes our Nation's businesses more competitive globally—is pro-

viding cause for business owners to feel more confident about the current economic climate. Tax reform is helping to provide them with the certainty they need to grow and to succeed.

I came to the floor in February to talk about the developments we were seeing in Arkansas as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, just 2 months after it was signed into law. Despite the dire warnings from our friends on the other side of the aisle who opposed our changes to the Tax Code, businesses across the country and in Arkansas were already beginning to reap the benefits and passing them along to their employees, their customers, and the communities they operate in.

I am pleased to say that this trend is continuing. More companies based in Arkansas or with a significant presence in the State are handing out bonuses, improving benefits, or investing in their businesses and their communities. Tax reform is helping hard-working Arkansans keep more of their money in their own pockets. It is delivering results that are helping the middle class.

On the 6-month anniversary of the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, I join my colleagues in celebrating this achievement and the results that have followed from our commitment to make comprehensive tax reform a reality.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 2926 AND 2971 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2910

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following amendments be called up en bloc: Young No. 2926 and Tester No. 2971. I further ask that the time until 4:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form and that at 4:30 p.m. the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed and, finally, that there be no second-degree amendments in order to the amendments prior to the votes.

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

The clerk will report the amendments en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BOOZMAN], for others, proposes amendments numbered 2926 and 2971 en bloc to amendment No. 2910.

The amendments are as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2926

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the effectiveness of the Veterans Crisis Line)

At the end of section 232 of title II of division C, add the following:

(c)(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a study on the effectiveness of

the hotline specified in subsection (a) during the five-year period beginning on January 1, 2016, based on an analysis of national suicide data and data collected from such hotline.

(2) At a minimum, the study required by paragraph (1) shall—

(A) determine the number of veterans who contact the hotline specified in subsection (a) and who receive follow up services from the hotline or mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs thereafter;

(B) determine the number of veterans who contact the hotline who are not referred to, or do not continue receiving, mental health care who commit suicide; and

(C) determine the number of veterans described in subparagraph (A) who commit or attempt suicide.

AMENDMENT NO. 2971

(Purpose: To prevent the denial of access to records and documents by various inspectors general)

At the appropriate place in title II of division C, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . INSPECTORS GENERAL.

(a) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to deny an Inspector General funded under this Act timely access to any records, documents, or other materials available to the department or agency of the United States Government over which such Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.), or to prevent or impede the access of such Inspector General to such records, documents, or other materials, under any provision of law, except a provision of law that expressly refers to such Inspector General and expressly limits the right of access of such Inspector General.

(b) TIMELY ACCESS.—A department or agency covered by this section shall provide its Inspector General access to all records, documents, and other materials in a timely manner.

(c) COMPLIANCE.—Each Inspector General covered by this section shall ensure compliance with statutory limitations on disclosure relevant to the information provided by the department or agency over which that Inspector General has responsibilities under the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

(d) REPORT.—Each Inspector General covered by this section shall report to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives within 5 calendar days of any failure by any department or agency covered by this section to comply with this section.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

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

FAMILY SEPARATION POLICY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we have been focused on the U.S.-Mexico border, where the prospect of children being separated from their family has shocked and horrified many of us. We have been working to come up with a solution to this problem. That includes President Trump, who yesterday called

on Congress to preserve family unity, while calling for a zero tolerance policy when it comes to violating our immigration laws.

I would like to provide a little bit of context for how we got here and offer a proposed solution. Just like under the Obama administration in 2014, when we saw tens of thousands of unaccompanied children coming across the border into my State of Texas from Central America through Mexico—I remember at the time President Obama called that a humanitarian crisis, and, indeed, it was—trying to find a way to deal with this flood of humanity coming across our border in a safe and humane manner was a huge challenge for the Federal Government, for local communities, like McAllen, TX, and for various faith-based and other organizations. But come they did.

Between August 1 of last year and May 31 of this year, the number of families apprehended at the southwest border rose 58 percent, compared with the same period a year earlier. Of course, just like the humanitarian crisis of 2014, most of these individuals came from Central America. I think it is important to point out that even though these are not unaccompanied minors in the same number that we saw in 2014, we are still seeing so far this year roughly 30,000 children coming across our southwestern border from across dangerous territory in Mexico and from Central America, transported by human traffickers and the cartels, for whom this is their business model. Let me explain for a minute.

Recently, an expert on this topic made the point that these criminal organizations that run children, families, and other adults across the border are “commodity agnostic.” That is what he said. In other words, they don’t care whether it is drugs, contraband, children, or adults. Whatever it is, they are in it for the money, and they have found an incredibly profitable business model in transporting all of those commodities, if you can call them that, from Central America and across the Mexican border.

For those who are worried about the opioid crisis here in America, which we all are, it is not just about prescription drugs—that is a huge part of the problem—but it is also the heroin that is frequently substituted for the prescription drugs because it is cheap and it is more plentiful. So all of these are good reasons, in my mind, for us to be very focused on what happens at our border.

My State happens to have 1,200 miles of common border with Mexico, and we are at ground zero when it comes to the border security challenges and when it comes to the humanitarian crises and to the law enforcement challenges that go along with it.

This Friday, Senator CRUZ, my colleague from Texas, and I will be traveling to Brownsville and McAllen, TX, to once again get an idea of what the facts are on the ground. We have been there many times before, of course, and

have worked hand in glove with our local and State officials, with our faith-based organizations and with everybody who is concerned about what is happening at the border, including the Border Patrol, the Texas National Guard, and the like.

I want to make one point when it comes to those who enter our country in order to claim asylum, as many of these people do from Central America. They claim a fear of persecution as the basis for a claim for asylum, but those who present themselves lawfully at ports of entry—those are the bridges that enter into the United States—can do so and claim asylum without violating any immigration laws. As Secretary Nielsen, the Department of Homeland Security Secretary, said, it is only those who try to enter the country in those vast areas between the ports of entry, which is exceedingly dangerous, by the way, who violate our immigration laws when they enter the United States illegally. When they come with a child, whether it is their biological child or somebody they claim is their child—maybe the cartels have figured out that if they pair these people up, they have found another way to exploit vulnerabilities in the system—it presents the challenges that we have seen here in the last few days.

I want to emphasize that we have seen the arrival of families and children before. So none of this is new, but we do need to put what is happening now in proper context. As the Secretary of Homeland Security, Ms. Nielsen, has said, if the situation in your home country is dangerous and if you have chosen to seek asylum for your family in the United States, there is no reason for you to enter the United States illegally. We saw this during the previous policy that was since eliminated by the Obama administration of Cuban refugees who, because of a unique policy called “wet foot, dry foot,” once they crossed over our ports of entry, they were entitled to seek refuge in the United States under the laws at the time. So none of this is new.

As I said, people with a credible fear of persecution in their home countries may present their claims through a normal, well-defined process. There is no reason for somebody to expose themselves, much less their children, to the dangerous, remote regions—areas I call the wild, wild west—down along the border in order to try to sneak through by illicit means.

But people do sometimes falsely claim a credible fear of persecution. In other words, they don’t qualify for asylum. So that is why it is so important for us to give them an opportunity and to insist that they present those claims to an immigration judge on a timely basis so those claims can be properly evaluated.

The Trump administration has made the very commonsensical decision to have a zero tolerance policy when it comes to illegal immigration. They

have made the decision to fully enforce our laws by prosecuting adults in criminal courts when they are apprehended crossing our borders illegally. In my opinion, that is exactly the right decision—enforce the laws as written. The relevant laws—the ones that criminalize illegal crossings—have been on the books for a long time. They are a product of congressional action and Presidential approval, like all legislation. These are not something that President Trump created out of whole cloth, as some people would have you believe. But the truth is that often these laws were not enforced by previous administrations and, particularly, when families were involved. Now that they are being enforced, the adults are, unfortunately, under the status quo, separated from families as part of the legal process as it plays itself out. It is not because of any desire to separate families and children, but rather because of previous Federal court decisions, consent decrees, and statutes that Congress has passed that require children to be placed in a separate, safe setting. In other words, we don’t want to place children in a jail cell with hardened, potentially violent criminals because the adult that brought them into the country has violated our criminal laws. So putting the children in a safe, separate setting was really motivated by the best of intentions.

The relevant authorities are important to acknowledge because, as the New York Times has stated this last weekend, contrary to what you may have heard, “technically, there is no Trump administration policy stating that illegal border crossers must be separated from their children.”

What there are, instead, are many variables that are hard to disentangle from one another, and, I think, unfortunately, those who would like to create a false narrative here have taken advantage of the complexity of these laws and the situation in order to claim some sort of sinister intent to tear children away from their parents unnecessarily. That is not the goal. In fact our goal is just the opposite: How do we keep these children with their families, pending the decision by an immigration judge of whether or not they have a viable claim to asylum or some other benefit.

The so-called Flores agreement is one of those laws that are required to be observed which requires that children can be held no longer than 20 days. A Ninth Circuit opinion applies the Flores bill to family units, protracted timelines for asylum claims, limited detention facilities, and a division of responsibility among ICE, or Immigration and Custom Enforcement, Health and Human Services, and other agencies. All of this adds to the complexity of this situation.

Most of these factors are pretty uncontroversial. I think every Member will agree with the Trump administration that we should never place children in prisons or jails with hardened,

potentially violent criminals when their parents are being lawfully prosecuted for entering the country illegally.

We need to see that this is how we got to where we are now. They are entirely reasonable decisions that seemed to make sense at the time—that children should not be held for any longer than is strictly necessary, that they should never be detained with adults in a jail cell in potentially dangerous circumstances. A lot of that seemed to make sense at the time. By the same token, I and many others certainly don't want family members to be separated from one another as a consequence of officials doing their duty and enforcing the laws they are sworn to uphold.

I know Customs and Border Protection leaders like Manny Padilla, chief of the Rio Grande Valley sector, and David Higginson, and all of the other men and women who work under them in the Rio Grande Valley, are trying to do their job. They are trying to enforce the law. That is what we have asked them to do. That is their duty. It is a good thing, and I think we should all appreciate their attempt to do so in a very complex environment.

This is where I have some questions for the minority leader Senator SCHUMER and others. Senator FEINSTEIN, my friend from California whom I have worked with on a number of pieces of legislation, secured the support of all Members of the Democratic side of the aisle on a piece of legislation which does nothing to ensure that the law will be enforced. Sure, it purports to deal with family separation but basically provides a get-out-of-jail-free card to any adult who illegally crosses the border. In fact, they go from a zero tolerance program by President Trump's administration to a zero enforcement program, thus creating an incentive for people to illegally immigrate across the border and making it almost impossible for law enforcement to enforce our immigration laws. That will continue to be a draw on people from different parts of the world who would love to move to the United States.

We can be sympathetic. We can be concerned. We should do everything within our power to help them so they can live in their own country safely, but we know we simply can't have an open border policy so anybody and everybody who wants to move to the United States can do so. That is why we have exceptions like asylum claims that have to be decided by an immigration judge.

Yesterday, Senator SCHUMER said President Trump alone could fix this situation by signing a Presidential order, but even though the President has stated his decision to do so, I think that is likely not going to be decided finally by the President but rather by the courts when that Executive order is challenged based on the other legal considerations I mentioned a moment

ago: the Ninth Circuit decision, a consent decree in the Flores case, and other statutes.

I don't think our friend, the Democratic leader, actually believes President Trump can do this by a flick of a pen, as he said; otherwise, he wouldn't have cosponsored the bill by the Senator from California to address this situation. Why in the world would he propose legislation if he actually sincerely believes the President alone can fix this problem?

The truth is, we in Congress and the President have a shared responsibility and a role to play in addressing this crisis at the border, but the result of the proposal by the Senator from California, embraced and cosponsored by the Democratic leader, is that it makes it impossible to enforce the laws Congress has written when it comes to adults illegally entering the United States when they are accompanied by a child.

We should not be under any illusion that the criminal organizations that facilitate the movement of people from other countries into the United States—they understand these gaps in our laws. That is why they sent tens of thousands of unaccompanied children into the United States in 2014, creating that humanitarian crisis. They know well that because of the gaps in our law that allow adults with children to be treated differently, they are exploiting that for financial gain.

The result of the proposal by the minority leader and our Democratic colleagues means it is impossible to enforce laws that Congress has written. Ending zero tolerance means ignoring the law, and that amounts to ignoring the will of the people who put Members of Congress in office and ending our respect for the rule of law. Ending zero tolerance, as they would seek to do, means tolerating criminal activity. As I mentioned, these are organized criminal organizations—they are sometimes called transnational criminal organizations—and they will trade in anything that makes them money: People, guns, drugs, any sort of contraband we can imagine. Not applying the law to illegal entry does nothing but fuel them and feed their money machine, which is why they continue to do what they do.

The other concern I have with the legislation proposed by our Democratic colleagues, even though they have said only the President can fix it, is that while legislation from the Senator from California does seek to keep families together—a goal we share—it doesn't specify where those families should be held. That is a big problem because when it comes to the safety of these children, we don't want to leave that open to interpretation or misunderstanding. We want to be sure and clear that these families are kept in separate residential housing facilities, away from hardened and potentially violent criminals, but our Democratic colleagues' bill that every single one of the Democrats in the Senate has signed

on to doesn't even address that. As I said, in fact, their bill would likely result in many adults entering the United States illegally getting off scot-free because of the no enforcement zone, basically extending within up to 120 miles from the border. Basically, Federal law enforcement authorities, not just the Border Patrol but the FBI, the U.S. attorneys, and others, would be essentially prohibited from prosecuting anybody for violation of our laws.

Now, all of us sat up and paid close attention when former First Lady Laura Bush and the current First Lady Melania Trump expressed their concerns about family separation and called on us to find a better way to answer the current crisis, and I agree with them. In fact, we have gotten off to a pretty good start.

Led by our colleague from North Carolina, some of our colleagues and I, just a few minutes ago, introduced a bill called the Keep Families Together and Enforce the Law Act. The goals of this legislation are pretty straightforward: keep families together in safe, secure facilities while their cases are waiting to be decided by a court.

We set mandatory standards of care for family residential centers to make sure they are hygienic and safe and the sort of place where we can treat people compassionately.

We also authorize 225 new immigration judges because of the huge backlog that makes it hard to handle all the cases that come across the border. We give these families a chance to move to the head of the line to get their cases decided on an expedited basis so that while they are being detained in these safe, secure, family facilities, their cases can be decided quickly. Also, if they are entitled to an immigration benefit like asylum, they could be afforded that on a reasonable timetable and not left in limbo for any longer than absolutely necessary.

Now, I believe, talking to my friend the senior Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, that these are elements of a bill we might be able to agree to, Democrats and Republicans, in order to address the common concerns we have about family separation. Throughout the course of our discussions, though, it has become clear this is something we all believe; that families crossing the border should be kept together. Where we may differ is whether that should also go along with a joint commitment to enforce our immigration laws, but, as I said earlier, this is not an either-or situation. We can keep parents and children together while, at the same time, remaining resolute in enforcing our immigration laws—something I believe we should do.

The Trump administration has said it will not tolerate any violation of those laws and that all offenders will remain on the table for prosecution, but there is no reason for our Democratic colleagues to oppose what I have

laid out. Either we are or we are not a nation of laws, with a government that enforces those laws, or we are a nation with no law and open borders; simply waving through anybody who wants to come into the country at their discretion.

So I would urge all of our colleagues to work together to continue talking about and supporting a bill that represents these shared values. If we come together, we can resolve the situation swiftly and ensure that these children are kept together with their families and, as I said, that they can be expeditiously presented before an immigration judge so they can present any legitimate claim they may have to any immigration benefit. I think that is a commonsense solution to this problem, and I look forward to our colleagues working together to try to solve it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as we know, last week President Trump took what I believe is a historic first step in making America and the whole world more safe, more stable, and more secure. I believe his efforts to end North Korea's nuclear weapons program have already produced tangible results. North Korea has suspended nuclear tests and is dismantling a test facility. They have also committed to recovering and sending home the remains of Americans killed during the Korean war.

Now the Trump administration is taking the next steps. The State Department is hard at work on followup discussions. Secretary of State Pompeo says he may personally return to North Korea before very long.

When we heard from President Trump about his trip to Singapore last week, he was upbeat about the talks. He understands these followup talks are going to be where the specifics really start to be discussed. That is where, as they say, the rubber meets the road. I think the talks have a very real opportunity for success. Success means an agreement that is durable, enforceable, and verifiable. It means an agreement that eliminates all nuclear weapons from North Korea and from the entire Korean Peninsula—nothing less. So I am cautiously optimistic about the talks.

President Trump has applied a program of maximum pressure, and that has brought North Korea to the table. We had a hearing in the Foreign Relations Committee, and the upload from the whole discussion was this: Sanctions work.

The next stage of these negotiations is going to help us understand whether now is the right time, whether the Kim regime is truly ready to give up its nuclear weapons. If it is not ready, the pressure can resume. The pressure can even be increased. The maximum-pressure approach will ultimately work—if not today, then someday.

Meanwhile, the United States is in a very strong negotiating position. We know that as a result of the efforts by President Trump and the strong position we are in, it is something that not just we know but North Korea knows as well. We know exactly what we need to have happen in these talks and exactly what North Korea must do. We are willing to walk away if an agreement falls short. That is how you win a negotiation.

When President Obama negotiated with Iran over their nuclear program, I think he lost sight of that important rule. He wanted a deal so badly that what he was willing to accept was a bad deal. President Trump is a negotiator, and I am confident that he is going to walk away if the only deal to be had is one that is bad for the United States.

I am confident we can reach our goals of a nuclear-free North Korea—today or at some point down the road. I remain very clear-eyed, as does the President, about the possibilities, as well as the pitfalls, and I think we should be clear-eyed and concerned.

The world remains a very dangerous place. Our adversaries, including North Korea, are cunning, opportunistic, and aggressive. We need to be sure we don't lose sight of whom we are dealing with. The Kim regime, going back to his father and grandfather, has a history of appalling attacks on their own people. They have shown no interest in the human rights, political rights, or civil liberties of North Koreans. I think history will judge this family very harshly.

All that said, making the world a safer place and doing what is best for America means we have to deal with other countries as they are. Sometimes it includes sitting down to negotiate with other countries and other leaders who have a terrible record on human rights. The United States must continue to do all we can to force hostile nations back from the brink of war. We must encourage countries to embrace democracy, to abide by the rule of law, and to support the freedoms and rights of all people. As President Kennedy once said, "Is not peace, in the last analysis, basically a matter of human rights?"

The worst human rights violations imaginable would be a nuclear explosion killing millions of people, some of them instantly, many of them slowly and in agony. President Trump knows that is what these negotiations are about, that the stakes are high, and that Mike Pompeo is the right person for this difficult job. He understands the people he is negotiating with, and he understands the facts on the ground.

During his confirmation hearing to be Secretary of State, Mike Pompeo said an interesting thing about America's place in the world. He said: "If we don't lead for democracy, for prosperity, and for human rights around the world, who will?" I think it is clear that the Secretary of State approaches

these talks with a clear understanding of what American leadership looks like. He also knows what American strength looks like.

The President hit the "pause" button on military exercises scheduled for later this year. He can just as easily restart those exercises. We have 28,000 U.S. troops in South Korea. I have visited some of them who are from my home State of Wyoming. The U.S. Navy is still in the area; they remain ready at a moment's notice.

So America is going to be in a position of strength at every step of these negotiations, whether it is economically, diplomatically, politically, or militarily.

I was critical of President Obama's Iran deal because it was a bad deal, not because ending Iran's nuclear program was a bad idea. I was critical of the Iran deal because it gave up too much in return for too little. It made permanent concessions for temporary return. I was critical because it was done without the support of the American people through their representatives in the Senate. I am confident that President Trump will not make the same mistakes. President Trump has given Kim Jong Un a taste—just a taste—of what it means to be welcomed as one of the peaceful, civilized nations of the world. It is up to Kim whether he wants to remain in this world or whether he wants to return to being an isolated, backward, pariah state, as North Korea has been for so long. It is up to Kim whether he wants to embrace civilized norms of respecting human rights and the freedom of his people. That is his decision to make.

As for the rest of us, we can remain hopeful while still being skeptical. We cannot insist that the talks in North Korea must lead to great breakthrough immediately. Nobody can make a promise like that, and no one can expect that as the only standard for success. What we can expect is that our President will always put the interests of the American people first, whether he is negotiating with our allies or with our adversaries. That is what the American people expect, and I think all of us can rest assured that President Trump will keep that promise.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

FAMILY IMPRISONMENT POLICY

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, as we await the details of the President's Executive order today, we know enough already to have serious and significant concerns about the continuing policy of this administration in dealing with asylum seekers coming across our borders.

Make no mistake—ending family separation would be a welcomed and humane step, but the solution cannot be the immoral and unlawful detention and imprisonment of children. Family separation cannot be replaced with

family incarceration and imprisonment. Indefinitely imprisoning children and families is still inhumane and ineffective law enforcement.

President Trump's current policy, as articulated in this Executive order, will put children behind bars indefinitely and indiscriminately, and that is intolerable in a free and democratic society. Children will experience much of the same lasting trauma that they do now in the current situation, and the world will continue to watch the spectacle of the American Government locking up innocent children and throwing away the key. Locking up innocent children indiscriminately and indefinitely is a betrayal of American values.

Much like the policy of family separation, this new policy of indefinite and indiscriminate family imprisonment harkens back to the worst days of our country's history.

Japanese children thrown into World War II-era detention camps were imprisoned with their parents, but the days of history rightly judged that decision harshly, and history will also judge us harshly if we permit an inhumane and immoral policy to be carried out without our protests and opposition. Instead, we must now shame the administration into adopting a humane and moral policy.

This policy threatens to be costly. It will be costly in dollars and cents. The estimate is, approximately, almost \$800 per day for every incarcerated person or detained individual. Even more costly will be the undermining of our moral authority and our image around the world and our own sense of offending our basic morality, our image of ourselves, and our sense of our own morality must be offended by imprisoning, indefinitely and indiscriminately, families with their children.

There are alternatives. One is stronger oversight and supervision over families who can be released without danger of flight or physical violence. These programs have been tried, and they have been proven successful. Family case management efforts have produced appearance rates above 90 percent, and those alternatives must be explored instead of detaining and incarcerating, indefinitely and indiscriminately, children with their families.

The world and all of us were repulsed by the images of children separated from their families. Those sights and sounds were searingly painful, but so must be children in cages and behind bars indefinitely, without the basic services and respect for humanity that our great Nation has epitomized.

At the core of the current administration policy is so-called zero tolerance, which results in criminal prosecution of the asylum seekers. The President has recognized the public outrage and yielded to it, but the policy of zero tolerance will continue.

The current approach of detaining and incarcerating these children indefi-

nately likely violates court orders issued in 1997 and 2016, but indefinite and indiscriminate imprisonment of children and families ought to violate, as well, our rules of morality and humanity.

I urge the administration to explore alternatives, to work with Congress on real reform, to support the legislation that has been supported by every Democrat in this body that would, in effect, avoid imprisonment of immigrant families.

Beyond that legislation, we should pass compassionate and comprehensive immigration reform that provides a pathway to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants currently living in the shadows and improves the due process right so that adjudication is fairer and more effective.

We must shame this administration to do what is right—to end zero tolerance and support changes to our immigration system that represent the best in America, not as the House bills to be voted on today or tomorrow reflect the worst.

We are here on World Refugee Day, appropriately. We ought to acknowledge the remarkable journey of refugees and asylum seekers as they pursue freedom and opportunity over the immense obstacles they encounter. We should recognize their contributions to our country, the talents and energy they bring here. We should recognize the humanitarian importance of refugee resettlement programs nationwide.

Though victims of global conflict come here from all parts of the world, almost all of these refugees are also resilient survivors who embrace their new lives and contribute to their communities, even after these harrowing journeys to the United States. Too often we fail to recognize their contributions to American communities, but today we celebrate all that they offer.

Today, on World Refugee Day, we commemorate that Connecticut, since 2005, has resettled 7,000 refugees—our small State, with 3½ million people from all over the world, particularly in major resettlement cities like Bridgeport, Hartford, and New Haven.

Today, proudly, I wish to share some of the stories from refugees who have made Connecticut their home and highlight the important work my constituents are doing to support refugees. There are several refugee agencies throughout Connecticut that serve as a key touchstone for these refugees by providing essential case management and employment services. I am proud of these organizations and am grateful for the work they do.

IRIS—Integrated Refugee & Immigrant Services—is Connecticut's largest refugee resettlement and immigrant services organization headquartered in New Haven. Volunteers welcome and resettle refugee families in over 35 of Connecticut's towns. Likewise, the Connecticut Insti-

tute for Refugees and Immigrants, located in Bridgeport, assists refugees and immigrants in resolving legal, economic, linguistic, and social barriers as they integrate into their communities.

Let me tell you about the journey of Issa, Aminah, and their three children. They resettled in Westville, CT, the night of the 2016 Presidential election. This family fled Syria to Jordan after one of their members was abducted and beaten by the regime. When they arrived in the United States, Issa started working as a parking attendant at a hospital parking garage, and Aminah launched a thriving catering business. Their children are thrilled to attend school again after years of educational disruption caused by their displacement.

Let me tell you about Rafid. He was an electrical engineer in Baghdad who worked with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers during military operations in Iran. After he received death threats from insurgents, he fled with his family to Jordan and then resettled in Connecticut, where he works as a team leader at Schick Manufacturing in Milford. He also started his own subcontracting company, Golden Gate CT, to create jobs for other Connecticut residents. He is truly an entrepreneur in the best sense of that word.

Francis and Evelyn fled persecution in Rwanda and the Democratic Republic of the Congo to resettle in Bridgeport, CT. When they shared their story with my office, they said: "We understood that the American Dream was alive in each of us if we wished to move forward and work hard." Francis and Evelyn certainly embody that American dream.

Connecticut constituents have embraced these refugee families. They have opened their hearts to these individuals and families who are seeking nothing less than the American dream and escape from the trauma of war, the violence of persecution, and the face of oppression. In the face of unimaginable upheaval and horror, they have come to this country and made that journey. I am grateful to them for their courage.

I wish to recognize one of my constituents who has demonstrated equal courage and strength, a Trinity College professor, Janet Bauer. She has dedicated her entire career to welcoming and integrating families. She established the Hartford Global Migration Lab, which connects college students and refugees. Through this program, Janet's students tutor at Jubilee House and help children with their homework at the Hartford Public Library.

Like her, Jean Silk, a coordinator with the Jewish Community Alliance for Refugee Settlement, has also worked with refugees and done immeasurable good. At a time of global conflict, when the horrors of war are all too real every day, the Trump administration has capped refugee resettlement at 45,000 this fiscal year—the lowest in American history. Even with

this cap, the estimate is that the United States will resettle only about 20,000 refugees this year.

Each of these numbers represents an individual human life transformed by coming to this country, given new light and life. I hope the administration will commit to resettling at least 75,000 refugees in fiscal year 2019.

Again, as I close, I want to emphasize the importance of this day, the historic significance of our turning a point and taking advantage of an opportunity to do right and to do better than we have. I urge that colleagues across the aisle join in supporting a policy that stops indefinite and indiscriminate imprisonment of children. It may be with their families, but it recalls the worst chapters in our history when families were detained indiscriminately and indefinitely.

When the judgment of history is made, I hope we will be spared the kind of blame that rightly went to previous generations who made the wrong decision. Let us do what is best for America. Let us exemplify the best in America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the 74th anniversary of the GI bill, which we will be celebrating later this week.

Before the Senator from Connecticut leaves the floor, I want to thank him for his comments. I want to follow up briefly on what he has said. As the Presiding Officer knows, and our colleague from Connecticut knows, every Wednesday morning, there is a prayer breakfast. Democrats, Republicans, Independents, and a number of Senators from both sides have breakfast together. One of the Senators talks about their faith and how their faith affects the way they approach their work here, our work here.

Today, I was invited to speak, and I mentioned that sometimes when people say "What kind of Democrat are you?" I say I am a Democrat who has read Matthew 25.

People say: What is Matthew 25?

Matthew 25 goes something like this. When I was hungry, did you feed me? When I was naked, did you clothe me? When I was thirsty, did you give me something to drink? When I was sick and imprisoned, did you visit me? When I was a stranger in your land, did you welcome me?

Every day here, the Chaplain starts our session with a prayer, and we have Bible study groups. I want to take a minute, and I don't expect my friend from Connecticut to stay on the floor, but I want him to hear the beginning of this. I just want to cite a couple of Scriptures. There are one or two in the Old Testament and maybe one or two in the New Testament.

In the Book of Leviticus in the Old Testament, chapter 19, we read these words: "When a stranger resides with you in your land, you shall not wrong him."

The next verse, 34, reads: "You should treat the stranger who sojourns with you as the native among you, and you shall love him [or her] as yourself, for you were strangers in the land of Egypt."

In the New Testament are the words of Jesus. We read in Matthew 18, I think verses 2 through 6: "He called a little child [meaning Jesus] and placed the child among them."

Jesus said to them: "Truly, I tell you, unless you change and become like little children, you will never enter the kingdom of Heaven. Therefore, whoever takes the lowly position of this child [who was with him that day] is the greatest in the kingdom of Heaven. And whoever welcomes one such child in my Name welcomes me."

Matthew 18:6 reads: "If anyone causes one of these little ones, those who believe in me, to stumble, it would be better for them to have a large millstone hung around their neck than be drowned in the depths of the sea."

That is pretty straight talk or, as we used to say in the Navy, the straight skinny. Those are good words from the Old Testament and the New Testament to keep in mind.

Again, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for his words.

74TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GI BILL

Mr. President, our colleague from Connecticut, by the way, is somebody who has spent time in uniform. His sons have spent time in uniform, and I think one or two are still serving.

When I came back from Southeast Asia at the end of the Vietnam war, after having been a naval flight officer for a number of years, I was fortunate to have been eligible for the GI bill. The GI bill that I was eligible for was a bill that provided me \$250 a month to help pay for my tuition and my expenses at the University of Delaware, where I was in the business school trying to earn an MBA, which I ultimately did.

The benefit for GIs today is not \$250 a month. As my colleagues know, whatever the tuition costs are, they are paid for by the GI bill. If you go to a private school or something like that outside of your State, the benefit could be higher. There is a cap on that, but I think it is over \$20,000. The expenses for tuition, tutoring, books, and fees are paid for by the GI bill. In Delaware, there is a monthly housing allowance, and there is in every State. The monthly housing allowance in Delaware is \$2,000 a month. That compares with those of us who, at the end of the Vietnam war, received \$250 a month.

I don't deny or feel bad about the current GIs—sailors, airmen, airwomen. I don't feel bad about their getting a lot more, because it is a good benefit, and it is one that is worth celebrating.

My dad came back from World War II, and my uncle served either in World War II or Korea. I was born after the war was over. Somewhere along the line when I was a little kid, my dad

talked about how he got his early training after the war, but I was not old enough to understand what he was talking about. Shortly after the war ended in 1945, he went back to West Virginia.

As best I could figure out, other people took advantage of the GI bill, which was new then. They went to colleges and universities. My recollection is that Frank Lautenberg, who was a Senator for a number of years, went to Harvard. People went to different kinds of colleges and universities and maybe to community colleges.

Apparently, my dad got training not by going to a 2-year school or a 4-year school but by gaining a skill. The skill that he apparently gained was to be able to fix wrecked cars and to do bodywork on those cars. He worked at a place called Burleson Oldsmobile in Beckley, WV. He must have been pretty good at what he did. One day, an insurance adjuster came in from Nationwide Insurance to look at a car that was insured by Nationwide. He talked to my dad for a while.

The insurance agent from Nationwide Insurance said: You sound like a pretty sharp guy. I am surprised that somebody who seems to have as much on the ball as you do is here, fixing wrecked cars. You could do what I do.

My dad asked: Do you mean be a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance?

The fellow said: Yes.

Sure enough, a year later, my dad, apparently, became a claims adjuster for Nationwide Insurance. He had a high school degree from Shady Spring High School, which is just outside of Beckley. My mom did as well. Neither of them ever went to college. My dad worked for Nationwide for probably 25 years or more—maybe 30 years—in different places around the country. One of his last assignments for Nationwide Insurance, in its home office of Columbus, OH, was to run the training school for Nationwide's insurance adjusters from all over the country.

Here was a guy with a high school degree, who had served in World War II with honor, who had a chance to get a GI bill benefit and turn it into a lifetime opportunity for himself and his family. It enabled my sister and me to go on and finish school. Thanks to the Navy, I got my Navy scholarship and used some money when overseas to help my sister go to school.

The GI bill means a lot to my family, and it does to a lot of families. I think this is a benefit which has been around now for I believe 74 years this Friday. Think about that—three-quarters of a century this Friday. This Friday marks the 74th anniversary of President Franklin Roosevelt's signing of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 into law. This legislation is more commonly known as the GI bill, and we have always called it the GI bill.

Thanks to the GI bill, millions of returning World War II veterans flooded our Nation's colleges and universities,

and it ushered in an era of unprecedented economic expansion. Since 1944, the GI bill has transformed our country and the lives of millions of veterans, including mine. It really helped to create a middle class in this country, as millions of GIs came back and had a chance to learn a skill and go to college in many cases and have economic opportunities for themselves and their families that never before had been possible.

This week, we are recognizing—I think for the first time—the historical significance of the GI bill. We are going to designate the week from June 18 through June 22 as “National GI Bill Commemoration Week.”

I want to thank several Senators.

I thank Senator SULLIVAN from Alaska—a colonel in the Marine Corps.

As the chairman and ranking member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee, I thank JOHNNY ISAKSON and Senator JON TESTER for joining me in submitting the resolution in the Senate to designate June 18 through 22 as “National GI Bill Commemoration Week.”

I thank House Veterans’ Affairs Committee Chairman ROE and Ranking Member WALZ for submitting the same solution in the House of Representatives.

I also thank the American Legion for its hard work in making this resolution a reality and for advocating for veterans and veterans’ education benefits in Congress, as have other service organizations, but I think the American Legion was present at the creation and worked very hard right at the creation to make sure that we had a GI bill and that it would survive.

Because this is GI Bill Week, I want to mention just a few reasons some folks refer to the GI bill as the greatest legislation. We have a greatest generation—my parents’ generation. They are the folks who grew up in the Great Depression and went on to do amazing things with their lives.

Some have referred to the GI bill as the greatest legislation, and I have already shared my own story today. The GI bill made immediate financial support, education, and home loan programs available. I bought my first home with the GI bill, with VA mortgage-backed insurance. That is how I insured my mortgage. I was able to get the low rate offered in the GI bill. Millions of veterans bought homes with the help of the GI bill. This combination of opportunities changed the social and economic fabric of our country.

A 1988 report from the Joint Economic Committee estimated that for every \$1 the United States invested in the GI bill, about \$7 was returned in economic growth. Think about that. For every \$1 we invested, there was a \$7 return in economic growth thanks to the GI bill.

Close to half a million engineers, close to a quarter of a million accountants, close to a quarter of a million

teachers, almost 100,000 scientists, about 67,000 doctors, over 120,000 dentists, and thousands of other professionals entered the workforce of the United States. I might add that they are still entering the workforce of the United States.

The GI bill truly democratized our higher education system, established greater citizenship and civic participation, and empowered the “greatest generation” to lead our country following World War II.

Over the past 74 years, Congress has enacted subsequent GI bills to provide educational assistance to new generations of veterans, including the Veterans Readjustment Benefits Act of 1966, the Post-Vietnam Era Veterans’ Educational Assistance Act of 1977, the Veterans’ Educational Assistance Act of 1984, and most recently the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008, which we voted on and debated here, I think in about my eighth year here in the Senate.

After returning from three tours of duty over in Southeast Asia, as I said earlier, I was fortunate enough to be able to use my Vietnam-era GI bill benefits at the University of Delaware.

I close by saying that Senator YOUNG is on the floor. I think he is going to offer an amendment in just a moment. He is a marine, and I am proud to serve with him. The Marine Corps and the Navy have different uniforms but are on the same team. I salute him for his service.

If you go back to 2008, that was when we were falling into the worst recession since the Great Depression, some of us will recall. These pages up here were about half their current age. They are now about 15 or 16 years old. They were about 8 years old when we were falling into the worst economic hole we had been in since the Great Depression. The unemployment rate for our country, as I recall, reached or exceeded 10 percent. The unemployment rate—I was told by my staff—was higher for veterans. It was higher than 10 percent. I have been told it was significantly higher. That was where we were in 2009—at the bottom of the great recession.

Since that time, a lot of veterans have come home. They have been able to take advantage of the current GI bill, the new GI bill—a very generous GI bill. Do you know what has happened? They have found jobs. They have found economic opportunity. They are doing all kinds of things with the education they have gained at sometimes 4-year colleges with advanced degrees, at 2-year colleges, at trade schools.

The unemployment rate for our country has now dropped to under 4 percent. We are in the ninth year of an economic expansion—the longest running economic expansion in our country’s history. While the national unemployment rate is about 3.9 percent, the veterans’ unemployment rate is no longer above the national average. It is below.

The national average is down to about 3.9, and the veterans’ unemployment rate is about 3.4. Again, I think we can say that the GI bill has helped to educate a whole new generation of young men and women. The GI bill is in no small part responsible for that.

I commend my colleague Jim Webb, a former Senator from Virginia, who was the author of the legislation in 2008 that a lot of us supported and voted for.

We are also grateful to those veterans and to the people of this country for having confidence in us in making sure that we could make an investment on their behalf and our behalf.

Later this week, on Friday—people ask, what day is Friday? It will be the 74th anniversary of the GI bill. It is one of the greatest pieces of legislation we have ever passed and enacted in this country. It is the gift that keeps on giving, and it hopefully will continue to do so for a long time.

Mr. President, there are two Senators on the floor who lead the Veterans’ Affairs Committee. I ask unanimous consent for Senator YOUNG, who is the author of an amendment that has been offered, to speak for 5 minutes and for Senator TESTER to speak for 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for his naval service and for his concern for veterans. It is a pleasure to serve with him.

AMENDMENT NO. 2926

Mr. President, as marines, we tend to make interservice jokes when we are in the company of one another, but I know we share a common dedication in making sure our veterans receive the sort of care and support that, of course, they deserve. That is why I rise in support of amendment No. 2926 to the MILCON-VA bill.

Suicide is one of the most serious problems that face our veterans today. According to the Department of Veterans Affairs, “after adjusting for differences in age and sex, risk for suicide was 22 percent higher among Veterans when compared to U.S. non-Veteran adults.” That figure is 19 percent higher among male veterans when compared to U.S. non-veteran adult men and 2½ times higher among female veterans.

Our veterans deserve the highest possible quality of care. Mental health care services are a critical component of that effort and are essential to preventing veteran suicides. Congress and the Department of Veterans Affairs has a solemn duty to ensure that programs designed to protect veterans’ emotional and mental health are effective.

The Department of Veterans Affairs launched what is now known as the

Veterans Crisis Line in 2011. While we applaud the VA for administering this program, we embrace the fundamental responsibility of Congress to exercise robust oversight of the Veterans Crisis Line to ensure that this program is actually effective and properly supporting at-risk veterans. That is why I joined with Senator DONNELLY and Congressman BANKS to introduce a bill to study the effectiveness of the Veterans Crisis Line and the followup treatment these veterans receive.

Amendment No. 2926 is based on the core elements of the original S. 2174 Veterans Crisis Line Study Act. Studying the Veterans Crisis Line is vital to ensure that it is successful in its mission to save as many veterans as we can, and I ask my colleagues for their support.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Indiana for this amendment. It is a good amendment and is an amendment we need to pass in this body. As Senator YOUNG pointed out, issues around mental health are very prevalent. It is the signature injury coming out of the Middle East. When these folks come back home, our men and women who have served need to have access, especially when they are in crisis. I thank Senator YOUNG.

AMENDMENT NO. 2971

Mr. President, I have a different amendment. This amendment does one simple thing. It stresses the importance of the independence of the Office of the Inspector General at the VA. To be honest, I am not sure we should ever have had to have this amendment, but we do because it is clear the VA is denying access to the Office of Inspector General to get the information it needs to carry out its mission of oversight. Over the past week, there have been a flurry of letters back and forth from the VA to the IG about access to information about the nature of the relationship between the two.

This is what I have to say. The rhetoric coming out of the VA is a bit troubling. Sunlight, bringing information to light, is the best antiseptic for good government. When the IG is doing its job correctly, that is exactly what happens. So with the rhetoric that is coming out of the VA, it opens the door to the VA to be able to control or interfere for political reasons what should be the OIG's independent oversight efforts. I am here to state that the VA is not above the law or exempt from independent oversight. Despite the Acting Secretary directing the inspector general to act like he is his subordinate, he is not. This amendment No. 2971 simply prohibits funds appropriated in this bill to be used in a way that limits the access of the Office of Inspector General to the information or documents it deems necessary to investigate and do the oversight of the VA's work.

As we have seen, the Department cannot be trusted to police itself. It must be held accountable to the veterans and taxpayers, and the Office of Inspector General is an important watchdog that should not be undermined.

I would like to add to the RECORD the cosponsors of this bill: Senators ISAKSON, MURRAY, BLUMENTHAL, HIRONO, MANCHIN, DUCKWORTH, BALDWIN, KING, GILLIBRAND, WARREN, BROWN, MCCASKILL, JONES, DURBIN, and WYDEN.

This is a good amendment. It is a good governance amendment. It is an amendment to allow us, the folks in the Senate, to offer the kind of oversight we need to offer to the VA to make sure it is serving the veterans of this country.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2926

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the Young amendment No. 2926.

Mr. ALEXANDER. 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 assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 135 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Bennet	Harris	Perdue
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Cardin	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Isakson	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Jones	Scott
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Smith
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	Markey	Udall
Durbin	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Flake	Murkowski	Wyden
Gardner	Murphy	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Corker	McCain
Duckworth	Shaheen

The amendment (No. 2926) was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2971

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now occurs on agreeing to Tester amendment No. 2971.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. CORNYN. The following Senator are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 136 Leg.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Gillibrand	Murray
Baldwin	Graham	Nelson
Barrasso	Grassley	Paul
Bennet	Harris	Perdue
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Blunt	Hatch	Portman
Booker	Heinrich	Reed
Boozman	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Cardin	Inhofe	Sasse
Carper	Isakson	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Jones	Scott
Collins	Kaine	Shelby
Coons	Kennedy	Smith
Cornyn	King	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Tester
Crapo	Leahy	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Tillis
Daines	Manchin	Toomey
Donnelly	Markey	Udall
Durbin	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Enzi	McConnell	Warner
Ernst	Menendez	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Fischer	Moran	Wicker
Flake	Murkowski	Wyden
Gardner	Murphy	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Corker	McCain
Duckworth	Shaheen

The amendment (No. 2971) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, first of all, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Montana, Mr. TESTER, on his amendment in support of the VA's inspector general position. I believe it is critical to ensuring oversight and accountability at the Department of Veterans Affairs.

What this amendment does and the reason I support it is that it ensures that the inspector general's office can fully vet, investigate, and examine the cases presented to them by making certain they have access to the necessary

records and documentation within the Department of Veterans Affairs. To arrive at the truth, the inspector general must have all of the information associated with any given situation to determine what is accurate and who should be held accountable.

Mr. President, I also want to express my pleasure in speaking today in regard to something I have long advocated for, and I compliment the three chairmen and women here in support of the appropriations bills of which they have jurisdiction, but we need regular order, and this return to regular order for consideration of the fiscal year 2019 appropriations process is important to the U.S. Senate. More importantly, it is valuable to the American people and valuable to my constituents home in Kansas.

As a U.S. Senator and a member of the Appropriations Committee, our duty is to fund the Federal Government in a responsible way that will wisely utilize every taxpayer dollar, which requires a deliberation to prioritize Federal spending. I also think, when we can return to regular order, we have greater ability to influence decisions made by Cabinet Secretaries, department heads, bureau chiefs, and agency heads because we can influence decisions they make because of the power of the purse string.

On the appropriations bills we are debating this week, I want to call attention to the MILCON-VA appropriations bill and the great work Senator BOOZMAN and his ranking member, Senator SCHATZ, have achieved as chairman and ranking member of the subcommittee. I am very familiar with their staff, and I compliment them on their work.

This bill provides an additional \$1 billion in fiscal year 2019 for the VA to provide veterans access to care in the community, and to avoid any lapse in that care, this bill provides \$11 billion in advance appropriations for fiscal year 2020.

The point I am making is, we have worked hard to provide services in the community for veterans who either can't get the service or live such a distance from the VA or, now, because of the new law, when it is in their best interests to have care provided in the community. It is necessary we provide the funding to accomplish that.

We have the opportunity to provide veterans and the VA with appropriations for fiscal year 2019 that builds on the momentum the reform legislation, which just became law, the VA MISSION Act, provides. I want to make sure we do the right things because we want the VA MISSION Act to work.

On June 6, we paid tribute to one of our Nation's heroes who bravely stormed the beaches of Normandy in November of 1944. In addition, 2 weeks ago today, on June 6, Senator BOOZMAN and I, as well as many of our colleagues, were at the White House, where we joined the President as he signed the VA MISSION Act into law.

The VA MISSION Act represents a significant achievement in providing

our Nation's veterans with access to the care they are entitled to and that they deserve.

Just as I urged my colleagues to support the VA MISSION Act, I call on my colleagues to support the appropriations for implementation of the reforms contained in this legislation. It is critical we do so to make certain veterans can rely on a community care program that meets their needs and offers access to the care they deserve.

The MISSION Act delivers several critical reforms that the funding provided in this bill will enable the VA to carry out and build on. Particularly helpful for the appropriations process, it requires the Department to submit routine strategic plans to Congress and develop a multiyear budget process to better forecast future needs and requirements. It also mandates market area assessments to better understand what communities and local VAs are able to offer their veterans, allowing the VA and Congress to better identify gaps that require more resources to be filled and prevent redundancy; in other words, to provide the resources where they are needed and to make sure we don't spend them where they are not.

As my colleagues are aware, the VA has faced several budget shortfalls in recent years. We have been on the floor often, and I have spoken about this numerous times. Unfortunately, it has required our attention numerous times. The VA has been unable to estimate how much money they will need to provide care in the community through the Choice Act, and this legislation requires a process by which they can accurately forecast those needs, particularly when it comes to care in the community.

I have long believed that when it comes to the VA, it isn't a lack of funds that is the problem. In fact, we have consistently—and this bill does it again—increased their budget. Instead, it is a problem of how they spend the funds that are appropriated to them, how they manage those funds, and how the Department of Veterans Affairs is led.

I am confident reforms like those included in the MISSION Act will enable the VA to be a better steward of taxpayer funds, while also enabling them to better carry out their mission of providing veterans with the care and benefits they are entitled to through consistent, stable budgeting.

As reforms in the VA MISSION Act and the new community care programs are implemented over the next year, it is important that third-party administrators—administration entities which managed the community care program, Choice, in its old days for the VA—manage a network of community providers that serve veterans. Continuity of care is paramount to the success of VA's community care program, and we must ensure that the VA maintains veterans' access to the care they need by utilizing third-party administrators during the implementation stage of these reforms.

I remind my colleagues that the VA is not ready to manage or operate a health network themselves. Our urgency to fund the Choice Program during repeated shortfalls in the past was, in part, out of the necessity of making certain that network continued to support veterans and those third-party administrators—the services they provide. I do not believe the VA is now capable of building or replicating those networks that currently exist, and I would indicate that, at least in part, the contract with the third-party administrator is terminated on June 30, and we need assurance the Department of Veterans Affairs has a plan to make certain those contracts are extended so that care does not lapse.

This next year must be focused on the implementation of the MISSION Act and readying the VA healthcare system for its transformation. Any distraction from completing this mission is unfair to veterans who will benefit from it and puts the community care program at risk.

Our work on the MISSION Act and a community care program is in jeopardy if the Department of Veterans Affairs declines or is unable to renew contracts to keep the network in place.

We are on the cusp of real reform and transformation at the VA which will benefit veterans and their families for decades to come. I can think of no greater obligation during this year's appropriations process than ensuring veterans, and the programs that serve them, are resourced to deliver the care and benefits they deserve.

I thank the chairman, Senator BOOZMAN, the ranking member, Senator SCHATZ, and their staff for their expertise and their work in making sure the appropriations process lends its support to the MISSION Act—the John McCain MISSION Act—we enacted in the Senate and was signed by the President now just a few short days ago.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the images that we have seen from our own country over the past few days are shocking and heartbreaking. They don't reflect our values as a nation. I am glad the President is reversing course. I am glad that he is signing something, putting a stop to his administration's cruel, pointless, and heartless policy of separating children from their parents at the border. That is just the beginning of the work that needs to be done to undo the damage that the President's policy has inflicted on these children and to begin to create a more human and humane immigration solution.

Any parent can tell you that being separated from a child is one of the worst things you can imagine. We have seen pictures and heard the sounds of crying children—children who are still in diapers. When I first heard that

audio clip—I think all of us remember the first time we heard it—of children who were screaming and crying for their parents, I almost couldn't listen to it.

As an American, as a human being, as a father, as a grandfather, it was revolting. It should be hard to listen to. We should recoil at those terrible sounds. The second it is not heard, the second we shrug our shoulders and do nothing at the sounds of little children who are wailing, that is the second we lose our humanity. It is hard for us to listen to. If it is hard for us to listen to—if it makes us uncomfortable—that is nothing compared to what it must mean, to what it must feel like, and what those parents are going through.

Yesterday, the administration reported that some 2,300 children were taken from their parents at the border in just a single month. Everybody in this body has gone to a school, and probably everybody in this body has gone to a grade school to visit. Remember what it is like to walk down the hall or to walk into a gym or to walk into a classroom and see dozens or even hundreds of children. Think about that. Think of walking into a school and seeing happy children—lots of them, dozens of children—who are singing or talking or playing on a playground.

Now think of these 2,300 children who were taken from their parents at the border in a single month—from May 5 to June 9. For 5 weeks, there were 60 kids taken, every single day, on average. There were 60 kids yesterday, 60 kids the day before, and 60 kids the day before that. We don't know how many since June 9, but from May 5 to June 9, there had been 60 kids every single day.

Clearly, the President did the right thing. Clearly, the President did it under great political pressure. Clearly, the President never admitted he was wrong about it. That is not something he would do, unlike most human beings I know. Yet signing something today doesn't magically reunite those families overnight. It is not like these children now—as any of my colleagues who have watched children who are at a grade school, who will run out to the cars when their moms pick them up or run out to the playground, joyfully, when their dads visit. They will not magically reunite with their families overnight. Signing this order the President signed—oh, so clearly reluctantly—will not undo the trauma those children have endured.

We still don't have good answers as to what has happened to those kids or what kinds of conditions they are living under. We have heard reports of siblings who have been ripped from their parents that they can't hug each other. We have heard of staff being told they are not allowed to comfort these children by touching them and hugging them. Imagine that. A child is taken away from her mother, and you are not even allowed to comfort her. You are just supposed to let her scream. That is

inhumane, un-American, and is counter to everything most of us—at least in this body, if not the White House—have been taught.

Dr. Colleen Kraft, the current President of the American Academy of Pediatrics and the past medical director of the Health Network by Cincinnati Children's in my State, warned that the toxic stress resulting from these separations can slow down brain development. She called it “a form of child abuse.”

Today, I demanded answers from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and from the Secretary of Homeland Security about what they are doing to care for the mental, physical, and emotional well-being of the thousands of traumatized children in their custody.

This chapter isn't closed. You don't just say, “Thank you, Mr. President, for finally doing the right thing. Everything is fine.” We have to track those 2,300 children for that month's period. There have been almost 2 weeks since then and more children. We have to find these children, comfort them, and examine them. Pediatricians have warned that this is some kind of child abuse because it can slow down brain development, and these children have already seen horrors that the rest of us can't imagine.

Some of these parents are seeking asylum in America. They are fleeing violence, and they are just looking for a safe place for their children. Who knows how many of these children already were traumatized because they had lived in a war zone, because they had lived in an area with all kinds of violence from drug wars. They were pulled out of that and were traveling with almost nothing but the clothes on their backs and very little, with one or both parents, and went north, not knowing what was going to happen each day and seeing things that almost none of us growing up has seen. Then they were separated from their parents at the border.

The way we keep our country safe is by going after terrorists and violent criminals, not by turning our backs on families and children just like ours, whose only goal is to escape violence and persecution.

We have a lot of work to do to fix our immigration system, but tearing families apart will not solve anything. We need to come together, and we need to work on a bipartisan solution that recognizes we aren't going to deport 13 million people who are already here. We can secure our borders. We can create a pathway for people to earn citizenship if they follow the law, to have a job, and pay taxes.

My son-in-law, Alejandro, lives in Cranston, RI—the boyhood home of our colleague Senator JACK REED. He was 10 years old—maybe 11 years old—when he came to this country. His mother was a journalist. She had her life threatened as a journalist in El Salvador. She fled their country to come

to our country. The parents then went to New York. We embrace people like that—who are refugees, whose lives we can save, and who can contribute so much to our country, as Alejandro has and his mother has. His whole family has contributed to this country. He is the father of two of our grandchildren now.

This may be a complicated issue, but we are a country of values that protects people. We are a haven for so many people. We have made a difference in so many lives because of who we are and what our values are. Surely, it is a complicated issue, but the administration has only made it so much worse. It has added the challenge of having to undo the damage it has done in having to work to get those children back to their parents and help to make them whole.

I hope we are seeing the end of this heartlessness. I hope this isn't a one-step pullback by the President, and then there will be more attacks on immigrants and more attacks on children. We have a lot of work to do to pick up the pieces and reunite families. The administration needs to provide answers immediately as to how it is going to make that happen and end the cries of these children with comforting words and much more.

I close with this story.

I had a message on Facebook from an Ohioan. He had heard the tragic story of a 10-year-old with Down syndrome who was reportedly separated from her parents at the border. That is barbaric, but this Ohioan gives me hope. He wrote that he and his wife have a daughter with Down syndrome. They wanted to offer to take in the little girl and her mother and have them stay with their family in Ohio. Imagine that.

Those are the values of Ohioans. Those are the values of North Carolinians. Those are the values of Americans. They are not the President's values, who, because of whatever motive, has separated these families. That encompasses the State and the country I love—this family who wrote to us. I know there are so many more Americans out there who feel the same way—who practice compassion, whose hearts break for these children. It is time for their government to step up and reflect those values of this great country.

Mr. President, yesterday, I met a veteran from Massillon, OH, James Powers. Mr. Powers brought to my attention a problem he was having with the VA's accounting mistakes, and our conversation led to a bill I introduced with Senator TESTER, a Montana Democrat, and Senator BOOZMAN, an Arkansas Republican, the bipartisan Veteran Debt Fairness Act. Both Senators serve with me on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Both Senators know how VA overpayment and debt affect veterans every day.

James retired 2 years ago, but he noticed that the Army was continuing to pay him both an Active-Duty salary

and retirement benefits. James caught the mistake. He did the honorable thing. He notified the VA it was overpaying him, but the VA continued to overpay him. Then it charged him twice to recoup the overpayments, and they garnished his benefits.

The staff in my office worked with the VA to resolve James's issues, but this should never have happened in the first place. It is fixed now. He had to go through that. To his credit, to James's credit, he wanted to make sure his experience, which was uncomfortable—or worse at times—would change policy and affect future veterans so they wouldn't have to go through this, which is why I admire him so much.

This story is too common. In 2016, the VA issued some 200,000 overpayment notices to veterans. When this happens, the agency often tries to get its money back by withholding some or all of the monthly disability payments our veterans have earned. Our veterans deal with enough stress already. They shouldn't be forced to pay for the VA's accounting mistakes.

Our bill would ban the VA from charging veterans for its own mistake in overpayments. It should protect veterans' payments who depend on their benefits by capping the amount the VA can deduct from a veteran's monthly payment at 25 percent. It would ban the VA from collecting debts that are more than 5 years old.

Our veterans sacrifice so much already to serve our country. I am the first Ohioan to ever serve a full term. I have been on this committee now for 12 years, the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I am on that committee because we should serve those who serve us. We should protect those who protect us. The veterans shouldn't be paying for the mistakes of the agency that is supposed to serve them.

Unfortunately, our bill was not included in the National Defense Authorization Act last week. Instead, we have an amendment to the MILCON-VA bill to require the VA to track down these overpayments and report to Congress on the scope of VA debt. We will continue to push for the Tester-Boozman bill, but I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this bipartisan, commonsense step toward fixing VA overpayment and debt for America's veterans.

I yield the floor.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I have submitted amendment No. 2955 to H.R. 5895 on behalf of Senator JEANNE SHAHEEN. I strongly support the provision's intent to ensure that veterans in New Hampshire receive the best possible care.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 2910.

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 Senate amendment No. 2910 to Calendar No. 449, H.R. 5895, an act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Todd Young, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Ben Sasse, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, John Cornyn, Patrick J. Toomey, Pat Roberts, Jeff Flake, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, Mitch McConnell.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for the bill H.R. 5895.

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 Calendar No. 449, H.R. 5895, an act making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

John Thune, Todd Young, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Ben Sasse, Johnny Isakson, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, John Cornyn, Patrick J. Toomey, Pat Roberts, Jeff Flake, Mike Rounds, Mike Crapo, Tim Scott, Mitch McConnell.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, here is where we are. I filed cloture, but we anticipate that will not actually be necessary and we will be able to vitiate the cloture motions tomorrow because we anticipate being able to process additional amendments throughout the day and wrap the bill up sometime tomorrow afternoon. But there will be an opportunity during the day to continue to process amendments, and we should be able to finish the bill this week without resorting to cloture.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the June 19, 2018, vote on Senate amendment 2914 to Sen-

ate amendment 2910 to H.R. 5895, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2019. I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the June 19, 2018, vote on Senate amendment 2920 to Senate amendment 2910 to H.R. 5895, Energy and Water, Legislative Branch, and Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Appropriations Act, 2019. I would have voted yea.

WORLD REFUGEE DAY

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of World Refugee Day and to express my deep concern over the Trump administration's systematic assault on refugees, asylum seekers, and the United States' refugee resettlement program.

Manmade conflict, natural disasters, poverty, and violence have left the world in the midst of the largest refugee crisis in recorded history with over 25 million refugees worldwide. Tragically, less than 1 percent of these individuals will ever be resettled to a third country.

The United States was built on the hopes and dreams of those fleeing persecution and oppression, those seeking better lives for themselves and their families. The values and moral compass that embraced these individuals and shone as a beacon of freedom have made this country great. In times of crisis, the United States traditionally asserted global leadership through these values that have made this country so successful. That leadership served as an important uniting and motivating voice in the face of tremendous international challenges.

Unfortunately, instead of asserting moral and strategic leadership, the Trump administration has chosen to retreat. The President has traded in our proud tradition of lifting up the most vulnerable for an agenda of degrading and insulting those who seek our support. Starting with his assertion that Mexicans are "rapists" and "drug dealers," this President has spent his tenure as our Nation's leader attacking America's immigrant and refugee communities. The President said he wanted to protect Dreamers; yet he abruptly ended the DACA program throwing the lives of 800,000 people into great uncertainty. He imposed a slap-dash Muslim ban that has been repeatedly struck down by the courts. He has slowed refugee admissions to a trickle, closing America's doors to some of the most vulnerable people on the planet, reducing America's global leadership standing.

Driven by vitriolic voices, the President and the Attorney General together have worked to effectively destroy the refugee resettlement program, which traditionally received broad bipartisan support. Last September, the President decreed that the number of refugees to be admitted in

fiscal year 2018 should be 45,000—half of the historic average. Even more concerning, it is now clear that this administration is further rigging the admissions program to ensure that only a fraction of that number of people will be allowed in. In the first quarter of 2018, just 6,704 refugees were resettled, compared to 25,671 in 2017 and 13,791 in 2016.

The U.S. Refugee Resettlement Program—and the faith groups, organizations, families and individuals that assist it—supports the most vulnerable. These are the victims of torture, people with urgent medical needs, and desperate women and children. They are not safe in their home country. They have gone through extensive multi-agency vetting before even reaching the United States. We are witnessing the intentional dismantling of a program that has helped the world's most defenseless, built our leadership abroad and here at home helped create thriving, diverse communities across the country, including in places like Camden and Elizabeth in my home State of New Jersey.

Despite its effort to prove the opposite by commissioning a study by the Department of Health and Human Services, the administration's own report found that refugees have had a net positive economic impact in the United States over the past decade. The study concluded that between 2005 and 2014, refugees "contributed an estimated \$269.1 billion in revenues to all levels of government" and estimated the net positive fiscal impact of refugees over the 10-year period to be \$63 billion.

Alarming and horrifically, we have witnessed the administration's callous and misguided approach to migrants and refugees most recently on our southern border. American citizens and people around the world have watched in horror as U.S. officials are forcibly pulling babies and children out of their parents' arms, tearing families apart, and using preposterous defenses for their actions. This is not the United States I know. This is not the United States that has stood as a champion for the rule of law and human rights.

The President has blamed those fleeing persecution. He has blamed Democrats. He has taken no responsibility. His tweets have only gotten more hysterical. His repeated demands for a ridiculous wall are not a solution and only further fuel negative perceptions of the United States.

The party of "family values" has become the part of "family separation." This "policy" is not required by U.S. law. This is a choice that this administration has made. It was a policy choice to charge asylum seekers in criminal court with illegal entry. In essence, it seems that President Trump and Attorney General Sessions want to turn every asylum seeker into a criminal and every child into a foster child.

It is easy to be distracted by the President's tweets and outlandish statements. The palace intrigue coming from the White House provide endless fodder for the talking heads on TV, but we cannot lose focus on the real harms being done to our fellow human beings and to our global standing.

On this World Refugee Day, let us come together and remember that part what makes America great is our open doors that have welcomed people from all over the world. We have been a shining city on a hill; a beacon of light and hope. Since 2001, the United States has settled nearly a million refugees. They are our friends, our neighbors, our coworkers. They sit next to your kid in school, and someday, they may grow up to be a Secretary of State like Madeleine Albright.

What kind of a country do we want to be? A country where we rip children from their parents? A country that keeps out refugees because of their religion? I have seen a quote posted on Twitter, pasted on signs at rallies, even on a church bulletin board—I don't know who said it first—but it bears repeating here: "Rather than a wall, America needs to build a giant mirror to reflect on what we've become."

FOOD LABELING

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jacob's letter and my response letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEAR SENATOR RUBIO: Approximately a year and half ago I was diagnosed with Celiac, which means that I can only eat gluten free foods.

There are not a lot of things that are labeled gluten free and there should be more. A lot of things right now I have to look up to see if they're gluten free. I have read some articles that explain how every company should label their products. It's also hard to know for sure if something is safe to eat when I go food shopping, out with my friends, and to restaurants. It would be great if the government could find a way to put food labeling on packages consistently.

Thank you for putting your time into this.

Sincerely,

JACOB TANNENBAUM.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, DC, June 20, 2018.

Jacob Tannenbaum,
202 Royal Palm Way,
Boca Raton, FL.

DEAR JACOB: Thank you for your letter regarding food labeling. Hearing from fellow Floridians on issues that affect millions of Americans, including children, is important for me to do my job in the U.S. Senate.

Food allergies are sometimes mild and easily preventable by avoiding consumption of certain foods, while other cases may be life-threatening. With respect to celiac disease, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) estimates that there are approximately 3 million people in the United States, like you, who must refrain from ingesting gluten.

Among its many roles, the FDA is responsible for ensuring the safety of our nation's food supply by enforcing labeling laws and regulations. The Food Allergen Labeling and Consumer Protection Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-282) was enacted to require a list of ingredients that may cause allergic reactions to be included on food labels. Further, the law tasked the Secretary of Health and Human Services to define the term "gluten-free" on food labels. The FDA issued its final "gluten-free" rule in 2013. Currently, all FDA regulated food products and dietary supplements (including imports from other countries) which bear a "gluten-free" label must comply with the agency's 2013 voluntary labeling law. Under the rule, "gluten-

free" means a food is either naturally gluten-free, is not constituted from gluten-containing grains, is constituted from gluten-containing grains that have been processed to remove gluten, or has an "unavoidable presence" of gluten of not more than 20 parts per million.

With the prevalence of food allergies impacting millions across our nation, the federal government plays an important role in enforcing voluntary labeling requirements, based on sound science, to ensure consumer safety and confidence. National, uniform, voluntary labeling standards establish consistency for businesses engaged in interstate commerce, while providing necessary protections for consumers to make safe choices when selecting what food products to purchase and eat. Mandatory labeling, however, could pose significant burdens on industry and produce confusion for consumers with a multitude of labels for every food allergy recognized by the federal government on each product.

I understand your concerns that it may be difficult at times to determine what is safe to eat. The good news is that we live in a country blessed with a plethora of food options, and a market that responds quickly to consumer needs and demands. This evolving market, in concert with federal standards for voluntary labeling, means that it will only get easier for all Americans to find the ingredient and nutrition you need to make safe and smart choices in the future.

It is an honor and a privilege to serve you as your United States Senator, and I commend you for bringing awareness to this important issue.

Sincerely,

MARCO RUBIO,
U.S. Senator.

TAX REFORM

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, as you may know, I voted in favor of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that became law last year. Every day we are learning more about the positive impact this law is having on the economy and about average Americans having more money in their paychecks. While it is important to appreciate the effects that the tax law had on individuals, we should not forget that small businesses have benefited from the law as well. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I supported the legislation because I believed it would allow small business owners to invest in their businesses, increase overall economic growth, and reduce taxes for the millions of small businesses who employ the majority of Americans in every part of the country. I also saw the potential that the legislation would have, not just to give an economic boost to small businesses in my home State of Idaho, but to spark renewed confidence from small businesses across the country. A couple of weeks ago, I began this series of speeches to bring attention to small businesses that have benefited from this law.

While there are many stories about small businesses benefitting from tax reform, I rise today to talk about Dempsey Wood Products in Orangeburg, SC. Dempsey Wood Products offers a wide variety of high-quality pine and hardwood products to its customers. The company serves many different industries with kiln-dried lumber for the housing industry, pallet stock for pallet manufacturers, debarked chips for the paper industry,

mulch for landscapers, and sawdust for alternative fuel use. The company employs about 80 to 100 workers and has an extensive sawmill and dry kiln operation. Ronny Dempsey started the company in 1988 and has spent all of his life around the lumber industry. His father, Charles Parker Dempsey, worked in various sawmills over the course of his career and eventually was the co-owner of a sawmill that he later sold. Today Parker Dempsey, a third-generation sawmill operator, has taken over as president, though his father, Ronny, is still by his side as vice president of the company.

This family-owned small business has already benefitted greatly from the tax law that was passed last year. They have announced plans to upgrade their sawmill, purchase a new dry kiln, and invest in a new planer mill over the next 5 years. They expect the capital expenditure to total \$7 million and estimate that they could add a second shift in the near future, thereby creating new jobs in the Orangeburg community. These investments were viable for the company due to the accelerated depreciation provisions contained in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. This section of the law allows companies to deduct the value of any new equipment purchased in a single year, instead of over several years. Tax reform has had a material impact on small businesses like Dempsey Wood Products and their employees. Overall, the new law has increased small businesses' confidence, employee bonuses and wages, while lowering taxes and spurring new capital investment.

TRIBUTE TO ALAN L. GUNN

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, today, Senator CRAPO and I recognize and congratulate Mr. Alan L. Gunn on his upcoming retirement from the U.S. Department of Energy after more than 40 years of distinguished service in various roles at the U.S. Navy and U.S. Department of Energy.

In 1980, Mr. Gunn received a bachelor of science degree from Mississippi State University and went on to complete graduate work in business administration at Louisiana State University, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, State University of New York at Albany, and Idaho State University.

In February 1982, Mr. Gunn completed the Navy officer candidate school as a distinguished military graduate and was commissioned as a Navy officer. He was selected for duty in the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program and served as both a member of the staff of the Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion program in Washington, DC, and as a field representative for the director in Schenectady, NY, and Idaho Falls, ID.

In 1996, Mr. Gunn completed the College of Naval Warfare program in residence at the U.S. Naval War College, Newport, RI, and received a master of arts degree in national security and strategic studies.

Since the completion of his Active-Duty service, Mr. Gunn has served as a civilian with the U.S. Department of Energy and the National Nuclear Security Administration in numerous leadership and management positions with the Office of Naval Reactors in Washington, DC, the Idaho branch office of Naval Reactors, the Naval Reactors Laboratory field office, and the Idaho operations office.

In 2007, after completing over 28 years of Active and Reserve military service, Mr. Gunn retired as a captain in the U.S. Navy.

Most recently, Mr. Gunn served as the principal deputy manager for Nuclear Energy and served as the assistant manager for programs and facilities at the Department of Energy's Idaho Operations Office, DOE-ID. In his current capacity, he provides exceptional leadership for DOE-ID's nuclear programs and Idaho facilities management divisions, national security programs, the Radiological and Environmental Science Laboratory, and the Office of Project Management project.

Mr. Gunn's organization is responsible for oversight of the Idaho National Laboratory, INL, and other contractor performance on nuclear energy, education, national security, and other research and development projects and programs, including strategic partnership projects and the INL laboratory directed research and development programs; as well as facility and infrastructure operations, maintenance, planning, and other activities associated with facility and infrastructure operations at the INL. Mr. Gunn also provides direct support to the specific manufacturing capability, SMC, project that includes the oversight of the maintenance and operations of the SMC facilities, as well as the programmatic oversight of the armor production.

Through his years of dedicated service, Mr. Gunn exemplifies the best qualities of Idaho. Senator CRAPO and I want to thank Alan for his service and wish him well in all of his future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS E. FRYE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I wish to recognize a dedicated public servant and proud student of West Virginian and American history, Dennis E. Frye, on the occasion of his retirement from the National Park Service. Innumerable visitors to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park benefited from his wealth of knowledge and notorious performances that brought history to life.

As Dennis tells it, at a young age, he wanted to be either a historian or an astronaut. Once he found out that becoming an astronaut entails being very good at math, he decided history was the way to go. He studied at what was then Shepherd College in Shepherdstown, WV, while volunteering at Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, becoming a park ranger

in 1977. Eschewing the traditional route of advancement in the National Park Service through moving from park to park, Dennis stayed put and advanced within the park, and set about the task of changing perceptions of Harpers Ferry in the Civil War history community.

As staff historian and later chief historian at the park and through his work in various historical societies concerned with the Civil War, Dennis emphasized the importance of Harpers Ferry to the history of the Civil War. Thanks, in large part, to his efforts, the Battle of Harpers Ferry and the importance of the town in the history of America are better recognized by the historical community, of which he is a vocal member. Indeed, Dennis's dedication to his passion as an advocate and student of history is apparent from the 10-year sabbatical he took to focus on writing historical works and to serve as president of the Civil War Trust, an organization dedicated to the preservation of Civil War battlefields. He is also a recipient of the Shelby Foote Award from the Civil War Trust, the National Park Service's Freeman Tilden Award for excellence in interpretation and education, and the Nevins-Freeman Award for outstanding contributions to the study of the Civil War.

Dennis later returned as chief historian of Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, where his work of inspiring and educating visitors, including my staff and myself, through meticulous detail and dramatic performances continued to the present day. If the job of a historian is to both impart knowledge and ensure the lessons of history remain with us, then Dennis Frye is a master in his field.

No one who knows him doubts that Dennis E. Frye will continue to be a forceful advocate for his passions in retirement, which includes being an ardent fan of the Boston Red Sox. I believe I speak for many when I say that I sincerely appreciate his public service and the contributions he has made to a better understanding of the history of West Virginia and America. I am proud to call him a friend, and I wish him well in his future pursuits.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ROCKY BARKER

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Rocky Barker for his extensive career as an Idaho journalist.

Rocky is retiring from the Idaho Statesman where he worked as an environmental reporter-blogger-columnist for the past 22 years. Prior to his position at the Statesman, Rocky was a columnist and correspondent-at-large for the Post Register in Idaho Falls. He has also written and contributed to numerous books, created an Idaho news website, and received many awards and recognitions for his reporting.

Over his more than 30-year career, Rocky has reported comprehensively

on issues that matter deeply to Idaho. He has dug into pressing and often controversial issues, including reporting on water, public lands, fish and wildlife habitat, fires, and other related matters that no doubt have required considerable resolve. Throughout, his devotion to reporting and his deep respect for the importance of a free press to our system of governance has remained unwavering.

Congratulations, Rocky, on your years of writing. "Litera scripta manet," meaning the written word endures, is among the inscriptions in the Library of Congress. You can go onto the next chapter of your career and life knowing that you have been an important part of taking down that written word for our great State for decades. Thank you for your devotion to and deep personal interest in chronicling issues that matter greatly for Idahoans. I wish you and your wife, Tina, all the best in your retirement and much happiness in the years ahead.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF GORHAM SAVINGS BANK

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary of Gorham Savings Bank, a notable leader of financial services and community engagement in southern Maine. As the only bank headquartered in Cumberland County, Gorham Savings Bank's impressive, locally based economic focus allows the institution to serve as a source of strength for the community.

Founded in February of 1868, Gorham Savings Bank was established by the Maine State Legislature under its first president, Captain Toppan Robie. A few weeks later, the bank began business when the first deposit of 10 cents was made. Over the years, the bank has expanded to multiple locations across southern Maine, incorporating new financial services to meet the expanding needs of its customers. In 1998, during my time as Governor, I attended the opening of the bank's operations center in Gorham, ME, and hosted the ribbon-cutting ceremony. Across its branch locations, Gorham Savings Bank provides a variety of banking services to its customers, including resources for personal and business accounts. Through online banking services, customers have the tools they need to manage their money at their convenience. Today, Gorham Savings Bank has surpassed the \$1 billion mark in assets, and last year, the bank began the restoration of the historic Grand Trunk Railway Company Building in Portland, ME, as a new office space. With over 200 employees across 13 locations, the community bank is an important employer in the region.

In addition to serving their customers, Gorham Savings Bank supports the prosperity and growth of the surrounding communities. First, the bank promotes a number of financial literacy programs, including ones for

tax preparation and another geared towards high school students. In the education field, Gorham Savings Bank participates in job-shadowing programs and contributes to scholarship opportunities for individuals looking to further their education. Gorham Savings Bank also supports the growth of local business and hosts an annual Launchpad small business competition, where five Maine entrepreneurial businesses compete for \$50,000 for business development. Thanks to the teamwork of the bank's employees, Gorham Savings Bank has led efforts to fundraise for nonprofit organizations, including the Boys and Girls Club and United Way.

I applaud Gorham Savings Bank on their achievements over the past 150 years and look forward to their continued success as a force for good for the State of Maine.●

REMEMBERING ANDREW RAMOTNIK

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I commemorate the life of Andrew Ramotnik, a retired veteran from Jacksonville, FL, who recently passed away.

Andy Ramotnik grew up in Pennsylvania coal country. Two weeks after the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941, at the age of 18, he enlisted in the U.S. Army Air Corps. In 1943, after basic and radio operator training, he was assigned to a B-25 medium bomber squadron based in the north African desert.

On his 43rd bombing mission, Andy's bomber was shot down over Italy, and he was captured. Andy was a prisoner of war in Stalag 17B for 19 months in Austria. In April 1945, he escaped, was recaptured, and escaped a second time. For 13 days, Andy and a fellow POW evaded capture. He was evading the enemy when the war ended in May 1945 and had to find his way to friendly troops. Andy met up with American troops and was granted leave and returned to service. After his return, Andy received a letter from the War Department and a check compensating him \$1 for every day he was a POW. The check was for \$554.

It was the rest of the letter that led to my knowing Andy and his incredible story. While the check he received was for \$554, Andy had actually been a POW for 567 days. However, for 13 of those days, Andy was evading capture while hiding from the Germans in the Austrian countryside. The Army does not pay soldiers when they are evading capture, so the Army docked Andy \$13 for the days he had escaped.

Now, Andy did not need the \$13. It was not the money but rather the principle. He had done what was expected of him and what was prescribed in the Armed Services Code of Conduct. He had escaped, and the Army was docking him for it. So when I met Andy more than 60 years later, he still had that \$13 on his mind. He told me his story of the bombing missions, of his plane being shot down, and the struggle

to get the door open so he and another soldier could parachute out. He told me about the POW camp, hiding in a cave during his first escape, and hiding at an Austrian farm during his second. He also told me how foolish he thought it was that the Army docked his pay for doing what he was supposed to do.

My office looked into it. Unfortunately, it is a longstanding policy not to pay soldiers evading capture and an issue not easily remedied. Unfortunately, we could not get Andy his \$13.

So, with his passing, I would like to recognize the life of Andy Ramotnik and thank him for his service. On principle, I think we still owe him \$13. It is a small cost to pay for an 18-year-old boy standing up to help stop the spread of tyranny and preserving the free world.●

TRIBUTE TO JAHA DUKUREH

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jaha Dukureh for her Nobel Peace Prize nomination.

A recent graduate of the University of Central Florida, Jaha was named one of TIME magazine's "100 Most Influential People in the World" in 2016 and has been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize this year for her work to end female genital mutilation, FMG. She was born in The Gambia, a small west African country, and was subjected to female genital mutilation when she was just one week old.

A documentary produced by the Guardian called "The Girl Who Said No to FGM" was made about her story. It details how her identity was stripped again when she was forced into an arranged marriage at the age of 15 in New York City and was cut for a second time.

Since beginning her activism, Jaha helped usher in the ban of female genital mutilation in The Gambia. It is estimated that, by the age of 14, nearly 56 percent of girls in The Gambia were subjected to FMG. She is also the first person to have been nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize from The Gambia.

Jaha earned her bachelor's degree in business administration management at Georgia Southwestern State University in 2013. She graduated with her master's degree in nonprofit management from the University of Central Florida in 2018.

I am honored to express my sincere gratitude to Jaha for her extraordinary leadership to end this horror and look forward to hearing of her continued work in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DONALD ESLINGER

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Donald Eslinger, the former Seminole County sheriff, for his induction into the Law Enforcement Officers' Hall of Fame.

Sheriff Eslinger's law enforcement career began in 1978 as a radio dispatcher for the department. He subsequently rose through the ranks, leading in various roles at the department

until his appointment as sheriff in 1991 and election to the position the next year. He served the community as sheriff for 25 years, retiring in 2017. Throughout his tenure, Sheriff Eslinger focused on mental health advocacy, crime reduction, and is responsible for the Kids House, Shop with the Sheriff, and Christmas Village programs.

Sheriff Eslinger was nominated by law enforcement leaders to be inducted into the Florida Law Enforcement Officer's Hall of Fame. His induction was approved by Governor Rick Scott and the State cabinet. At his induction ceremony, Sheriff Eslinger noted protecting the most vulnerable in the community was at the core of the Seminole County Sheriff's Office under his leadership.

Sheriff Eslinger earned his bachelor's degree from National Louis University and graduated from the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy in Virginia. He and his wife, Elise, have four children.

I express my sincere gratitude to Sheriff Eslinger for his dedication to serving the community with the Seminole County Sheriff's Office, and I wish him the very best in his retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS PATTERSON MANEY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Judge Thomas Patterson Maney, who has served his Nation honorably and is retiring.

Judge Maney served our Nation in the Army Reserve for almost 37 years, including 8 years of Active Duty, serving in Panama, Haiti, Bosnia, and Afghanistan. As a major and lieutenant colonel, he worked with the military group at the U.S. Embassy in Panama, training the Guardia Nacional/Panama Defense Force in civil affairs and civic action. He commanded a reserve civil affairs brigade in Maryland, as well as the 350th Civil Affairs Command in Pensacola, and later served as the deputy commander of the Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations Command and deputy commandant of the John F. Kennedy Special Operations School at Fort Bragg. He is the recipient of the Purple Heart and retired as an Army brigadier general in 2007.

Judge Maney was appointed Okaloosa County court judge by Governor Bob Martinez and assumed the bench on June 5, 1989. He was elected to the position in 1990 and was subsequently reelected each time he was on the ballot. During his time as a circuit court judge, he served as a juvenile dependency judge, child support judge, and served as the Baker Act/Marchman Act judge for nearly a decade. Judge Maney shares his passion and expertise of the law with colleagues across the district and the State of Florida, delivering educational presentations for the Conference of County Court Judges and the Advanced Judicial College. He also started the Okaloosa Mental Health

Court and the Okaloosa Veterans Treatment Court. The act establishing the Okaloosa Veterans Treatment Court was named the T. Patt Maney Veterans Treatment Court Act in his honor.

Judge Maney was born in Lexington, KY, and is a graduate of the University of Kentucky, the University of Louisville College of Law, Troy State University, and the Army War College. He has been married to his wife, Caroline, for almost 47 years, and they have two daughters and six grandchildren. He is also a member of the Sons of the American Revolution.

I thank Judge Maney for a lifetime of devotion to serving our Nation both overseas and on the bench. I extend my best wishes to him and his family on his well-earned retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO JAMES WEIR

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Mr. James Weir with respect for his service and accomplishments as he turns 93 years old this month. Jim, as his friends refer to him, or Pap-pap, as he is known by his family, grew up in Mount Pleasant, PA, not far from Pittsburgh. Inducted into the U.S. Navy on August of 1943, Jim went to war on behalf of this Nation, fighting in Europe and Asia. On June 6, 1944, Coxswain Weir crossed the English Channel aboard a LCT(A) to deliver tanks and troops onto the beaches of Normandy. After the battle was won in Europe, Jim fought in the liberation of the Philippines and was stationed in Japan as part of the occupational forces after the war.

In between those pivotal moments, Jim received a 20-day leave after D-Day. He rushed back to the States to marry his sweetheart, Laverne Myers. They had been sweethearts since he had sat behind her in sixth grade, but Laverne was only 17 and Jim's leave was short. He loved Laverne, and she loved him. They quickly left Pennsylvania for Alabama, where they tied the knot before he had to return to the war. They remained in love for 73 years of marriage.

After the war, he worked as a master electrician and was a renowned Corvette racer, leading the national Corvette club as its president. Jim now lives in Miami, FL, where he has two granddaughters and six great-grandchildren who love him dearly.

In honor of his 93rd birthday, for his service to our great Nation and his love for his family and community, I would like to recognize my friend Jim Weir and look forward to seeing him on his 94th birthday this time next year.●

TRIBUTE TO STEVE FORRESTER

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I want to honor longtime Oregon journalist Steve Forrester.

Steve has retired as editor and publisher of the Daily Astorian. He will remain president and chief executive offi-

cer of the EO Media Group, which owns the Astorian, as well as several other newspapers, including publications in eastern Oregon, but we will no longer benefit from his day-to-day leadership at the Astorian.

I have known Steve for nearly 40 years, since he was a reporter in Washington, DC, and I was a young Member of the House. In all that time, Steve has never hesitated to ask the tough questions and to be fiercely devoted to local journalism's principles and importance. The theme running consistently throughout Steve's career has been always to ensure local readers understand the impact of decisions and policies made in Congress, the statehouse, and city hall.

I particularly wanted to honor Steve today because, over the Fourth of July recess, I will be home in Oregon highlighting the foundational freedoms of the First Amendment with events celebrating those freedoms of religion, speech, assembly, and the press.

The Founding Fathers knew those First Amendment freedoms were core to our country and to creating the values that have made America a destination for all who hunger to be free of fear and liberated to pursue their dreams. As the child of parents who fled the Nazis for refuge in the United States, I learned early on about the importance of these freedoms. As the son of a reporter, I also learned especially about the importance of the freedom of the press.

Because Steve has contributed so much to a vibrant and free press in our great State of Oregon, I will be proud to present him on July 1, in Astoria, with a "Go Fourth" award. Steve's career makes him richly deserving of this award and an inspiration for Oregon journalists for generations to come.

I suspect Steve will exercise his self-deprecating modesty and question why he is worthy of such attention. I know Steve would much rather shine the spotlight on others, but the bottom line is I want Oregon to recognize his enormous and long-lasting contributions to making our State a better place to live and to making all of us as Oregonians better-informed citizens.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11 a.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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3192. An act to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to ensure access to mental health services for children under the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4005. An act to promote State innovations to ease transitions to the community for individuals who are inmates of a public institution and eligible for medical assistance under the Medicaid program.

H.R. 4627. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize expenditures to combat emerging terrorist threats, including vehicular attacks, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4991. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5590. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for an action plan on recommendations for changes under Medicare and Medicaid to prevent opioids addictions and enhance access to medication-assisted treatment, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5605. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an opioid use disorder treatment demonstration program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5676. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the suspension of payments by Medicare prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans pending investigations of credible allegations of fraud by pharmacies.

H.R. 5687. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require improved packaging and disposal methods with respect to certain drugs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5723. An act to require the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission to report on opioid payment, adverse incentives, and data under the Medicare program.

H.R. 5762. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize a Joint Task Force to enhance integration of the Department of Homeland Security's border security operations to detect, interdict, disrupt, and prevent narcotics, such as fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, from entering the United States, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5773. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require electronic prior authorization for covered part D drugs and to provide for other program integrity measures under parts C and D of the Medicare program.

H.R. 5774. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidance on pain management and opioid use disorder prevention for hospitals receiving payment under part A of the Medicare program, provide for opioid quality measures development, and provide for a technical expert panel on reducing surgical setting opioid use and data collection on perioperative opioid use, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5775. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require Medicare Advantage plans and part D prescription drug plans to include information on the risks associated with opioids, coverage of certain nonopioid treatments used to treat pain, and on the safe disposal of prescription drugs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5796. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide

grants for eligible entities to provide technical assistance to outlier prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5801. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for requirements under the Medicaid program relating to the use of qualified prescription drug monitoring programs and prescribing certain controlled substances.

H.R. 5811. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to postapproval study requirements for certain controlled substances, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6042. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the reduction in Federal medical assistance percentage for Medicaid personal care services furnished without an electronic visit verification system, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6110. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the review and adjustment of payments under the Medicare outpatient prospective payment system to avoid financial incentives to use opioids instead of non-opioid alternative treatments, 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. 3192. An act to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to ensure access to mental health services for children under the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4005. An act to promote State innovations to ease transitions to the community for individuals who are inmates of a public institution and eligible for medical assistance under the Medicaid program to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 4627. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize expenditures to combat emerging terrorist threats, including vehicular attacks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 4991. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the National Urban Security Technology Laboratory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5590. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide for an action plan on recommendations for changes under Medicare and Medicaid to prevent opioids addictions and enhance access to medication-assisted treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5605. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an opioid use disorder treatment demonstration program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5676. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the suspension of payments by Medicare prescription drug plans and MA-PD plans pending investigations of credible allegations of fraud by pharmacies; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5687. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require improved packaging and disposal methods with respect to certain drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 5723. An act to require the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission to report on opioid payment, adverse incentives, and data

under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5762. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize a Joint Task Force to enhance integration of the Department of Homeland Security's border security operations to detect, interdict, disrupt, and prevent narcotics, such as fentanyl and other synthetic opioids, from entering the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 5773. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require electronic prior authorization for covered part D drugs and to provide for other program integrity measures under parts C and D of the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5774. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidance on pain management and opioid use disorder prevention for hospitals receiving payment under part A of the Medicare program, provide for opioid quality measures development, and provide for a technical expert panel on reducing surgical setting opioid use and data collection on perioperative opioid use, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5775. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require Medicare Advantage plans and part D prescription drug plans to include information on the risks associated with opioids, coverage of certain nonopioid treatments used to treat pain, and on the safe disposal of prescription drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5796. An act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide grants for eligible entities to provide technical assistance to outlier prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5801. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide for requirements under the Medicaid program relating to the use of qualified prescription drug monitoring programs and prescribing certain controlled substances; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 5811. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to postapproval study requirements for certain controlled substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 6042. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the reduction in Federal medical assistance percentage for Medicaid personal care services furnished without an electronic visit verification system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H.R. 6110. An act to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the review and adjustment of payments under the Medicare outpatient prospective payment system to avoid financial incentives to use opioids instead of non-opioid alternative treatments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

S. 3093. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the protective custody of alien children accompanied by parents, and for other purposes.

S. 3100. A bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SHELBY, from the Committee on Appropriations:

Special Report entitled "Further Revised Allocation to Subcommittees of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 2019" (Rept. No. 115-280).

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. KENNEDY:

S. 3092. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to provide certain requirements relating to commitments by State agencies to provide the State share of the administrative costs of administering the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HELLER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. FLAKE, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SASSE, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CORKER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 3093. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the protective custody of alien children accompanied by parents, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3094. A bill to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3095. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to help build a stronger health care workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. REED):

S. 3096. A bill to allow the Coast Guard to issue a certificate of documentation with a coastwise endorsement for the vessel OLIVER HAZARD PERRY, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 3097. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to report on tax compliance with respect to non-employer business income, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH:

S. 3098. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the sources of the authority to issue regulations regarding certifications and other criteria applicable to legislative branch employees under the Wounded Warriors Federal Leave Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3099. A bill to require the review of durations of use of approved indications of medically-important antibiotics labeled for use in

animals; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 3100. A bill to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington; read the first time.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 3101. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to require a State to conduct State leadership activities that reduce or eliminate out-of-pocket expenses related to enrollment in a career and technical education course or dual or concurrent enrollment program for students in special populations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. Res. 552. A resolution commemorating June 20, 2018, as "World Refugee Day"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. UDALL):

S. Res. 553. A resolution designating June 20, 2018, as "American Eagle Day" and celebrating the recovery and restoration of the bald eagle, the national symbol of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 554. A resolution designating the month of June 2018 as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month" and June 27, 2018, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FLAKE):

S. Res. 555. A resolution recognizing the freedom of Muslims of the United States to exercise their religion and participate in the civil systems of their country; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 26

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 26, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain can-

didates for the office of the President, and for other purposes.

S. 384

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 384, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 700

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 802, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of Lawrence Eugene "Larry" Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II.

S. 1251

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1251, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a pilot program for providing portable benefits to eligible workers, and for other purposes.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1328, a bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in

recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1520

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1520, a bill to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and for other purposes.

S. 1835

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1835, a bill to provide support to States to establish invisible high-risk pool or reinsurance programs.

S. 1903

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1903, a bill to assist communities affected by stranded nuclear waste, and for other purposes.

S. 2072

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2072, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take action to eliminate human exposure to asbestos, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2131

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2131, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish medically necessary transportation for newborn children of certain women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2157

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2157, a bill to require drug manufacturers to disclose the prices of prescription drugs in any direct-to-consumer advertising and marketing to practitioners of a drug.

S. 2165

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2165, a bill to provide additional disaster recovery assistance for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the United States Virgin Islands, and for other purposes.

S. 2221

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi

(Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2221, a bill to repeal the multi-State plan program.

S. 2360

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, a bill to provide for the minimum size of crews of freight trains, and for other purposes.

S. 2410

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2410, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit high deductible health plans to provide chronic disease prevention services to plan enrollees prior to satisfying their plan deductible.

S. 2432

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2432, a bill to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

S. 2463

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2463, a bill to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 2513

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to improve school safety and mental health services.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2736, a bill to develop a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region, and for other purposes.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2830

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2830, a bill to reauthorize the rural emergency medical services training and equipment assistance program under section 330J of the Public Health Service Act.

S. 2938

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2938, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify provisions relating to hours of service requirements with respect to transportation of livestock and insects, and for other purposes.

S. 2995

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2995, a bill to establish the Rural Export Center, and for other purposes.

S. 3051

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3051, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricultural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes.

S. 3091

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3091, a bill to limit the separation of families seeking asylum in the United States and expedite the asylum process for individuals arriving in the United States with children.

S. RES. 477

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 477, a resolution recognizing and celebrating the National Comedy Center being built at 203-217 West Second Street, Jamestown, New York.

AMENDMENT NO. 2551

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2551 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2927

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2927 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2929

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added

as cosponsors of amendment No. 2929 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2954

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2954 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2971

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. McCASKILL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2971 proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2972

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2972 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2978

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2978 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2986

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2986 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2999

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2999 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3003

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Louisiana

(Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3003 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5895, a bill making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3095. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to help build a stronger health care workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senator BLUNT in reintroducing the Building a Health Care Workforce for the Future Act.

According to the Association of American Medical Colleges, by 2030, there will be a shortage of up to 120,000 physicians. Over one third of the shortage, up to 49,300, will be in primary care. Individuals and families living in underserved areas—urban and rural—will continue to be those most disadvantaged by this shortage.

The passage of the Affordable Care Act in 2010 ushered in an expansion of access to health insurance for millions of Americans. While we fight to protect these gains and work to improve the system further, many Americans are going to the doctor for preventive health care for the first time. In order for this to be successful, we must expand our health care workforce to ensure that we have enough health care professionals to seamlessly accommodate the newly insured as they join the ranks of those who already have coverage. In addition, as the baby boomers age, we will need health care professionals to care for them as well. According to the Pew Research Center, roughly 10,000 baby boomers will become eligible for Medicare every day through 2030.

The Building a Health Care Workforce for the Future Act would authorize programs that would grow the overall number of health care providers, as well as encourage providers to pursue careers in geographic and practice areas of highest need.

Building on the success of the National Health Service Corp (NHSC) Scholarship and Loan Repayment Program and the State Loan Repayment Program, our legislation would establish a State scholarship program. Like the NHSC State Loan Repayment Program, States would be able to receive a dollar-for-dollar match to support individuals that commit to practicing in the state in which the scholarship was issued after completing their education and training. At least 50 percent of the funding would be required to support individuals committed to pursuing careers in primary care. The States would have the flexibility to use the remaining 50 percent to fund scholarships

to educate students in other health care professions with documented shortages with the approval of the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The Building a Health Care Workforce for the Future Act would also authorize grants to medical schools to develop primary care mentors on faculty and in the community. According to the Association of American Medical Colleges, graduating medical students consistently say that one of the most important factors affecting the career path they choose is role models. Building a network of primary care mentors in the classroom and in a variety of clinical settings will help guide more medical students into careers in primary care.

The legislation would couple these mentorship grants with an initiative to improve the education and training offered by medical schools in competencies most critical to primary care, including patient-centered medical homes, primary and behavioral health integration, and team-based care.

It would also direct the Institute of Medicine (IOM) to study and make recommendations about ways to limit the administrative burden on providers in documenting cognitive services delivered to patients. Primary care providers treat patients in need of these services almost exclusively, and as such, spend a significant percentage of their day documenting care. That is not the case for providers who perform procedures, such as surgeries. This IOM study would help uncover ways to simplify documentation requirements, particularly for delivering cognitive services, in order to eliminate one of the potential factors that may discourage medical students from pursuing careers in primary care.

Providers across the spectrum of care recognize that this bipartisan legislation is part of the solution to addressing the looming health care workforce shortage and have lent their support, including: the Alliance for Specialty Medicine, the American Association of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, the American Association of Colleges of Osteopathic Medicine, the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy, the American Osteopathic Association, the Association of American Medical Colleges, and the Society of General Internal Medicine.

I look forward to working with these and other stakeholders as well as Senator BLUNT and our colleagues to pass the Building a Health Care Workforce for the Future Act in order to help ensure patients have access to the health care they need.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 552—COMMEMORATING JUNE 20, 2018, AS “WORLD REFUGEE DAY”

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE,

Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. REED, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 552

Whereas World Refugee Day acknowledges the courage, strength, and determination of women, men, and children forced to flee their homes because of persecution or conflict;

Whereas, according to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—

(1) a refugee is an individual who faces persecution or has a well-founded fear of persecution because of race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or membership in a particular social group;

(2) more than 68,500,000 people are displaced worldwide, which is the worst displacement crisis in global history, including 25,400,000 refugees, more than 40,000,000 internally displaced people, 3,100,000 asylum seekers, and 10,000,000 stateless people;

(3) children comprise 52 percent of the global refugee population, many of whom lack access to education;

(4) on average, 44,400 people per day are displaced from their homes;

(5) 16,200,000 individuals were newly displaced due to conflict or persecution in 2017, including 11,800,000 internally displaced persons and 4,400,000 refugees and asylum seekers;

(6) more than 68 percent of all refugees worldwide come from the following 5 countries:

- (A) Syria, with 6,300,000 refugees;
- (B) Afghanistan, with 2,600,000 refugees;
- (C) South Sudan, with 2,400,000 refugees;
- (D) Myanmar, with 1,200,000 refugees; and
- (E) Somalia, with 986,400 refugees;

(7) 37 countries resettled 102,800 refugees, less than 1 percent of people in need of resettlement, in 2017;

(8) more than ½ of the Syrian population was displaced, either across borders or within the country, in 2016; and

(9) the need for third country resettlement continues to grow, with over 1,200,000 refugees requiring resettlement in 2017;

Whereas, during 2017, the United States welcomed a total of 33,400 refugees, well below the United States Government goal of 45,000 refugee admissions, and a 65 percent drop compared with the 96,900 refugees welcomed in 2016;

Whereas, at this pace, the United States may only admit approximately 20,000 refugees this year;

Whereas refugees are the most vetted travelers to enter the United States and are subject to extensive screening checks, including in-person interviews, biometric data checks, and multiple interagency checks;

Whereas refugees contribute to local economies in the United States, pay an average of \$21,000 more in taxes than they receive in benefits, revitalize cities and towns by offsetting population decline, and boost economic growth throughout the United States by opening businesses, paying taxes, and buying homes;

Whereas several industries rely heavily on refugee workers to support economic stability, and low rates of refugee arrival has impacted economic growth, especially in towns that rely on refugee populations to revitalize their industries;

Whereas the ongoing crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is projected to produce nearly 1,000,000 refugees in neighboring countries in 2018;

Whereas the escalating crisis in Venezuela has forced 1,500,000 refugees to seek safety in neighboring countries and beyond since 2014;

Whereas refugee children are 5 times more likely not to be in school than non-refugee children;

Whereas refugee women and children are often at greater risk of violence, human trafficking, exploitation, and gender-based violence; and

Whereas the United States resettlement program is a life-saving solution critical to global humanitarian efforts, which strengthens global security, advances United States foreign policy goals, and alleviates the burden placed on front-line host countries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) underscores the importance of the United States Refugee Resettlement Program as a critical tool for the United States global leadership, including leveraging foreign policy, strengthening national and regional security, and encouraging international support of refugees;

(2) reaffirms the bipartisan commitment of the United States to promote the safety, health, and well-being of refugees, including the education of refugee children and displaced persons who flee war, persecution, or torture in search of freedom and safety;

(3) recognizes individuals who have risked their lives working individually and for non-governmental organizations and international agencies, such as United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, to provide life-saving assistance and protection for people displaced by conflict around the world; and

(4) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to uphold its international leadership role responding to the global refugee crisis with humanitarian assistance and protection for the most vulnerable;

(B) to continue to provide adequate funding for refugee resettlement in the United States and protection for refugees overseas;

(C) to work in partnership with the international community to find solutions to existing conflicts and to prevent new conflicts;

(D) to alleviate the burden on frontline refugee host countries that absorb the majority of the refugees of the world through humanitarian and development support; and

(E) to reaffirm the long-standing tradition of resettling refugees in the United States regardless of nationality or religion.

SENATE RESOLUTION 553—DESIGNATING JUNE 20, 2018, AS “AMERICAN EAGLE DAY” AND CELEBRATING THE RECOVERY AND RESTORATION OF THE BALD EAGLE, THE NATIONAL SYMBOL OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 553

Whereas the bald eagle was chosen as the central image of the Great Seal of the United States on June 20, 1782, by the Founding Fathers at the Congress of the Confederation;

Whereas the bald eagle is widely known as the living national symbol of the United States and for many generations has represented values, such as—

- (1) freedom;
- (2) democracy;
- (3) courage;

(4) strength;

(5) spirit;

(6) independence;

(7) justice; and

(8) excellence;

Whereas the bald eagle is unique to North America and cannot be found naturally in any other part of the world, which was one of the primary reasons the Founding Fathers selected the bald eagle to symbolize the Government of the United States;

Whereas the bald eagle is the central image used in the official logos of many branches and departments of the Federal Government, including—

(1) the Executive Office of the President;

(2) Congress;

(3) the Supreme Court of the United States;

(4) the Department of Defense;

(5) the Department of the Treasury;

(6) the Department of Justice;

(7) the Department of State;

(8) the Department of Commerce;

(9) the Department of Homeland Security;

(10) the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(11) the Department of Labor;

(12) the Department of Health and Human Services;

(13) the Department of Energy;

(14) the Department of Housing and Urban Development;

(15) the Central Intelligence Agency; and

(16) the United States Postal Service;

Whereas the bald eagle is an inspiring symbol of the spirit of freedom and the sovereignty of the United States;

Whereas the image and symbolism of the bald eagle has—

(1) played a significant role in art, music, literature, architecture, commerce, education, and culture in the United States; and

(2) appeared on United States stamps, currency, and coinage;

Whereas the bald eagle was endangered and facing possible extinction in the lower 48 States but has made a gradual and encouraging comeback to the land, waterways, and skies of the United States;

Whereas the dramatic recovery of the national bird of the United States is an endangered species success story and an inspirational example to other environmental, natural resource, and wildlife conservation efforts worldwide;

Whereas, in 1940, noting that the bald eagle was threatened with extinction, Congress passed the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the “Bald Eagle Protection Act”) (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), which prohibited killing, selling, or possessing the species, and a 1962 amendment expanded protection to the golden eagle;

Whereas, by 1963, there were only an estimated 417 nesting pairs of bald eagles remaining in the lower 48 States, with loss of habitat, poaching, and the use of pesticides and other environmental contaminants contributing to the near demise of the national bird of the United States;

Whereas, in 1967, the bald eagle was officially declared an endangered species under Public Law 89-669 (80 Stat. 926) (commonly known as the “Endangered Species Preservation Act of 1966”) in areas in the United States south of the 40th parallel due to the dramatic decline in the population of the bald eagle in the lower 48 States;

Whereas the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) was enacted in 1973, and in 1978, the bald eagle was listed as an endangered species throughout the lower 48 States, except in the States of Michigan, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, in which the bald eagle was listed as a threatened species;

Whereas, in July 1995, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service announced that in

the lower 48 States, the bald eagle had recovered sufficiently to change the status of the species from endangered to threatened;

Whereas, by 2007, bald eagles residing in the lower 48 States had rebounded to approximately 11,000 pairs;

Whereas, on June 28, 2007, the Secretary the Interior and the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service removed the bald eagle from protection under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), but the bald eagle continues to be protected under the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the "Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act") (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.), section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the "Lacey Act"), and the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.);

Whereas Challenger, the trained, educational bald eagle of the American Eagle Foundation in Pigeon Forge, Tennessee, was invited by the Secretary of the Interior to perform a free-flight demonstration during the official bald eagle delisting ceremony held at the Jefferson Memorial in Washington, District of Columbia;

Whereas experts and population growth charts estimate that the bald eagle population could reach 15,000 pairs, even though a physical count has not been conducted by State and Federal wildlife agencies since 2007;

Whereas caring and concerned agencies, corporations, organizations, and people of the United States representing Federal and State governments and the private sector passionately and resourcefully banded together, determined to save and protect the national bird of the United States;

Whereas the recovery of the bald eagle population in the United States was largely accomplished through—

(1) the dedicated and vigilant efforts of Federal and State wildlife agencies and nonprofit organizations, such as the American Eagle Foundation;

(2) public education;

(3) captive breeding and release programs;

(4) hacking and release programs; and

(5) the translocation of bald eagles from places in the United States with dense bald eagle populations to suitable locations in the lower 48 States that had suffered a decrease in bald eagle populations;

Whereas various nonprofit organizations, such as the Southeastern Raptor Center at Auburn University in the State of Alabama, contribute to the continuing recovery of the bald eagle through rehabilitation and educational efforts;

Whereas the bald eagle might have been lost permanently if not for dedicated conservation efforts and strict protection laws such as—

(1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(2) the Act of June 8, 1940 (commonly known as the "Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act") (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.);

(3) the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 703 et seq.);

(4) section 42 of title 18, United States Code (commonly known as the "Lacey Act"); and

(5) the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3371 et seq.); and

Whereas the sustained recovery of the bald eagle population will require the continuation of recovery, management, education, and public awareness programs to ensure that the population numbers and habitat of the bald eagle remain healthy and secure for generations to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 20, 2018, as "American Eagle Day";

(2) applauds the issuance of bald eagle commemorative coins by the Secretary of

the Treasury to generate critical funds for the protection of the bald eagle; and

(3) encourages—

(A) educational entities, organizations, businesses, conservation groups, and government agencies with a shared interest in conserving endangered species to collaborate and develop educational tools for use in the public schools of the United States; and

(B) the people of the United States to observe American Eagle Day with appropriate ceremonies and other activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 554—DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF JUNE 2018 AS "NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH" AND JUNE 27, 2018, AS "NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY"

Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Mr. HELLER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. JONES, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. NELSON, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 554

Whereas the brave men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States (in this preamble referred to as the "Armed Forces"), who proudly serve the United States, risk their lives to protect the freedom of the people of the United States and deserve the investment of every possible resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being;

Whereas more than 3,000,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed overseas since the events of September 11, 2001, and have served in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the current generation of military men and women has sustained a historically high rate of operational deployments, with many members of the Armed Forces serving overseas multiple times, placing those members at high risk of experiencing combat stress;

Whereas, when left untreated, exposure to traumatic combat stress can lead to post-traumatic stress, sometimes referred to as post-traumatic stress disorder (in this preamble referred to as "PTSD") or post-traumatic stress injury;

Whereas men and women of the Armed Forces and veterans who served before September 11, 2001, remain at risk for post-traumatic stress;

Whereas the Secretary of Veterans Affairs reports that—

(1) about 11 to 20 percent of veterans who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom have PTSD in a given year;

(2) about 12 percent of Gulf War veterans have PTSD in a given year; and

(3) about 30 percent of Vietnam veterans have had PTSD in their lifetimes;

Whereas many combat stress injuries remain unreported, undiagnosed, and untreated due to a lack of awareness about post-traumatic stress and the persistent

stigma associated with mental health conditions;

Whereas exposure to military trauma can lead to post-traumatic stress;

Whereas post-traumatic stress significantly increases the risk of anxiety, depression, suicide, homelessness, and drug- and alcohol-related disorders and deaths, especially if left untreated;

Whereas public perceptions of post-traumatic stress or other mental health disorders create unique challenges for veterans seeking employment;

Whereas the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and Veteran Service Organizations, as well as the larger medical community, both private and public, have made significant advances in the identification, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of post-traumatic stress and the symptoms of post-traumatic stress, but many challenges remain;

Whereas increased understanding of post-traumatic stress can help eliminate the stigma attached to this mental health issue;

Whereas additional efforts are needed to find further ways to eliminate the stigma associated with post-traumatic stress, including—

(1) an examination of how post-traumatic stress is discussed in the United States; and

(2) a recognition that post-traumatic stress is a common injury that is treatable and repairable;

Whereas post-traumatic stress can result from any number of stressors other than combat, including rape, sexual assault, battery, torture, confinement, child abuse, car accidents, train wrecks, plane crashes, bombings, or natural disasters, and affects approximately 8,000,000 adults in the United States annually;

Whereas the diagnosis now known as PTSD was first defined by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980 to commonly and more accurately understand and treat veterans who had endured severe traumatic combat stress;

Whereas combat stress had previously been viewed as a mental illness, and the word "disorder" carries a stigma that perpetuates this misconception; and

Whereas the designation of a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day will raise public awareness about issues related to post-traumatic stress, reduce the associated stigma, and help ensure that those individuals suffering from the invisible wounds of war receive proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 2018 as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month" and June 27, 2018, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day";

(2) supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense, as well as the entire medical community, to educate members of the Armed Forces of the United States, veterans, the families of members of the Armed Forces of the United States and veterans, and the public about the causes, symptoms, and treatment of post-traumatic stress;

(3) supports efforts by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to foster cultural change around the issue of post-traumatic stress, understanding that personal interactions can save lives and advance treatment;

(4) welcomes the efforts of the National Center for PTSD of the Department of Veterans Affairs and local Vet Centers (as defined in section 1712A(h) of title 38, United

States Code) to provide assistance to veterans who are suffering from the effects of this injury;

(5) encourages commanders of the Armed Forces of the United States to support appropriate treatment of men and women of the Armed Forces of the United States who suffer from post-traumatic stress; and

(6) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense.

SENATE RESOLUTION 555—RECOGNIZING THE FREEDOM OF MUSLIMS OF THE UNITED STATES TO EXERCISE THEIR RELIGION AND PARTICIPATE IN THE CIVIL SYSTEMS OF THEIR COUNTRY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 555

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States guarantees religious freedom to people of all faiths;

Whereas article VI of the Constitution of the United States asserts that no religious test may be required for public office, ensuring that people of all faiths may serve their country;

Whereas the United States has always valued the right of individuals to practice their faith as they please, and religious freedom is fundamental to the national character of the United States;

Whereas people of the United States of all faiths, including Muslims, both immigrant and native-born and from a variety of races and ethnicities, have made valuable contributions to the United States throughout its history;

Whereas more than 3,000,000 Muslims now reside in the United States;

Whereas Muslims have served in the Armed Forces of the United States for generations, with more than 5,000 Muslims currently serving and many having made the ultimate sacrifice for the United States;

Whereas Muslim scientists and researchers in the United States have helped expand the understanding of medicine, engineering, and outer space;

Whereas Muslim inventors in the United States have made breakthroughs ranging from brain tumor treatments to the creation of the ice cream cone;

Whereas Muslim athletes have represented the United States in the Olympics and in most professional sports leagues;

Whereas Muslim entrepreneurs and business leaders in the United States have helped shape industries including financial services, food, transportation, cosmetics, and furniture;

Whereas countless Muslims contribute to the economy and well-being of the United States as business owners, firefighters, police officers, physicians, laborers, service workers, and teachers; and

Whereas Muslims have served as Members of Congress, Ambassadors of the United States, and other types of public servants: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes the religious freedom of Muslims of the United States and their civic contributions to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3005. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment

SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3006. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3007. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3008. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3009. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3010. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3011. Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3012. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3013. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3014. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3015. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3016. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3017. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3018. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3019. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3020. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3021. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3022. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3023. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3024. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3025. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3026. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3027. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3028. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3029. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3030. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3031. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3032. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3033. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3034. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3035. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3036. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3037. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3038. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3039. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3040. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3041. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. ENZI)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 770, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes.

SA 3042. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3043. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3044. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3045. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3046. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3047. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3048. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3005. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 2____. Any amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in this Act for bonuses for individuals in Senior Executive Service positions (as defined in section 3132 of title 5, United States Code) at medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs that have a one-star rating shall instead be used to conduct background check adjudication actions for employees of the Veterans Health Administration.

SA 3006. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 50, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 51, line 4.

Beginning on page 51, strike line 12 and all that follows through page 53, line 2.

SA 3007. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 29, line 19.

SA 3008. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III in division A, add the following:

SEC. 3____. No funds appropriated by this or any other Act, or made available by the transfer of funds in this Act, may be used by the Secretary of Energy to develop or manage any training or workforce development program for the growth of the energy efficiency or clean energy sectors.

SA 3009. Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. 3____. Section 136(a)(5) of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013(a)(5)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (C), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) through (C) as clauses (i) through (iii), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(3) in the matter preceding clause (i) (as so redesignated), by striking “designed to carry” and inserting the following: “designed—

“(A) to carry”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) to carry at least 28 seated passengers and that achieves not less than a 22 miles-per-gallon equivalent at a model bus testing program, while operating as a fully electric vehicle.”.

SA 3010. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 18, strike “\$2,161,000,000” and insert “\$2,165,000,000”.

On page 5, line 3, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “: Provided,

That of the funds made available under this heading, \$12,000,000 shall be for the navigation program of the Corps of Engineers under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (33 U.S.C. 577).”

On page 8, line 3, strike “\$193,000,000” and insert “\$189,000,000”.

SA 3011. Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, line 22, insert “, and, in recognition that there is growing evidence that plastic straws contribute to the 8,000,000 tons of plastic that enter the oceans every year while not contributing significantly to the beverage consumption experience, not more than \$5,000 that shall be used by the Architect of the Capitol to work with contractors to eliminate or reduce the use of plastic straws in facilities of the legislative branch that are under the care of the Architect of the Capitol” before “; for”.

SA 3012. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 2____. The Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall conduct an investigation of all nursing homes of the Department of Veterans Affairs that had an overall one-star rating as of December 31, 2017, as determined by the rating system of the Department.

SA 3013. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 2____. PUBLICATION OF QUALITY RATING OF NURSING HOMES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and publish in the Federal Register and on a publicly available Internet website of the Department of Veterans Affairs the rating assigned by the Department to each nursing home of the Department with respect to quality of care, including all internal metrics and criteria used in determining such rating.

(b) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 3014. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used for the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a civil works project of the Corps of Engineers authorized by Congress if that construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair does not provide an open, competitive process that considers both domestic and international supplies of iron and steel products used in the project.

SA 3015. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV of division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available in this Act for Overseas Contingency Operations and none of such funds that remain available after fiscal year 2019 may be used for the European Deterrence Initiative after fiscal year 2019.

SA 3016. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 28, strike lines 3 through 9.

SA 3017. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 5 _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the advanced technology vehicles manufacturing incentive program established under section 136 of the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C. 17013).

SA 3018. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019,

and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, add the following:

SEC. 3 _____. None of the funds made available in this title may be used to provide financial assistance under section 363 of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6323).

SA 3019. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in Division A, insert the following:

SEC. 5 _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on analysis contained in—

(1) the document entitled "Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in February 2010;

(2) the document entitled "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 and revised in November 2013;

(3) the notice published by the Council on Environmental Quality entitled "Revised Draft Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews" (79 Fed. Reg. 77802 (December 24, 2014));

(4) the document entitled "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in July 2015;

(5) the document entitled "Addendum to Technical Support Document on Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis under Executive Order 12866: Application of the Methodology to Estimate the Social Cost of Methane and the Social Cost of Nitrous Oxide", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016; or

(6) the document entitled "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016.

SA 3020. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, line 7, insert "": *Provided*, that the Director shall use not less than \$500,000

of the amount made available under this heading for (1) improving technical systems, processes, and models for the purpose of improving the transparency of estimates of budgetary effects to Members of Congress, employees of Members of Congress, and the public, and (2) to increase the availability of models, economic assumptions, and data and the replicability of estimates of budgetary effects for Members of Congress, employees of Members of Congress, and the public" before the period.

SA 3021. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in Division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The final rule issued by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army entitled "Clean Water Rule: Definition of 'Waters of the United States'" (80 Fed. Reg. 37054 (June 29, 2015)) is void.

(b) Until such time as the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of the Army issue a final rule after the date of enactment of this Act defining the scope of waters protected under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) and that final rule goes into effect, any regulation or policy revised under, or otherwise affected as a result of, the rule voided by this section shall be applied as if the voided rule had not been issued.

SA 3022. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I of division A, add the following:

SEC. 1 _____. (a) In the case of the funds made available under the heading "CONSTRUCTION" that are in excess of the budget request submitted to Congress by the President and are for the continuation of construction of projects that principally include improvements to rainfall drainage systems that address flood damages, the funds shall be equally distributed among all eligible projects.

(b) In this section, the term "eligible project" means a project—

(1) that principally includes improvements to rainfall drainage systems that address flood damages; and

(2) for which construction has begun or can continue.

SA 3023. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 305. (a) The amount appropriated by this title under the heading "DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION" under the heading "NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION" under the heading "ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES" is hereby increased by \$65,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be allocated to developing and preparing to implement a comprehensive, long-term monitoring and verification program for activities related to the denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of North Korea, in coordination with relevant international partners and organizations.

(b) The amount appropriated by this title under the heading "WEAPONS ACTIVITIES" under the heading "NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION" under the heading "ATOMIC ENERGY DEFENSE ACTIVITIES" is hereby reduced by \$65,000,000, with the amount of the reduction to be derived from amounts allocated to the W76-2 warhead modification program.

SA 3024. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PILOT PROGRAM TO EXTEND PAVEMENT LIFE.

(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary of the Army may, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of Energy, carry out a pilot program to design, build, and test technologies and innovative pavement materials in order to extend the service life of military roads and runways.

(b) **SCOPE.**—The pilot program authorized by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The design, test and assembly of technologies and systems suitable for pavement applications.

(2) Research, development, and testing of new pavement materials for road and runway use in different geographic areas in the United States.

(3) Design and procurement of platforms and equipment to test performance, cost, feasibility, and effectiveness.

(c) **COMPETITION REQUIREMENTS.**—Any award of a contract or grant under the pilot program authorized by subsection (a) shall be made using merit-based selection procedures.

(d) **REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than two years after the commencement of the pilot program, the Secretary of the Army shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the pilot program.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the effectiveness of activities under the pilot program in improving the service life of military roads and runways.

(B) An analysis of potential lifetime cost-savings associated with the extended service life of the runways and roads as well as potential reduction in energy demands.

(e) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authorities under this section shall terminate on September 30, 2024.

SA 3025. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 103, line 18, of division C, strike the period at the end and insert the following: "Provided further, that of the funds made available under this heading, \$3,500,000 shall be for the planning, design, and architect and engineer services for the strategic dispersal of the United States capital fleet."

SA 3026. Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 103, line 18, of division C, strike the period at the end and insert the following: "Provided further, that of the funds made available under this heading, \$5,000,000 shall be for the incremental funding of force protection measures."

SA 3027. Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title V of division A, add the following:

SEC. 5 ____ . None of the funds made available by this division or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to issue any order pursuant to section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4511) or section 202(c) of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824a(c)) that requires any entity—

(1) to purchase electric energy based on the fuel used to generate the electric energy; or

(2) to generate or sell electric energy unless the electric energy is required to meet an existing or imminent shortage of electric energy and the demand for electric energy cannot otherwise be met.

SA 3028. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 2 ____ . DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM ON FURNISHING DENTAL HEALTH CARE SERVICES FOR VETERANS IN RURAL AND OTHER UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a demonstration program to assess the feasibility and advisability of furnishing dental health care services, including through the use of alternative dental health care providers, to increase access to such services for eligible

veterans who reside in rural and other underserved communities.

(b) **LOCATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall carry out the demonstration program in not more than four rural States, as determined by the Secretary.

(2) **PRIORITY.**—The Secretary shall prioritize the establishment of programs under the demonstration program under this section in States that do not have a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs that offers on-site dental services.

(c) **ELIGIBLE VETERANS.**—A veteran is eligible for dental health care services under the demonstration program under this section if—

(1) the veteran is entitled to dental health care services from the Department; or

(2) the veteran is enrolled in the system of patient enrollment of the Department under section 1705 of title 38, United States Code, but is not eligible for dental health care services from the Department under authorities other than this section.

(d) **TELEHEALTH.**—For purposes of alternative dental health care providers and other dental care providers who are licensed to provide clinical care, dental services provided under the demonstration program under this section may be administered by such providers through telehealth-enabled collaboration and supervision when appropriate and feasible.

(e) **USE OF AMOUNTS.**—Of the amounts made available to the Veterans Health Administration in this title, \$20,000,000 shall be made available to the Secretary to carry out the demonstration program under this section.

(f) **ALTERNATIVE DENTAL HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "alternative dental health care providers" has the meaning given that term in section 340G-1(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 256g-1(a)(2)).

SA 3029. Mr. THUNE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division C, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AUTOMATIC ANNUAL INCREASE IN RATES OF DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND DEPENDENCY AND INDEMNITY COMPENSATION.

(a) **INDEXING TO SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES.**—Section 5312 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) Whenever there is an increase in benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) as a result of a determination made under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)), the Secretary shall, effective on the date of such increase in benefit amounts, increase the dollar amounts in effect for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation by the Secretary, as specified in paragraph (2), as such amounts were in effect immediately before the date of such increase in benefit amounts payable under title II of the Social Security Act, by the same percentage as the percentage by which such benefit amounts are increased.

"(2) The dollar amounts to be increased pursuant to paragraph (1) are the following:

"(A) **COMPENSATION.**—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1114 of this title.

“(B) ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR DEPENDENTS.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1115(1) of this title.

“(C) CLOTHING ALLOWANCE.—The dollar amount in effect under section 1162 of this title.

“(D) NEW DIC RATES.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 1311(a) of this title.

“(E) OLD DIC RATES.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under section 1311(a)(3) of this title.

“(F) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR SURVIVING SPOUSES WITH MINOR CHILDREN.—The dollar amount in effect under section 1311(b) of this title.

“(G) ADDITIONAL DIC FOR DISABILITY.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under subsections (c) and (d) of section 1311 of this title.

“(H) DIC FOR DEPENDENT CHILDREN.—Each of the dollar amounts in effect under sections 1313(a) and 1314 of this title.

“(3) Whenever there is an increase under paragraph (1) in amounts in effect for the payment of disability compensation and dependency and indemnity compensation, the Secretary shall publish such amounts, as increased pursuant to such paragraph, in the Federal Register at the same time as the material required by section 215(i)(2)(D) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)(2)(D)) is published by reason of a determination under section 215(i) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 415(i)).”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (d) of section 5312 of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall take effect on the first day of the first calendar year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 3030. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. JONES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division C, add the following:

SEC. 2 _____. It is the sense of Congress that none of the funds made available in this Act should be used in a manner that would increase wait times for veterans who seek care at medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SA 3031. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title IV of division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. It is the sense of the Senate that beginning in fiscal year 2020, the European Deterrence Initiative should be funded only from funds made available for base or discretionary spending of the Department of Defense instead of funds made available for Overseas Contingency Operations.

SA 3032. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water de-

velopment and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. **LIMITATION ON CONVERSION OF FUNDS FOR PROGRAM TO IMPROVE RETENTION OF HOUSING BY FORMERLY HOMELESS VETERANS AND VETERANS AT RISK OF BECOMING HOMELESS.**

The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not convert any of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in a fiscal year to carry out section 2013 of title 38, United States Code, from a specific purpose program to a general purpose program unless the Secretary included a proposal to do so in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs budget for such fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President for such fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code).

SA 3033. Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. **STAFFING OF PROGRAM MANAGERS FOR SUPPORTED HOUSING PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) STAFFING.—Section 2003(b) of title 38, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “(1)” before “The Secretary”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(2) The Secretary shall provide case management support whenever requested by a local housing authority under the supported housing program administered under such section.

“(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall ensure that in each fiscal year no case manager is concurrently assigned to more than 35 veterans under this subsection.

“(B) The Secretary may waive the requirement of subparagraph (A) for a particular case manager in a particular fiscal year as the Secretary considers appropriate.

“(C) Not less frequently than once each fiscal year, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the waivers made by the Secretary under subparagraph (B) in the previous fiscal year. Each report shall include a description of the circumstances under which each waiver was made.

“(4) The Secretary shall ensure that each veteran to whom a case manager is assigned under this subsection is located within such distance of the case manager as the Secretary considers reasonable.

“(5)(A) In any case in which a position within the Veterans Health Administration for a case manager described in paragraph (1) is vacant for a period of 180 days or more, the Secretary shall seek to enter into a contract with a local service provider with knowledge and expertise applicable to a case manager in such position to furnish the case management services that would otherwise be provided by a case manager in such position.

“(B) The requirement in subparagraph (A) to seek to enter into a contract shall cease to apply if the Secretary fills the vacancy referred to in such subparagraph.”.

(b) LIMITATION ON CONVERSION OF FUNDS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may not convert any of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available in a fiscal year to carry out section 2013 of such title from a specific purpose program to a general purpose program unless the Secretary included a proposal to do so in the budget justification materials submitted to Congress in support of the Department of Veterans Affairs budget for such fiscal year (as submitted with the budget of the President for such fiscal year under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code).

SA 3034. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title I of division C, add the following:

SEC. _____. (a) REPORT.—Not later than December 31, 2019, the Secretary of Air Force shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report setting forth the results of a review, conducted by the Secretary for purposes of the report, of the analytical model used for strategic basing of KC-46 aircraft.

(b) PARTICULAR ELEMENT.—The report shall include such recommendations of the Secretary for the analytical model as the Secretary considers appropriate in order to ensure that the model addresses changes in refueling requirements along the Northern Tier of the United States as a result of the 2018 National Defense Strategy and associated mobility capability requirements, including, in particular, in connection with the growth of activities in the Northern Polar region by global and regional powers.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The requirement for a report under this section may not be construed as limiting the ability of the Air Force to make any future adjustment to the analytical model used for strategic basing of KC-46 aircraft or to any of the criteria in the analytical model.

SA 3035. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. 305. None of the funds appropriated by this Act or any other Act may be obligated or expended to execute any organizational change in the Department of Energy that would—

(1) limit the authority of the Secretary of Energy over the National Nuclear Security Administration, unless the Secretary has determined the organizational change to be in the public interest; or

(2) make the General Counsel of the National Nuclear Security Administration independent of the General Counsel of the Department of Energy.

SA 3036. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making

appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 54, line 5, insert “\$10,000,000 shall be for activities related to the development of regulatory infrastructure for advanced nuclear technologies,” after “mission,”.

SA 3037. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 503 of title V of division A, insert the following:

SEC. 5 _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(1) the amount available under the heading “NUCLEAR ENERGY” under the heading “DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ENERGY PROGRAMS” under title III shall be \$1,196,000,000, of which not more than \$292,000,000 shall be for research and development relating to reactor concepts; and

(2) the amount available under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES” under the heading “NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION” under the heading “INDEPENDENT AGENCIES” under title IV shall be \$908,350,000, of which not less than \$10,000,000 shall be for activities related to the development of regulatory infrastructure for advanced nuclear technologies, except that the amounts reserved for such development under this paragraph shall not be derived from fee revenues, notwithstanding section 6101 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 2214).

SA 3038. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT ON CELL SITE SIMULATORS DETECTED NEAR FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

The Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a full accounting of cell site simulators detected near facilities of the Department of Defense during the three year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act and the actions taken by the Secretary to protect personnel of the Department, their families, and facilities of the Department from foreign powers using such technology to conduct surveillance.

SA 3039. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 79, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

RELOCATION EXPENSES

SEC. 131. (a) Any amounts made available for salaries and expenses of the Congressional Budget Office that are authorized to be used to reimburse new employees of the Congressional Budget Office for relocation expenses shall only be available for such purposes if the Joint Committee on Taxation has been authorized to reimburse new employees of the Joint Committee on Taxation for relocation expenses.

(b) This section shall apply with respect to fiscal year 2019 and each succeeding fiscal year.

SA 3040. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 75, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

SEC. 121. (a) Congress finds that—

(1) the Joint Committee on Taxation serves as a critical resource to Members of Congress on tax policy and legislation, providing expertise and technical knowledge on a nonpartisan basis;

(2) the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office both provide revenue estimates of legislation, and thus compete for many of the same candidates; and

(3) the professional staff of economists with a doctoral degree, attorneys, and accountants of the Joint Committee on Taxation should be recognized for their expertise and placed on a level playing field with the employees of the Congressional Budget Office.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the Joint Committee on Taxation and the Congressional Budget Office should be treated the same for purposes of compensation limitations and any other relevant matters pertaining to personnel.

SA 3041. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. ENZI)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 770, to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes; as follows:

Beginning on page 6, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 8, line 5, and insert the following:

“(A) ORDER OF ISSUANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The coins issued under this subsection commemorating either an innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each State, the District of Columbia, or a territory shall be issued in the following order:

“(I) STATE.—With respect to each State, the coins shall be issued in the order in which the States ratified the Constitution of the United States or were admitted into the Union, as the case may be.

“(II) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND TERRITORIES.—After all coins are issued under subclause (I), the coins shall be issued for the District of Columbia and the territories in the following order: the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(ii) APPLICATION IN EVENT OF THE ADMISSION OF ADDITIONAL STATES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), if any additional State is admitted into the Union before the end of the 14-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a \$1 coin with respect to the additional State in accordance with clause (i)(I).

“(iii) APPLICATION IN THE EVENT OF INDEPENDENCE OR ADDING OF A TERRITORY.—Notwithstanding clause (i)—

“(I) if any territory becomes independent or otherwise ceases to be a territory of the United States before \$1 coins are minted pursuant to this subsection, the subsection shall cease to apply with respect to such territory; and

“(II) if any new territory is added to the United States, \$1 coins shall be issued for such territories in the order in which the new territories are added, beginning after the \$1 coin is issued for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(B) ISSUANCE OF COINS COMMEMORATING FOUR INNOVATIONS OR INNOVATORS DURING EACH OF 14 YEARS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Four \$1 coin designs as described in this subsection shall be issued during each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1) until 1 coin featuring 1 innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each of the States, the District of Columbia, and territories has been issued.

“(ii) NUMBER OF COINS OF EACH DESIGN.—The Secretary shall prescribe, on the basis of such factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the number of \$1 coins that shall be issued with each of the designs selected for each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1).

SA 3042. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title III of division A, add the following:

SEC. 30 _____. Pursuant to section 1807 of the Grand Canyon Protection Act of 1992 (Public Law 102-575; 106 Stat. 4672), section 3(d)(1) of Public Law 106-392 (114 Stat. 1604), section 601(b) of the Colorado River Basin Project Act (43 U.S.C. 1551(b)), and section 15 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (43 U.S.C. 620n) of the offsetting collections in the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund of the Western Area Power Administration for repayment of capital costs, \$23,000,000 may be transferred to the Upper Colorado Basin Fund.

SA 3043. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

SA 3044. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

SA 3045. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:
The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

SA 3046. Mrs. GILLIBRAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 50, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(i) WEST VALLEY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT.—All high-level radioactive waste at the Western New York Service Center in West Valley, New York, from the project carried out under the West Valley Demonstration Project Act (42 U.S.C. 2021a note; Public Law 96-368) shall be considered to have resulted from atomic energy defense activities—

(1) for purposes of section 8 of the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 (42 U.S.C. 10107); but

(2) not for purposes of—

(A) section 3(a)(3) of the Waste Isolation Pilot Plan Land Withdrawal Act (Public Law 102-579; 106 Stat. 4779); or

(B) section 213 of the Department of Energy National Security and Military Applications of Nuclear Authorization Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-164; 93 Stat. 1265).

SA 3047. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 4, line 18, strike “\$2,161,000,000” and insert “\$2,250,000,000”.

On page 5, line 3, strike “law.” and insert the following: “law: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$89,000,000 shall be for dredging projects.”.

On page 22, line 23, strike “\$2,322,000,000” and insert “\$2,144,000,000”.

On page 22, line 25, strike “direction.” and insert the following: “direction: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$37,000,000 shall be available for bioenergy technologies.”.

SA 3048. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to

amendment SA 2910 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 5895, making appropriations for energy and water development and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division A, add the following:

SEC. 2. (a) Section 206(c)(2) of the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (43 U.S.C. 620 note; Public Law 113-235) is amended by striking “2018.” and inserting the following: “2022: *Provided*, That the Secretary shall not fund pilot projects in the Upper Colorado River Basin without the participation of the Upper Colorado River Division States, acting through the Upper Colorado River Commission.”.

(b) Section 9504(e) of the Secure Water Act of 2009 (42 U.S.C. 10364(e)) is amended by striking “\$450,000,000” and inserting “\$480,000,000”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have 11 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 Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

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 Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Combating money laundering and other forms of illicit finance: How organizations launder money and innovative techniques for fighting them.”

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Geoffrey Adam Starks, of Kansas, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission, and Peter A. Feldman, of the District of Columbia, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nomination: William Charles McIntosh, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Administrator, and Peter C. Wright, of Michigan, to be Assistant Administrator, Office of Solid Waste, both of the Environmental Protection Agency.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Current and Proposed Tariff actions administered by the Department of Commerce.”

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “USAID Resources and Redesign.”

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Medicaid fraud and Overpayments: Problems and Solutions.”

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Keep What you Catch: Promoting Traditional Subsistence Activities in Native Communities.”

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, and Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Roy Kalman Altman, and Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, and Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018 during votes to conduct a hearing entitled “Election Security Preparations: A State and Local Perspective.”

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Policy Response to Russian Interference in the 2016 U.S. elections.”

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 12 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, upon the recommendation of the Democratic leader, pursuant to Public Law 105-292, as amended by Public Law 106-55, Public Law 107-228, and

Public Law 112-75, appoints the following individual to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom: Ahmed M. Khawaja of California.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3093 AND S. 3100

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3093) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to address the protective custody of alien children accompanied by parents, and for other purposes.

A bill (S. 3100) to establish the Mountains to Sound Greenway National Heritage Area in the State of Washington.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, 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 be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 553, S. Res. 554, and S. Res. 555.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

AMERICAN INNOVATION \$1 COIN ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 770 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 770) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or

groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, to promote the importance of innovation in the United States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Murphy amendment at the desk be considered and 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. 3041) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

Beginning on page 6, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 8, line 5, and insert the following:

“(A) ORDER OF ISSUANCE.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The coins issued under this subsection commemorating either an innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each State, the District of Columbia, or a territory shall be issued in the following order:

“(I) STATE.—With respect to each State, the coins shall be issued in the order in which the States ratified the Constitution of the United States or were admitted into the Union, as the case may be.

“(II) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND TERRITORIES.—After all coins are issued under subclause (I), the coins shall be issued for the District of Columbia and the territories in the following order: the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(ii) APPLICATION IN EVENT OF THE ADMISSION OF ADDITIONAL STATES.—Notwithstanding clause (i), if any additional State is admitted into the Union before the end of the 14-year period referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Treasury may issue a \$1 coin with respect to the additional State in accordance with clause (i)(I).

“(iii) APPLICATION IN THE EVENT OF INDEPENDENCE OR ADDING OF A TERRITORY.—Notwithstanding clause (i)—

“(I) if any territory becomes independent or otherwise ceases to be a territory of the United States before \$1 coins are minted pursuant to this subsection, the subsection shall cease to apply with respect to such territory; and

“(II) if any new territory is added to the United States, \$1 coins shall be issued for such territories in the order in which the new territories are added, beginning after the \$1 coin is issued for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

“(B) ISSUANCE OF COINS COMMEMORATING FOUR INNOVATIONS OR INNOVATORS DURING EACH OF 14 YEARS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Four \$1 coin designs as described in this subsection shall be issued during each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1) until 1 coin featuring 1 innovation, an individual innovator, or a group of innovators, from each of the States, the District of Columbia, and territories has been issued.

“(ii) NUMBER OF COINS OF EACH DESIGN.—The Secretary shall prescribe, on the basis of such factors as the Secretary determines to be appropriate, the number of \$1 coins that shall be issued with each of the designs selected for each year of the period referred to in paragraph (1).

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

The bill was read the third time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate.

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 770), as amended, was passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:45 a.m., Thursday, June 21; 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, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 5895.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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, following the remarks of our Democratic colleagues.

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

The Senator from Oregon.

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, many members of the Democratic caucus are coming down to the floor to speak to the abomination of a policy of separating children from their parents when people are seeking asylum in the United States of America. The Senator from Minnesota is going to speak first, followed by the Senator from Hawaii, then the Senator from Washington, followed by the Senator from Illinois.

I yield to my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I thank Mr. MERKLEY, the Senator from Oregon, for his leadership and his calling attention to the tragedy that has been going on right on our border.

I rise today to join my colleagues to express my deep concern about the policy that was adopted by this administration to separate families at the border.

What we have seen over the past several days and weeks and actually months is simply unacceptable. While the President has now recognized publicly that we should not be taking children from their parents, this should not be happening in our country.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, 2,342 children were separated from their parents at the border between May 5 and June 9. The pace of these separations had been increasing, with nearly 70 children being taken from their parents up until today and being kept in facilities that are increasingly overcrowded.

The American Medical Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics have expressed their opposition. They said that this type of family separation does “irreparable harm” to children. The president of the American Academy of Pediatrics, who traveled to the border, called it “a form of child abuse.”

It is not just the medical groups. A bipartisan group of 75 former U.S. attorneys called on the administration to end its policy. The group included a former Republican U.S. attorney who served under both President Bushes, Tom Heffelfinger from the State of Minnesota. Their letter emphasized that the administration’s zero tolerance policy was “a radical departure from previous Justice Department policy” and that it is “dangerous, expensive, and inconsistent with the values of the institution in which [they] served.”

All five First Ladies have been critical, and, as we know, probably the woman who said it best was First Lady Laura Bush. She said:

This zero-tolerance policy is cruel. It is immoral. And it breaks my heart.

I think that says it all.

I am glad that several of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have recently stood up and said they disagree with this policy.

Senator GRAHAM said: “President Trump could stop this policy with a phone call.”

The weeks went by, and the families kept getting separated.

I am pleased that Senator FEINSTEIN is leading a bill, the Keep Families Together Act. I was an original cosponsor of this bill, but I do want to note that we do not need the legislation to stop the separation of children and their parents.

While I am still reviewing this Executive order, I will note that it still raises serious issues, including with respect to the indefinite detention of children and their families, and that there are major questions about the order. That being said, action on this was necessary, and now we must move forward.

I see the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, here, who has given so many speeches about Dreamers that I don’t think we could even count them. We have more issues for this country besides the one that has just broken the hearts of Americans. We have people on temporary status who are sitting in Minnesota who don’t know if they are going to be deported in a year, when they have been in this country legally for decades, working in our hospitals. We have Dreamers who came to this

country through no fault of their own. We have immigrants who love this country, who want to be citizens here, and this Senate gave them a path to be citizens in a vote in this very Chamber years ago, and that bill never advanced in the House. We can do that again.

If there is any silver lining to this tragedy as we work through it, I hope that it will focus the American people again on the fact that this is a country of immigrants and that immigrants do not diminish America; immigrants are America.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I thank Senator MERKLEY from Oregon for his leadership and my other colleagues who are coming to the floor this evening.

Like so many people across the country, I have been deeply affected by what is happening on our southern border. Children are being ripped away from their parents, placed into mass detention, deprived of adequate legal counsel, and isolated from everyone they have ever known. Millions of people are rising up with sorrow and horror over what is happening and with good reason.

The President of the United States and this administration are playing games with the lives of these innocent children, and when confronted, they hide behind excuses that they are just “following the law.” This is just another lie from a President and an administration that have institutionalized lying to justify their unconscionable policies. There is nothing in the law that requires a zero tolerance approach at the border. It was a choice that Donald Trump and his administration made, and these children are suffering the consequences.

The President’s actions are unnecessary and cruel, but they aren’t particularly surprising, coming from him. On issue after issue, Donald Trump creates a crisis through his own actions, blames others for what is happening, and uses the ensuing chaos to demand a legislative solution that often harms even more people.

It is up to each of us and to the millions of Americans outraged by his actions to stand up, fight back, and demand action. This action remains urgent, even after the President announced earlier today that he would use his Executive authority to end family separation at the border. This Executive order just creates an entirely new problem. It does not end zero tolerance, and it does not end indefinite detention. It only means children are going to be incarcerated together with their parents. This is still unacceptable and echos back to one of the darkest periods in our history when, during World War II, the U.S. Government incarcerated 120,000 Japanese Americans. That this time we are incarcerating non-Americans misses

the point. Due process applies to everyone—everyone—on American soil.

The President’s order also instructs the Attorney General to challenge the Flores settlement, which sets national standards for humane treatment of children in immigration detention and ensures their prompt release. The elimination of these national standards would have profoundly negative consequences for thousands of children every year and is yet another demonstration of the cruelty with which this administration treats immigrants to our country.

The President has also hinted that legislation will accompany his Executive action. Any legislative solution must result in less chaos and more justice for these children and their families.

Congress certainly has a responsibility to repair our broken immigration system, and we tried hard in 2013, with months of work and bipartisan compromise. But we cannot and should not enact a patchwork solution that enshrines Donald Trump’s hatred and fear of immigrants into law. We need to think through the inevitable consequences of our policies and propose legislation that will actually help these families and their children. This approach stands in stark contrast to a President and an administration that rarely think things through. They never stop to consider the consequences of their actions.

Instead of being ashamed about this, the President appears to take pleasure in the chaos he sows, but this chaos causes real damage to real people. These misguided, shoot-from-the-hip decisions of his have already caused significant harm to thousands of children who will face a lifetime of trauma after being separated from their parents.

Let me tell you a story. It is one I haven’t told very often because it is difficult to talk about. I often speak about my own immigrant experience of coming to this country when I was 7 years old with my mom and my older brother Roy. Mom was escaping an abusive marriage to start a new life for us. Mom brought us two older kids with her, leaving my 3-year-old younger brother behind in Japan, because we were old enough to go to school, and at 7 and 9 years old, we could look after ourselves while she was at work supporting us. My younger brother left back in Japan never really recovered from the trauma of the separation from his mother and his siblings. My mother always had deep sorrow about having to leave her baby behind. We finally reunited almost 3 years later.

What is happening to these children feels personal to me. Like so many people, I find that my anger and emotion about this issue aren’t far below the surface for me. I am very concerned about what will happen to these 2,400 children who have already been separated from their parents. These children have already been traumatized.

Yet the President's Executive order does not prioritize reuniting these children with their parents.

Years from now, stories will be written about this dark moment in our Nation's history and what happened to these children. People will judge what we did and how we responded.

I will continue to fight against this President's reprehensible actions that dehumanize immigrants, tear families apart, and undermine our country's moral leadership. I call on all of my colleagues, especially those on the other side of the aisle, to join us in this fight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Hawaii for sharing her personal experience of how that felt because that is so important for us to hear. I thank the Senator from Oregon and all the Senators who are out here tonight to speak on this.

I may be only one person, but today I bring to the floor of the Senate the outrage, the pain, and the frustration of millions of people in my home State of Washington and across the country who see what President Trump has been doing on our southern border, who have been watching the pain this forced family separation has caused so many innocent children, who have begged the President to pick up the phone, sign a piece of paper, do whatever it takes to make it stop, who have refused to be silenced as President Trump carries out his hateful and divisive attacks on immigrants, and who heard a recording with desperate cries of children calling for their parents. When I heard that, my heart stopped. Like every mom, like every human being, I just wanted to reach out and comfort that child. I could only think of how his mother felt because I assure you, whether she was in that room, a room 100 miles away, or a room 3,000 miles away, like every mom, she heard her child's cry, too, and her heart was broken.

While today we saw President Trump change his story about whether he did, in fact, have the ability to make it stop, there are a lot of questions that remain—questions that actually I and others have been asking the Trump administration for weeks that have gone unanswered, like exactly how these parents are being informed about their children's safety. Where are they? Where are they being located? When will they be reunited? Those are just a few. There are more.

President Trump says the Executive order stops the separation. Does that mean starting today? Next month? When? What about the thousands of children who have been removed? Will they ever see their parents again? When? Where? How?

I have not gotten answers from the Secretary of Health, Alex Azar, whose Department should be focused on families' health and well-being but has in-

stead spent that time complicit in a policy of separating families and traumatizing parents and children alike.

Even experts, such as the president of the American Academy of Pediatrics, said that the practice of intentionally inflicting trauma on young children is child abuse.

While it is a good thing that President Trump dialed back his systematic child abuse, it is not enough. We are not going to say everything is OK now. We are not going to stay quiet because while we are still digging into this new Executive order, here is what we do know right now: If this is implemented, there will continue to be zero tolerance for all asylum seekers, including domestic violence survivors. It is a system of locking up children by the thousands, all carried out in our great country's name.

I just read the story of a woman named Blanca who left El Salvador after she received threats on her 8-year-old son's life. She took those threats seriously, she said. Why? Because another family member had already been kidnapped. And as Blanca said, when the extortionists don't get their money, they kill people.

So Blanca left everything behind to seek safety for her son. Two months ago she arrived at the U.S. border to seek asylum. Blanca said that was the last time she saw or talked to her son, Abel, whose last words to her were "Mom, don't leave me."

That is the last thing she heard.

Blanca now sits in a Federal detention center at SeaTac in Washington State where she told her story through tears to an AP reporter. Her son, she has been told, is in custody in upstate New York. That is 3,000 miles away from her, and she doesn't know when or if she is ever going to see him again.

Blanca's story is horrifying. It is sad. Unfortunately, it is not unique. She is one of thousands of parents and children who fled violence and persecution only to find a new nightmare upon arrival in the United States of America—a nightmare caused deliberately, for no good reason, by President Trump, who has chosen to scapegoat asylum seekers and put their children into detention centers for an undetermined amount of time.

We are better than this. We must be better than this. Turning children into bargaining chips or leverage points or deterrents—that kind of cruelty should not be an option in this great Nation.

In recent days, my office has been flooded with thousands of calls and emails and letters from moms and dads and grandmothers and grandfathers—people from all walks of life, from every community I represent—who are angry at the President's new zero tolerance policy and who are horrified by these families who are being ripped apart. So I know I am not alone.

If we can find hope in one thing, it is knowing that all those calls and emails and letters—all of that outcry—got through to the President to change

course on one of his most heartless policies yet.

But we cannot let up now.

President Trump has claimed for days he needed congressional action to do anything at all. Today, he proved that to be simply untrue.

So now we know President Trump will bow to stern pressure of a stern moral movement. Families in Washington State and in every State across the Nation are continuing to demand action, and I am going to keep working to make sure their voices are heard for the sake of so many who seek refuge in our great country and those who believe in the kindness and respect and compassion that does make this country great.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, first he came for the Dreamers. It was in September of last year when President Trump announced that he was going to abolish the DACA Program, an Executive order by President Obama that protected 790,000 young people who came forward, registered with the Federal Government, paid a \$500 filing fee, went through an extensive criminal background check, proved that they had completed at least a level of education, and made clear that they were no threat to this country. For that, they were allowed, under the Executive DACA order, to live in the United States without fear of deportation for 2 years at a time, renewable, and to work in this country.

Last September, President Trump decided to abolish that protection. He challenged Congress. He said: Now it is up to you. Pass a law.

Many of us took him seriously. I worked on a bipartisan basis with many Senators, including Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina, Senator CORY GARDNER of Colorado, Senator MICHAEL BENNET, and Senator BOB MENENDEZ, and we put a lot of hours into it. We wrote a bill to answer the President's challenge. We produced the bill and presented it to him, and he rejected it. He was not going to allow us to come to a bipartisan conclusion to solve this problem without changing other parts of the law, which he demanded.

We couldn't find bipartisan consensus for the President's proposal. In fact, when President Trump's immigration proposal was called on the floor of this Senate Chamber, 39 of the 100 Senators voted for it—only 39. It was a clear illustration that the President's approach to immigration was not even acceptable to all of the Members of his own political party.

So, today, 790,000 young people across America, because of the action of President Trump last September, have only the protection of a court order that saves them from being deported, which allows them to continue to work, which allows them to renew

their DACA status. If that court decision changes in a matter of days, weeks, or months, their protection disappears. Clearly, this President could care less.

First he came for the Dreamers. Then, in April, with the zero tolerance policy, he came for the children—the infants, the toddlers, the little boys and girls who accompanied their parents to the border of the United States.

President Trump did something that most Americans—two out of three—find not only objectionable but unimaginable. This President decided as a matter of policy—a get-tough policy toward immigration—that he would take children—babies, infants—away from their parents. So far, 2,400, we believe, have been taken this way. What has happened to them? We don't know.

You see, in this great country of America—this transparent and open democracy—the Trump administration will not allow any type of visits by Members of Congress, members of the press, to see exactly what is happening with these children. A few photos have made it out, showing these kids being held in cages—kids in cages. That is the Trump approach when it comes to immigration. The recording came out of the cries of these children when they were being separated from their mothers and their parents. There was the report of a father who had a son yanked out of his arms and in desperation went to his jail cell and committed suicide. That is the reality of this Trump policy.

He has been unapologetic. From where he is standing, with the inspiration of Stephen Miller, his adviser and expert on immigration, getting tough is the only answer, the deterrent, putting pressure on Congress to pass the law this President demands—this ridiculous \$25 billion wall that he wants to build on our border with Mexico.

So what has happened? People have spoken out, and I want to thank those Republicans who had the courage to stand up and speak out. Forty-eight Democratic Senators joined Senator FEINSTEIN in making it clear that we were prepared, if necessary, to pass legislation to solve this problem. Some Republican Senators have said the same, that this approach is unacceptable and reprehensible. And the First Ladies of the United States, including Laura Bush, who was quoted earlier by Senator KLOBUCHAR, have just been amazing. They have come forward to let us know, on a bipartisan basis, that what President Donald Trump is doing at the border with children is not only un-American, it is inhumane by any standard.

Treating children this way is something that can have long-term trauma on individuals. We heard from our colleague, Senator HIRONO. She experienced an emotional moment here in the Senate, and I have never seen that before from her. She talked about her family's separation and what it meant to her brother and mom. That is the re-

ality of life. It is a reality this President has ignored.

Well, today, after days and weeks of objections from all across the United States, the President said that he would respond to the situation he created with an Executive order that I have in my hand. It is not that long; it is three pages. I read it closely. I read it carefully. I will tell my colleagues, this Executive order by this President does not solve the crisis that he created.

The order doubles down on the President Trump, Attorney General Sessions, Stephen Miller zero tolerance policy that started this whole crisis of punishing children and families.

The order provides no guarantee that families actually will be kept together. Here is what the language says: It just says the administration will try to maintain family unity, including by detaining alien families together “where appropriate and consistent with law and available resources.” That is from the President's Executive order. That is no guarantee that these families will be kept together.

The order does nothing, speaks not a word to uniting the 2,400 children who have been separated from their families—not one word in there. For goodness' sakes, that is where the President should start with his Executive order: ordering his agencies to reunite these families as quickly as possible so the children who are going through the trauma of this separation will finally have a chance to see their parents again.

And the order provides for—this is the President's order issued today—the indefinite detention of mothers, fathers, and children who are fleeing violence and seeking asylum in the United States.

There is no law on the books that requires this government or allows this President to rip children away from their parents. The horrific scenes we have seen and heard on television are the result of a Trump administration policy that could have ended today if President Trump had simply issued an order to end it. He has it within his power to end the crisis he created. He chose not to.

Instead, on World Refugee Day, President Trump offered this remedy to the crisis he created: Lock up entire families together indefinitely.

To do this, he has to ignore a court order that applies to his administration and every administration for the last 20 years. The Flores settlement between the U.S. Government and the petitioners resulted in a binding 1997 court order that required that children be released from custody without unnecessary delay. The Government of the United States of America was a party to that agreement. That Flores case recognizes that children should not be treated like criminals, and it prohibits the prolonged detention of children because of harmful effects.

The Trump Executive order seeks to undo the Flores consent decree. Re-

pealing Flores was actually a key component of President Trump's own immigration legislation. That was rejected, if my colleagues will remember, by 39 to 60 in the Senate in February.

Is throwing kids in indefinite detention what we want to do as a nation? Is it a loophole that a 5-year-old child cannot be detained beyond 20 days under Flores? Of course not.

Remember, the Flores settlement does not prohibit detention if it is necessary to ensure the safety of the child. The Flores settlement simply prohibits indefinite detention of children, even with their families, and any order to undermine this critical protection will almost certainly be challenged in court.

This Executive order from President Trump will be challenged on the very first day that it violates the Flores settlement. In this order he sends Attorney General Sessions into court to undo the Flores settlement, which has been the law of the land and the standard for Presidents of both political parties for almost 20 years.

Looking at the administration's policy of so-called zero tolerance, which Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced in April and on which the President doubled down on today, here is what we find: The policy means they are criminally prosecuting everyone at the border, no matter what reason brought them to that border.

If someone is coming to the border to smuggle opioids or as part of a criminal gang, throw the book at them. But it makes no sense to throw the book at parents who come to the border with their kids because they are fleeing violence and death threats. There is no requirement—none—to prosecute every border case as a criminal case. As with many laws, there can be criminal or civil penalties for crossing the border without authorization. Our Nation could criminally prosecute everyone who drives too fast, but we use discretion and prosecute selectively.

Asylum seekers do not need to be caged to remain united with their families. The government has the power to individually assess each person apprehended at the border and determine whether that person presents a flight risk or a safety risk. Those who do not present a risk can be released with their families to await immigration proceedings. We have found that if they are given the benefit of counsel, over 90 percent of those who have court proceedings show up for the proceedings. We should do that. We have effective and cost-efficient alternatives to detention available.

President Trump and his allies have taken thousands of children hostage to try to enact their anti-immigration agenda into law. We will not be fooled. This crisis doesn't need legislation to fix it. It requires Republican Members of Congress to join us, stand up, say no, and put an end to this ill-conceived Trump policy.

Instead, we face efforts like Senator CRUZ's bill, which would not protect

children and could undermine the due process approach that we have used in this government. This bill, like the President's Executive order, would override the Flores settlement. That is not a good starting point to the humane treatment of children.

Homeland Security Secretary Kirstjen Nielsen claimed: "We do not have a policy of separating families at the border. Period." Like many of the President's tweets, that was just plain false. Attorney General Jeff Sessions established the zero tolerance policy that separated families—a policy that former First Lady Laura Bush called cruel and immoral. When asked to justify how we could take this immoral position, Attorney General Sessions appeared to find some quote in the Bible that gave him solace.

The president of the American Academy of Pediatrics was more plain-spoken. She called this Trump policy "government-sanctioned child abuse."

I urge my Republican colleagues. People are watching and asking across this country: Aren't we better than this? Can't we treat the Dreamers in a more humane way? Can't we save these children from being caged away from their parents?

Do we want this image in the world? Is this what America has come to? I don't believe so, and two out of three Americans happen to agree with what I just said. We are a better country than this. This President's Executive order does not solve this problem. It makes it worse.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I first thank Senator MERKLEY from Oregon for organizing this very important session tonight.

Last month, Attorney General Jeff Sessions unveiled the Trump administration's new zero tolerance immigration policy. Whether you come to this land fleeing violence, poverty, or persecution, justice isn't blind. It is now also brutal.

This inhumane policy sends a shudder down the spine of the Statue of Liberty, but not that of our President. Zero tolerance really means zero refuge. Zero tolerance really means zero discretion. Zero tolerance really means zero humanity.

The Trump administration's mindless approach to our broken immigration system takes away the ability of Federal law enforcement officers to exercise any discretion that might be warranted based on the facts and circumstances on the ground. In other words, zero tolerance is an anti-immigrant dragnet, the shocking effects of which we have been witnessing these past few days as children have literally been ripped from their parents' arms and separated from them, as their mothers and fathers are taken into custody.

These horrific images were finally enough, even for President Trump.

This afternoon, he signed an Executive order that he says addresses the family separation crisis. It does no such thing. The Executive order that the President signed doesn't end the zero tolerance policy of prosecuting anyone and everyone who crosses the border. It reaffirms it.

If all parents are still being prosecuted as criminals, which the Executive order requires, what does this Executive order actually do? We can only assume that this Executive order would imprison, remand, and incarcerate children—some as newborns—into the same correctional facilities as their parents. They would be sleeping in cages instead of cribs.

In this country, our courts have decided that this treatment of children and families is malicious. In the Flores agreement, more than 20 years ago, we stopped this practice. Now, the President wants to bring it back with a vengeance.

The Executive order directs the Attorney General to try to modify the Flores agreement, but any attempt to undermine the critical protections for children that this landmark settlement has put in place should and will face immediate court challenge. Families and children don't belong in jail, period.

Our President's Executive order does not ask for trained child welfare workers to carry out his wishes. He has called in the military. He expects this cold-blooded tactic—a tactic he is using to negotiate his wall—to be implemented by the Pentagon.

Now, what does that mean? Apparently, he envisions internment camps, using existing military brigs or other facilities to lock up these families. It sounds like a return to the shameful internment camps of the 1940s, during World War II, one of the darkest chapters in our Nation's history. We know how that ended—with the Federal Government paying more than \$1 billion to right a wrong that could never actually be corrected. It was a mistake that we should not even contemplate repeating.

So President Trump first manufactured this crisis at the border, and his new Executive order makes it worse. The only thing President Trump wants to solve is the public relations nightmare he has plunged his administration into.

This is not a PR stunt. These are children's lives at stake. How we respond to this crisis will define the character of each and every one of us. It will define our character as a nation. At this critical moral juncture, I ask each of my colleagues to choose humanity.

To my Republican friends, your voices carry weight in this conversation, especially with this administration in power. Use your voices. Make clear that this Executive order will not end the suffering that this administration is inflicting on vulnerable immigrant families, because in the United States we do not keep children in jails

or military prisons. We do not criminalize asylum seekers. We welcome immigrants for their contributions. We seek immigrants for their talents. We proudly remember our own families who came across a border, whether land or water, knowing this country meant a new start.

We are better than this. We must be better than this. The President wants to send a message that immigrants aren't welcome in America. His leadership may be devoid of compassion, but the American people are not. This policy must end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I begin by thanking Senator MERKLEY. Senator MERKLEY, in my view, delivered a wake-up call to the country several weeks ago when he went to the border, and I have been very pleased to be able to join him in this effort.

A few days ago, we visited a detention center in Sheridan, OR. We spoke with a father who had been separated from his 18-month-old daughter. The day before Father's Day, colleagues, Senator MERKLEY and I listened to a father who had been separated from his 18-month-old daughter and had no idea where she was and didn't know when he would see her again. All over the country, as part of this national shame, these stories have been breaking our hearts.

Now, the President has said, for example, that he is turning away gang members. What Senator MERKLEY and I saw last Saturday was that he is locking up innocent people who are in danger because they refused to submit to gangs in their home countries. That is what we heard at the Sheridan prison just a few days ago.

These stories are particularly poignant in our household. The Wydens had the opportunity to flee the evils of Nazi Germany for the safety and the promise of the United States. My father came as a youngster. He barely spoke English. He studied hard, and when the war came he wanted to wear the uniform of the United States more than anything.

He served in our propaganda arm, where his fluent native German was a great value to the war effort because he wrote propaganda pamphlets that we dropped on the Nazis telling them that they had no chance, that they had no opportunity to survive. Unlike the comical efforts of our enemies, who mangled English, the work of young immigrants like my father, wearing the uniform of the U.S. Army, struck at the morale of German soldiers freezing on the battlefield.

My parents were lucky to be able to make a home in our country, and they raised my brother and me here. They did their part to add to the fabric of the United States.

Now, the Wydens were able to come, but not everyone of their Jewish background was so fortunate. Shiploads of Jews fleeing persecution and violence

were deemed undesirable, and they were turned away from America. Let me be clear about what happened. The rallying cry for those who wished to keep people like my Jewish parents out of this country—those who denied Jewish refugees safety in their moment of desperation—was “America first.”

What happened to those families who turned to the beacon of America for safety and opportunity? Many were forced back to Europe, and many of them ultimately ended up in concentration camps. People don’t embark on the harrowing journey to America, much less with kids by their side, unless they are fleeing serious danger and deprivation.

It is with that history that I wanted to join my colleagues tonight on this floor to talk about the heartlessness we see in the Trump zero tolerance policy—thousands of kids, refugees, forcibly separated from their parents. There are reports that border agents lied to mothers and fathers, telling them that their kids were being taken away for a bath, only to have them disappear—a terrifying scenario, colleagues, with grim historical echoes. There are nursing babies taken from their mothers and kids locked in cages for days, regimented like they are criminals facing hard time.

There is a reason that the courts have barred the executive from holding child refugees for more than 20 days. However, it appears the President intends now to ignore the courts and hold children in jails for the foreseeable future.

The administration has gone to great lengths to defend their policy, but they will not stand up and defend it with honest answers. The administration even buried a recent government report showing that refugees are a positive economic force. I gather it is because it just didn’t fit the company line.

I will close by saying that in my view a strong leader does not rip kids from their mothers and lock them in cages. A strong leader does not take child hostages to use as political pawns. A strong leader does not lie and mislead the American people about the true nature of the policy he enacts.

In my view, these have been acts of weakness. My view is that the national shame which we have seen over the last few weeks is going to go down as one of the dark moments in American history. It is why it is so important in the days ahead that we come together—Democrats and Republicans—and we restore the greatness of America, which is that we are better and stronger because we stand up for refugees, refugees like the Wydens, who fled Nazi Germany decades ago.

I again thank my colleague from Oregon for his critical leadership on this matter.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I rise on World Refugee Day to thank the Amer-

ican public for standing up against the heartless decision by the Trump administration to separate children from their families at the southern border of the United States. Because the administration’s policy triggered our moral gag reflex, you spoke up loudly—everyday citizens, business executives, faith leaders, Governors pulled back Guard troops from missions on the border, and airlines announced they would not facilitate separation of families by flying children hundreds of miles away from their parents. Because of you, the American public, this administration has altered its cruel policy, at least for the time being.

A new Executive order suggests that families will not be separated, but many questions remain. Will they be detained indefinitely? Where will they be detained? What process will be used to determine their fate? Will people seeking to use our legal asylum process be treated like criminals?

The most urgent question I have is this. What is the fate of the 2,300 children you have stripped away from their families? How will you assure that these children are properly returned to parents who are worried to death about them?

Congress has to exercise the most persistent oversight to ensure that these children are restored to their families. An administration that so cavalierly separated them from their parents out of a mistaken belief that the American public wouldn’t care about it can hardly be trusted to reunite these families with speed and compassion. We have to stay on the task to ensure that they do.

Much has been said about the trauma inflicted upon these children taken from their parents. I want to say a word about how traumatic it is for a parent to have a child taken away without any idea when or if a child will be returned. Marco Antonio Munoz was a 39-year-old father from Honduras who made the difficult trek to the United States with his wife and 3-year-old boy. They came here in May after his brother-in-law was murdered by a drug gang near Capon. Honduras has one of the highest homicide rates in the world, and they just wanted their family to be safe. The family crossed into the United States on May 12, in Granjeno, TX—a popular crossing point for Central American families and teens who want to turn themselves in and seek asylum in the United States.

I know a little bit about families like the Munoz family. I lived in Honduras in 1980 and 1981 and have returned a number of times, most recently in 2015. The violence in these neighborhoods is severe, driven by gangs connected to a drug trade that has its origins in American demand for illicit drugs produced in Mexico, Central, and South America. The violence in these Honduran neighborhoods has a direct connection to the sad reality of addiction in the United States. When a family like the Munoz family leaves their

home, they leave everything behind, and all they have is each other.

When the Munoz family was taken into custody in the United States, Border Patrol agents told them the Trump zero tolerance policy meant they had to be separated, and Mr. Munoz, the father, had a panic attack.

As one border agent said: “They had to use physical force to take the child out of his hands.”

That is called being a parent. If you tried to take my child out of my hands, I will hold on with every ounce of strength in my body.

They took Mr. Munoz away. They put him in a car to take him to a kennel-like jail, and he fought in the car. He tried to escape when they took him out of the car. When they put him in the kennel, he rattled the cage he was in. They decided the cage wasn’t strong enough, so they then transported him to a regional jail in McAllen, TX, and put him in a padded cell. The next morning, when they came to visit him, he was dead in his cell, a victim of suicide, with a piece of clothing wrapped around his neck.

An agent who found him expressed confusion about why Mr. Munoz would “choose to separate himself from his family.” It wasn’t Mr. Munoz who chose to separate himself from his family; it was a decision by this administration to punish him and his family that separated him from his family, and with no knowledge when or if he would see his wife and 3-year-old son again, he killed himself.

When you have left your entire life behind, and all you have is your family, how can anyone fail to understand how painful it is to lose them?

As we try to reassemble 2,300 families whom this administration has spread to the winds, there will be at least one 3-year-old boy who will not be able to reunite with his father.

I ask this President, I ask the Attorney General, I ask the Secretary of Homeland Security, was it worth it? Was it worth it?

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, let me thank Senator MERKLEY and others for organizing this important discussion—a discussion designed to reclaim American values. I also want to take this opportunity not just to thank Senator MERKLEY but to thank millions of people from coast to coast—people who are conservatives and progressives, Democrats, Republicans, Independents—for getting on the phone, for calling Members of Congress, for expressing their outrage that in the United States of America today, we have small children who are torn from their mothers and their fathers and locked up in detention cages. All over this country, regardless of one’s political view, one understands that is not what this country is about and must never be about.

Tonight, as I understand it, we have Democrats here, but opposition to this

policy is widespread. Let me quote from a recent op-ed that Laura Bush, our former First Lady, the wife of a conservative Republican, wrote. This is what she said:

Our government should not be in the business of warehousing children in converted box stores or making plans to place them in tent cities in the desert outside of El Paso. These images are eerily reminiscent of the internment camps for U.S. citizens and non-citizens of Japanese descent during World War II, now considered to have been one of the most shameful episodes in U.S. history.

This is former First Lady Laura Bush.

The good news is, because the American people spoke up, because some Republicans finally had the guts to do the right thing and convey their displeasure to the President, Trump has changed his policy. Let us be clear that the Executive order he issued today goes nowhere—nowhere—as far as it should go.

Mr. President, I am going to ask consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Daily Beast, a publication that came out tonight.

What they say is, there is no guarantee in this Executive order, as Senator Kaine has indicated, that the fate of the 2,400 children currently imprisoned will be changed. There is nothing specific in the Executive order that says those 2,400 kids will, in fact, be reunited with their parents. Presumably, this will apply to future apprehensions where children will be imprisoned with their parents.

Second of all, there is an effort in this Executive order to overturn the 1997 Flores settlement, which limits the government's ability to keep children in detention and orders them to be placed in the least restrictive settings as possible.

If you can imagine it, what this Executive order does is raise the possibility of children being in prison for very long periods of time. Is that better than them being separated from their parents? I guess. But does anybody really believe we should be imprisoning for an indefinite period of time little children? There are better ways to deal with this issue.

What is clear to the American people is that once again we have a President who caused this crisis by undoing existing policy. We have a President who I believe just the other day said: Nothing I could do, it is law.

Sadly, once again, he was lying. It is not Federal law. His decision to separate children from their parents was his decision and his decision alone, as he acknowledges today by announcing an Executive order ostensibly doing away with that policy.

Let me remind the American people that this terrible Executive order he issued separating children from their parents is not the first terrible Executive order with regard to immigration. Let us remember that months ago, Trump created the DACA crisis and put 1.8 million young people in this country—young people who were raised in

this country, who are working and going to school or serving in the military—in danger of deportation because of a decision he made.

I say to the President, start working hard on a new Executive order and make that Executive order clear that the 2,400 children, now in jail, separate from their parents, will, in fact, be reunited, and make it clear that we will not keep children in prison for an indefinite period of time.

By the way, while you are at it, why don't you deal with the DACA crisis you created and provide the legal status that 80 percent of the American people want to see for the young people in the DACA Program?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article I referred to from the Daily Beast printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Daily Beast]

TRUMP'S FAMILY SEPARATION ORDER DOES NOTHING FOR FAMILIES HE ALREADY BROKE UP

(By Betsy Woodruff and Justin Glawe)

KIDS ARE THOUSANDS OF MILES AWAY FROM PARENTS WITH NO RELIABLE WAY TO FIND EACH OTHER—AND THEY MAY NEVER AFTER ADULTS ARE DEPORTED.

EL PASO, TX.—Immigrant families won't be separated anymore, thanks to a new order from President Trump, but that doesn't mean families will be reunited.

Trump signed an executive order on Wednesday ending the practice of taking children away from parents who enter the U.S. illegally. Already, though, more than 2,000 children have been separated, according to the government, and advocates and attorneys for them fear they will never see their parents again.

Despite Trump's order, there is no clear, publicly articulated plan to reunite families who are already detained. Parents are held in facilities near the border like McAllen, Texas while their children are sent to foster-care homes as far as New York, Illinois and Michigan. While the adults wait to be deported, their advocates must navigate multiple federal agencies to locate their children.

"The executive order that President Trump signed is no solution," said Michelle Brané, director of the Women's Refugee Commission Migrant Rights and Justice program, in a statement. "First, there are more than 2,000 children already separated from their parents. This EO does nothing to address that nightmare."

The Department of Health and Human Services will not make a special effort to reunite the children already separated from their families, according to a CBS report.

On Tuesday, an ICE spokesperson told The Daily Beast if a parent asks to be deported with a separated child, the agency will accommodate the request "to the extent practicable."

A child immigrant advocate in the Midwest looking after a 6-year-old Guatemalan girl described "cold-calling" ICE officials in El Paso and Washington, D.C. to reunite girl with her mother so they can be deported together.

The girl's mother is in ICE custody in El Paso after being turned away at the Paso del Norte port of entry where she sought asylum. The Daily Beast is providing the advo-

cate with anonymity to protect the identity of the mother and child from feared retribution for speaking out.

In her case, the advocate says an Office of Refugee Resettlement agent was helpful in coordinating with ICE, but that isn't always the case.

"There's some actors that are more willing to cooperate than others," the advocate said.

The advocate estimated many of the separated children will be in the U.S. six months from now. "I would say these children will still be here," the advocate added.

Even if a foreign government agrees to allow a immigrant back into the country, there is no guarantee that U.S. court cases for the parent or the child will be resolved at the same time, allowing them to return together (Adults are being tried in criminal court, while children are tried separately in immigration courts.)

DHS conceded that parents have been deported without their children.

"When parents are removed without their children, ICE, ORR, and the consulates work together to coordinate the return of a child and transfer of custody to the parent or foreign government upon arrival in country, in accordance with repatriation agreements between the U.S. and other countries," the spokesperson said Tuesday.

Chris Carlin, head of the federal public defender's office in Alpine, Texas, told The Daily Beast that he fears some of his clients will never be reunited with their children.

"I think that's a real possibility," he said.

Many of the deported parents return to homelessness and poverty, Carlin said, and may not be reachable by the U.S. government who is still holding their child days, weeks or months later.

HHS has put the children of Carlin's clients in foster homes as far away as New York and Illinois, and he said this makes the obstacle of reconnecting children to their parents potentially insurmountable.

"In the cases that I'm personally familiar with, I don't see any evidence of any plan to reunify the parent and the child after the conclusion of the adult's criminal case," Carlin said. "I don't see any evidence of that at all."

Parents in detention are unlikely to have all the requisite identification documents DHS and HHS demand to prove that a parent and child are in fact related, according to Carlos M. Garcia, an immigration attorney in Austin.

Garcia said none of the people he met with had received any paperwork on how to find their children. However, The Daily Beast obtained an ICE document that is handed out to immigrants once they're detained. It contains several phone numbers for parents to try to find their children. One number notes that the lines are monitored by DHS, possibly scaring away undocumented members of immigrants' families.

"Who knows when they'll be reunified, if they are reunified," Garcia said.

A former ICE director told NBC News parents and children may be separated for years, if not permanently. "You could be creating thousands of immigrant orphans in the U.S. that one day could become eligible for citizenship when they are adopted," said John Sandweg, who served as ICE's acting director in the Obama administration from 2013-2014.

The children of parents who have been deported may sometimes be able to gain the legal right to stay in the U.S. if they can make a valid asylum claim, qualify for special immigrant juvenile status, or qualify for a visa for crime victims, according to Ashley Feasley, the director of policy at Migration and Refugee Services in U.S. Council of Catholic Bishops. Her organization works

with children who have been separated from their parents.

"How do we ensure that we can connect a mom that's been deported to make sure she is fully informed of her child's rights and responsibilities under the immigration system, and do so in the timely manner that we'll need to as prescribed by our immigration laws?" Feasley said. "That's a big concern of mine."

Children who have been separated from their parents usually get a brief legal orientation, but most don't have lawyers so they have to face an immigration judge alone. If their parents are deported or in detention, they may have no idea what kind of legal decisions their children face.

"These kids are traumatized," the Midwest advocate said. "The families are heartbroken."

Mr. SANDERS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who are here tonight and Senator MERKLEY for organizing this evening.

The President has taken a step back from a crisis he provoked, a crisis he caused, and it seems like it is a rare recognition on his part that when a President speaks and a President acts, he speaks and he acts on behalf of the American people, not on his own behalf. The American people could not stand the idea that this country would do what it did to these kids in their name. They could not stand the idea that the whole world would see the separation of children from their parents on the southern border of the United States of America—perpetrated by our own government.

Finally, probably for the first time ever, this President relented to the values the American people share whether they are conservatives or whether they are liberals or something in between that. That is a reason to say I am glad we are moving in that direction.

Maybe another good thing will come out of this, which is that the people who stood up who work for this administration and defended this terrible, inhumane policy in the name of the law and in the name of religion—the Bible—might think harder the next time they do that at a moment of conscience like this one.

As my colleagues have said, it is not clear tonight what is in the policy. I quote a New York Times article that is on the front page of the paper tonight. It reads:

And a Health and Human Services official said that more than 2,300 children who have already been separated from their parents under the President's "zero tolerance" policy will not be immediately reunited with their families while the adults remain in federal custody during their immigration proceedings.

"There will not be a grandfathering of existing cases," said Kenneth Wolfe, a spokesman for the Administration for Children and Families, a division of the Department of Health and Human Services. Mr. Wolfe said the decision about the children was made by the White House, but he added, "I can tell you definitively that is going to be policy."

So what are they saying—that current kids aren't going to be grand-

fathered, that the current kids who have been on the TV this week and the week before are not going to have the benefit of this Executive order?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, June 20, 2018]

TRUMP RETREATS ON SEPARATING FAMILIES, BUT THOUSANDS WILL REMAIN APART

(By Michael D. Shear, Abby Goodnough and Maggie Haberman)

WASHINGTON.—President Trump caved to enormous political pressure on Wednesday and signed an executive order meant to end the separation of families at the border by detaining parents and children together for an indefinite period.

"We're going to have strong—very strong—borders, but we are going to keep the families together," Mr. Trump said as he signed the order in the Oval Office. "I didn't like the sight or the feeling of families being separated."

But Justice Department officials said it was not clear whether the practice of separating families could resume after 20 days if a federal judge refuses to give the government the authority it wants to hold families together for a longer period.

And a Health and Human Services official said that more than 2,300 children who have already been separated from their parents under the president's "zero tolerance" policy will not be immediately reunited with their families while the adults remain in federal custody during their immigration proceedings.

"There will not be a grandfathering of existing cases," said Kenneth Wolfe, a spokesman for the Administration for Children and Families, a division of the Department of Health and Human Services. Mr. Wolfe said the decision about the children was made by the White House, but he added, "I can tell you definitively that is going to be policy."

The president signed the executive order days after he said that the only way to end the division of families was through congressional action because "you can't do it through an executive order." But he changed his mind after a barrage of criticism from Democrats, activists, members of his own party and even his wife and eldest daughter, who privately told him it was wrong.

Stories of children being taken from their parents, audio of wailing toddlers and images of teenagers in cage-like detention facilities had exploded into a full-blown political crisis for Mr. Trump and congressional Republicans, who were desperate for a response to those who have called the practice "inhumane," "cruel" and "evil."

The president's four-page order says that officials will continue to criminally prosecute everyone who crosses the border illegally, but will seek to find or build facilities that can hold families—parents and children together—instead of separating them while their legal cases are considered by the courts.

But the action raised new questions that White House officials did not immediately answer. The order does not say where the families would be detained. And it does not say whether children will continue to be separated from their parents while the facilities to hold them are located or built.

Officials on a White House conference call said they could not answer those questions.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, the headline of the article reads: "Trump

Retreats on Separating Families, but Thousands Will Remain Apart."

We need to know, and that, obviously, isn't going to be acceptable to the American people if that is what it is.

The last point I want to make tonight, because I know I have other colleagues here, is that it does not help matters when the President is completely allergic to the truth on any dimension but especially on this one.

Today, at the White House, in front of all of the cameras and in front of the Republicans he invited there—he didn't invite any Democrats—this is what he said in lamenting the fact that he couldn't do a deal with Democrats.

This is the President:

We're having a lot of problem with Democrats.

They don't care about lack of security, they would like to have open borders, where anybody in the world can just flow, including from the Middle East—from anybody anywhere they can just flow into our country. Tremendous problems with that. Tremendous crime caused by that. We are just not going to do it.

That is what he said is our position.

As the Presiding Officer knows, I was on the Gang of 8 in 2013 that negotiated what was called the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Enforcement Act of 2013. The first two words in that title are "border security." It got 68 votes on this floor. Every single Democrat voted for it. I want the American people to know what is in it because they will never hear from the President as to what was in it:

There is \$46 billion dollars for border enforcement; \$30 billion to hire and deploy nearly 20,000 new Border Patrol agents, doubling the total number, a doubling of the number of Border Patrol agents; \$8 billion for a fence along the southern border at least 700 miles long; \$4.5 billion for new surveillance technologies, including air and marine surveillance so we could see every inch of the border, so we would know what was happening there; \$2 billion to enact recommendations of a newly established southern border security commission; \$750 million to expand the E-Verify; the remaining \$1.5 billion dollars for administrative costs to the Departments of State, Labor, Agriculture, and Justice.

That was the border security bill we passed in 2013, and that is the border security bill we should pass today. The only reason it is not the law of the land today is that the House would not let it come to a vote. Had they let it come to a vote, had the Speaker allowed it to come to a vote, it would have passed.

I think, collectively, we should go back to that work and see if we can't actually solve the problem rather than just play politics with it or, in the case of what we have just seen, rather than play politics with the lives of the children on the southern border.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the President's Executive order about the separation of family policy and about the incarceration of family policy that has now replaced it. There are details that are unknown at this point about how this program will be working as we go forward, but we know enough right now to have the most serious and significant concerns about the President's Executive order.

Every great nation—even the greatest Nation in the history of the world like the United States of America—has moments of extraordinary shame, times when it loses its moral compass, and it simply takes the wrong direction. We can remember a number of them in our own Nation's history. One of them was the internment of Japanese children who were thrown into World War II-era detention camps and imprisoned, in effect, with their parents. Almost every lawyer in the United States of America and most citizens know the name Korematsu, and that is because it was a moment of shame for this country.

Ending family separation—the process of tearing children away from their moms and dads—is a welcomed and humane step, but the solution should not be the indiscriminate and indefinite detention of children. Family separation should not be replaced by family imprisonment. There is no moral advantage to incarcerating children as opposed to tearing them away from their parents. In fact, it is not only immoral, it is illegal. The courts have said so on a number of occasions—in 1997, in the Flores case, which is now well-known to everyone, but more recently, in fact, as recently as 2016. The reason goes to the core of our constitutional principle about how and when and whom we imprison, how we take liberty away from people.

Indefinitely imprisoning children and families is still inhumane and ineffective law enforcement. President Trump's current policies will put children behind bars indefinitely and indiscriminately. Children will experience many of the same enduring of trauma, pain, and harm. The world will continue to watch the United States of America lock up innocent children and throw away the key.

Much like the policy of family separation, this new policy of indefinite and indiscriminate family detention harkens back to those dark days, to those moments of shame in this country during World War II. History will judge us as harshly if we fail to speak out and stand up at this moment of testing. The gaze of history is upon us now. It is upon the President. It is upon every Member of the U.S. Senate.

There are immense costs to this policy—\$775 a day, per individual, at these detention camps. Yet the costs are way beyond dollars and cents; they are to the moral image and authority of this country and to our self-image—the accountability to ourselves, to our own sense of morality and humanity.

The world was outraged when it saw children being torn away from parents, and now the President has acknowledged that his heart responded as well. Yet soon—and I would predict very soon—we will see images as striking, as stunning, and as repugnant as those images of taking children away from their parents when we see those images of the detention facilities, cages, and of children—young people behind bars and packed beyond capacity—on military bases and other places that were never designed to be holding facilities. The world will be outraged by those images as well—of the sights and sounds of those children.

We owe this new policy a special scrutiny and a strong sense of outrage if it is what it seems like right now. We cannot remain silent about the children who have been already separated from their parents. Nothing in this Executive order—not a word—provides for the reunification of the thousands of children who have already been separated from their parents. What will happen to them? Where are they? Where are their parents? How will they be reunited? What trauma will they continue to endure? This policy remains as inhumane and cruel for them as it was earlier today or this week.

All of us bear a responsibility in this moment. I urge my colleagues to take this day—World Refugee Day—to commemorate the great work done by brave individuals in this country who help to resettle refugees and the refugees themselves who had the courage and strength to come here after having made the journeys from shores far away and after having overcome obstacles most of us have never confronted.

There are solutions other than putting children into detention camps. There are release programs that involve oversight and supervision. There is also a case management program that has been working, along with other cities' efforts, that has been used for releasing them. We should choose the least restrictive alternative, the least burdensome one that best serves the purposes of law enforcement. Make no mistake, we have that obligation not only as a matter of heart and morality but also of law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I begin tonight by thanking my colleague Senator MERKLEY for his leadership on this issue.

I rise to join my Democratic colleagues and millions of Americans who have been appalled and outraged at the humanitarian crisis that President Trump has created on our southern border.

Make no mistake, these past few weeks have truly been an affront to our American values. By now, we have all witnessed the horrifying reality—the images of children being held in cages, the cries of screaming kids who have no idea where their parents are being

taken or if they will ever see them again.

The Department of Homeland Security announced that between May 5 and June 9, the Department took 2,300 children—approximately 70 children per day—from their parents. Pediatricians, psychologists, and health professionals have made clear the lasting harm of these forced separations. According to experts, when children are forcibly removed from their parents, the amount of toxic stress can cause neurons in the brain to be killed off, leaving damage that impacts brain development and can cause long-term behavioral health issues, although no parent needs a doctor to tell them that.

The fact that our government has engaged in this type of physical and psychological damage to children is morally reprehensible. These actions have been unacceptable and completely unnecessary.

Let's be clear. The President created this crisis, and over the past days and weeks, the President and his administration made false claim after false claim, saying that there was nothing they could do to reverse the President's own actions. The fact that the President bowed to pressure and signed an Executive order today cannot undo the trauma that has already been inflicted.

We cannot forget about the children and parents that remain separated tonight, and immediate action must be taken to reunite children with their families. Earlier tonight, there were reports that the Department of Health and Human Services will not—will not—make special efforts to reunite children who have already been separated from families because of the President's actions. We cannot and will not accept this continued brutality. The President must act immediately to reunite these children with their parents. Surely the U.S. Government is capable of that.

In the United States of America, we must work to secure our border in a manner that reflects our values, and I am committed to working with anyone on comprehensive bipartisan immigration reform.

Separating children from their families was an abhorrent policy to pursue, and it will forever mark a dark and shameful period in our country's history.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I want to thank Senator MERKLEY for bringing us all together to address what is, I think, as my colleague Senator HASSAN has said, one of the dark marks in the history of our country.

I rise today to call attention to what has clearly been a human rights abuse committed by the U.S. Government, and that is the outrageous and inhumane separation of children from their parents at the border. This morning,

thousands of children woke up without their parents, not knowing where they were, not knowing when they would see them again, not knowing the adults who surround them, having no relationship of trust with these people who have removed their ability to be in the arms and embrace of their parents. This is simply inhumane, and it is unacceptable.

Even with the Executive order from the President of the United States, that number will be the same tomorrow. Those 2,000-plus children will be in the same situation tomorrow that they were in today and the day before and the day before and the day before that.

Over the last few months, the Department of Homeland Security has separated more than 2,000 children from their parents at the border, many of them younger than 4 years old. Let's be clear about what that point is and that moment is in this stage of human development. Age is more than a chronological fact. There are phases of childhood that can never be replaced—phases of childhood that when that child experiences trauma, he or she will have lifelong impact; phases of life during which a child is so innocent and needs love and needs nurturing and needs that love and nurturing from their parents. It cannot be replaced by anyone else, and certainly not by the case in which they are now being held.

So let's look at where we are. It is a child's worst nightmare, a nightmare that is displayed, as my colleagues have discussed, in the stories of a child who was apparently ripped from her mother's breast while being breastfed. There are nightmare stories of a 3-year-old who was torn from the arms of his father and the father being so distraught that he took his own life.

We should tell the truth. We have to speak the truth. The American public knows the truth. Let's speak truth here in the U.S. Senate. Let's speak truth as leaders and acknowledge the lifelong consequences of the separation we visited upon these children and their parents. The American Medical Association and the American Academy of Pediatrics have weighed in on this topic, and what they have said is that family separation in these cases, not as a general matter—it is generally true—but specifically in these cases it will cause lifelong trauma. They have indicated there is empirical evidence of the fact that it is likely to cause significant harm to the brain structure of these children and will affect these children's long- and short-term health.

Let's be clear. A society is judged based on how it treats its children. A society is judged based on how it treats the least among us, and we will be judged harshly. History will judge us harshly because of what this administration has done.

As I stand here at this moment, hours after the announcement of the Executive order on this issue, I find it shocking that the Executive order fails to acknowledge that over 2,000 children

are currently, at this very moment, without their parents. I find it shocking that the Executive order fails to acknowledge, take into account or even concern itself with the fact that tonight there will be over 2,000 children who will go to bed, who will go to sleep without a kiss goodnight from their mother or their father. There are 2,000 children in our country tonight who will go to bed without a hug from their parents. The 2,000 children tonight will go to bed asking: Where is my mommy? Where is my daddy? This is an outrage.

It is an outrage—not to mention these children are innocent and have committed no wrongdoing whatsoever. Let's be clear.

Thankfully, the American people have been speaking out over these last many weeks, and that is the only reason the administration finally had to acknowledge that politically it could not survive its misdeeds. There has still been no acknowledgment by this administration that it visited this policy upon itself and, after urging from every type of person from every walk of life, still held steadfast in supporting this policy. Then it started to snowball, and they couldn't stand by it any longer, but it was only because of the pressure, only because of the relentless coverage by journalists who went to Texas, who went to California and the activists who stood outside of those detention centers and demanded that there be justice and humanity in this system, and it was because of that activism and because of those people speaking out that finally this administration did what was necessary to end the thing that it started around the separation of these children. But this is not enough.

The reality is that there is nothing about this Executive order that addresses those 2,000 children who are currently without their parents. There is nothing about the administration's stated policy as of today that indicates any plan to reunify those children with their parents.

Let's look at the effect of this Executive order. The effect is there is still indefinite detention of families in America because of this administration's policy. So now we are going to go from babies in cages to babies with their mommies in cages.

Let's be clear about the effect of this Executive order. Millions more taxpayer dollars will be used to expand detention camps on top of the billions of taxpayer dollars that have already poured into this detention system.

Let's be clear about the effect of this Executive order. The so-called zero tolerance policy that created this problem in the first place is still in effect. It is still in effect.

Let's be clear about this Executive order. The effect is to suggest that a mother fleeing the murder capital of the world—which is what the zero tolerance policy suggests—that a mother fleeing with her child from the murder capital of the world should be treated

as being a threat to our safety that is equal to being a member of a transnational criminal organization. As a prosecutor for most of my adult life, I find that absolutely disingenuous and absolutely wrong on a moral level, on an ethical level, and devoid of any reference to real fact. But I am not surprised, given the administration's track record on this issue.

If you look at what has been coming out of this administration in terms of its policies, it paints a constellation of attacks on immigrant women, immigrant children, and immigrant families. Let's look at the constellation before us and what has been going on.

Let's just look at how this administration has changed the policies about detention of pregnant women. Before this administration acted on this subject, it was the policy of the U.S. Government to place pregnant women in the least restrictive place, where they could be able to get the kind of prenatal care they so desperately need and deserve. This administration rolled back those protections of pregnant women.

Let's look; there used to be a policy that gave a presumption that pregnant women would not even be detained and should be in less restrictive situations, but this administration changed that policy.

Let's look at how the Office of the Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office have raised serious concerns about oversight and conditions in the detention facilities. There is nothing about this Executive order that addresses those concerns.

Let's look at a complaint filed just last year by numerous organizations, such as the Women's Refugee Commission, that documents insufficient medical care and inhumane conditions for pregnant women in ICE custody—all of which is why I have been proud to work with Representative JAYAPAL to introduce the DONE Act, which will slash ICE detention beds by using alternatives to detention and would increase badly needed oversight of these facilities.

Let's look at another policy. There are reports that the Department of Homeland Security is looking at decreasing the standard of care for children in detention facilities—decreasing the standard of care. These standards govern the types of meals that a child must eat in order to be healthy. These standards govern the kind of recreation a child should receive, again, in order to be healthy, and just this past month, the Attorney General of the United States announced a decision that makes it nearly impossible for victims of domestic violence, over 90 percent of whom are women, to seek asylum in the United States.

Let's look at one final policy that makes this administration's priorities around children very clear—the fact that they have ended DACA. We have talked about this extensively. We have talked about how the American Government made a promise to these

Dreamers, these young people, and this administration has failed to keep that promise.

So what we see is an administration that is engaged in an act of complete hypocrisy, pretending to care about families and children, when in fact, they have a track record of policies that are specifically damaging to families, women, and children.

In conclusion, there is no medical or logical reason that dictates or requires this administration to detain more pregnant women, and it has to stop. There is no evidence that says you should reduce care for children in detention facilities. That has to stop. There is no reason not to have a plan to reunify the 2,300 children who will go to sleep tonight torn from their parents and alone. There is no reason, and it has to stop. This is not reflective of who we are as a country. We are better than this.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I really appreciate the comments of my colleague from California. She brings her background as a prosecutor, as attorney general to bear, as well as the heart of an American who understands that it is not within the scope of America's history or of our traditions or of our culture to treat those who are fleeing persecution by then persecuting them when they arrive on our shores. It is quite the opposite. Thank you for your comments tonight.

Thank you to my colleagues who have spoken before, the 13 Members of the Senate who came and spoke this evening, sharing some very powerful stories. In several cases, they told powerful stories about their own family history, about their own parents or grandparents coming here to the United States of America, placing themselves in a situation. They spoke about how they might have suffered if President Trump had been in office when their families came to the shores of the United States and if they had been separated from their parents when they arrived.

It really helps sometimes to put yourself in the shoes of others, to recognize that outside of our Native Americans, virtually all of us have roots that involve families fleeing persecution, fleeing civil war, fleeing religious oppression, fleeing starvation, and coming here to the United States of America. When they came to the United States, they knew that the general principle of our country was to treat them with respect and dignity.

It has always been symbolized by Lady Liberty. Lady Liberty says: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." That quote is the one we all know from Emma Lazarus. Her poem inscribed on the Statue of Liberty has some other powerful lines, like this one: "From her beacon-hand glows worldwide welcome." That has been

the attitude of America. She says "the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

Well, that golden door, Lady Liberty's torch lighting the path, has been desecrated by President Trump because he has a new inscription, a new message he wanted to send. That message is called a deterrent. If you are fleeing oppression abroad and you wash up here on the shores of the United States of America, we are going to put you in handcuffs, we are going to throw you in prison, and we are going to take away your children. That is hardly the powerful vision of respect and dignity that has been the hallmark of how we treated those fleeing oppression throughout our history.

Pregnant and fearing for her unborn baby's life, a woman fled a death threat from a drug cartel in Honduras. She made her way to America, delivering her baby girl, Andrea, along the way. On Sunday, a group of seven Members of Congress—myself included—met her and her baby. We had gone out on the bridge to see what was going on because we had heard that our American border guards were blocking those seeking asylum from coming across that bridge. They were demanding to see papers of people on the pedestrian bridge, saying: You have a visa, fine. You have a passport, fine. You have no papers and you are seeking asylum, you are not welcome. You may not enter.

I found it hard to believe that we would treat those fleeing persecution, seeking asylum, in that manner, but I heard from others that was the case, and there were articles in the newspaper. We went out there, and we saw it firsthand.

Here is this mother with her baby girl. We were able to talk to her because when we came off the bridge and went into the Hidalgo Port of Entry, through those doors, they had a variety of counseling rooms there. One room was holding 10 or so individuals.

I said: Have you let in anyone who is seeking asylum?

They said: Oh, yes.

I said: Can we meet that person?

They said: Yes.

They brought her out to us with her little girl. She sat down. I sat down beside her.

We asked her some questions.

Why are you fleeing from Central America?

She said: My family took a loan from a private bank. The private bank has a relationship with the drug cartel or criminal empire that runs that part of the city. We can't repay the loan. We had been told that I am targeted to be killed. I was safe as long as I was pregnant, but as soon as I delivered, I would be at high risk. With a month to go in my pregnancy, I fled. I fled to protect the life of my child and my life. I fled.

Unfortunately, her uncle was killed. She escaped, but her uncle was killed.

I think we all have to conclude that her fear was very real. There she is, 8 months pregnant, taking the journey from Honduras north up through Guatemala, through Mexico, to get to the United States, stopping along the way to deliver her baby.

I think about the journey of Mary and Joseph with Mary pregnant, seeking shelter, a place to deliver her child, Baby Jesus. She was let in, given accommodation, taken care of, welcomed.

This woman was largely on her own, as far as I could make out. She continued north with her newborn, and she made it to our border finally, escaped the drug cartel, escaped the death threat, and delivered her baby. She made it through Guatemala and Mexico. She got to our shore—the shore so long symbolized by Lady Liberty and her beacon of hope and welcome. She got to the border, and she tried to cross the pedestrian bridge, and she was stopped. She was sent back. She said she tried multiple times to get across that pedestrian bridge, and she was rebuffed again and again.

I said to her: How did you get across the bridge?

We had been out there. We had seen the border guards stopping those without papers.

How did you get across?

For just a moment, an absolute smile lit up her face. She said that as she was sent back time and again, she would study the situation, and she saw that there were people out washing the windows on the car bridge.

She said: I had a plan.

She went out and she borrowed a squeegee from one of the car window washers who were washing car windows and asking for tips. She washed windows all across the bridge, making her way through the cars to the United States of America, and then she was able to open that door to the port of entry in Hidalgo.

That is how hard it was for one young woman with a 65-day-old child in her arms to get the opportunity to seek asylum in the United States of America.

It troubles me to reread the transcript of Secretary Nielsen, who proceeded to say that there is no reason for people to cross our borders; all they have to do is come to the port of entry. That is all they have to do. But she is in charge of this program of slow-walking those seeking asylum to only let in a few at a time and send them back time and time again.

There was an attorney who was doing pro bono legal work for immigrants. On my first trip down 2 weeks ago before last Sunday, she told me that when she got out to that bridge, there were some 40 families sleeping on the bridge, waiting to be allowed to come in.

When I went on Sunday with the congressional delegation, we said we wanted to go out on the bridge.

The officer said: Well, there is no body on the bridge.

I asked: Why not? They were there 2 weeks ago.

He said: There is no one on the bridge. You can go out and see for yourself.

Well, here is why there was nobody on the bridge: There is nobody on the bridge because they are not being let past the American border guards to come to the American side of the bridge.

This pro bono immigrant advocate and attorney said that those folks are trapped in a terrible, no-win situation because if they return to the Mexico side, the gangs in that city know they are easy prey. She recounted how some had been kidnapped and then their families had been extorted to get the money to free them. It is almost better for somebody to be on the bridge waiting than to be sent back to the Mexican side.

Those who run out of patience and end up crossing the border by going across the nearby river—the bridge is actually over the Rio Grande River. If they do that, then the administration says: You have committed a crime. We are going to lock you up and take your children away.

Another young woman we met on this trip was hanging her head with hopelessness and resignation. She told us she had presented herself for asylum at an official port of entry because she heard the right thing to do was to ask for asylum. Despite doing it at a port of entry, she was charged with illegally crossing the border. Now she sits in an ICE detention center with no idea where her child is, no communication with her family, no legal representation. Will she ever see her toddler again? She doesn't know. I don't know. Do you know whether she will ever see her child again?

Another mother we talked with was panicked over her child's health. She said that her child had medical conditions. When the border guards took the child away, they didn't get any of the information from her about how he needed to be cared for. She is deeply disturbed. She was pleading with them to take the medical information. She still doesn't know where her child is. She doesn't know how he is going to be cared for. How is that mother going to find out about her son's health?

Here is what we know. This policy, which was run as a pilot project last summer, was officially sanctioned with a policy memo on April 6 and was officially announced on May 7. This policy of separating children from their parents is an extraordinarily egregious assault on the welfare of the parent, and it inflicts massive trauma on the child. The American Academy of Pediatrics describes it this way: "irreparable harm." It is harm that cannot be fixed.

Our colleague from Hawaii shared the story of family separation when her mother was not able to bring all of her children with her when she escaped domestic violence and came to the United States to start a new life and the life-

long impact that this has had on her brother.

Well, here is a piece of the puzzle we should spend a lot of time thinking about. Attorney General Sessions just changed the policy of the United States about what qualifies for asylum. So my colleague from Hawaii, whose mother fled domestic violence, would no longer qualify for an opportunity for asylum in the United States of America. She would have been turned away and sent home, back to the horrific circumstances from which she escaped, and my colleague today would not be a U.S. Senator, sitting here helping us to understand this issue through her personal, powerful experience. That mother, the window washer who carried her baby, Andrea, 65 days old, she told us, in one arm and a squeegee in the other, washing windows to get across and finally bypass the American border guard so that she could present her case for asylum—she was fleeing a gang. A drug cartel is defined as a gang, so she is not eligible for asylum—a change that was just made by Jeff Sessions unilaterally. This was an established policy to serve thousands of families fleeing from oppression overseas, and they have just lost their legal standing to be able to present their cases.

I was distraught about this Executive order that came out. It is very vague. The President—was he ready to stand up and take responsibility for the policy he implemented? Was he ready to say: I thought it was right, and here is why. I hear the American people. I hear the Southern Baptists. I hear the evangelical leaders. I hear the United Methodists. I hear the citizens profoundly disturbed by the treatment of children from every corner of the United States, from every part—from Alaska to Florida, from Maine to Southern California, and across Hawaii. I hear them, and I am going to do better. I am going to change this. I am going to modify what we do.

Did he take responsibility? No.

He titled it "Affording Congress An Opportunity To Address Family Separation," and then he proceeded to say nothing about actually uniting the families he has already separated. There is not a thing in here about actually remedying the harrowing plight that he has now put several thousand families into—and counting. The last count I heard was 2,300, and that was days ago. Where are we now? There are 2,500 families separated, children separated from their parents.

What do we know about this situation in which the existing children are going to be united or not united? We have an article from the New York Times that my colleague from Colorado referred to this evening. It answers the question very plainly. I have heard various analyses saying that this Executive order fails to address what is going to happen to the current children, those children who were sent far away from their parents and their par-

ents are incarcerated. The parents are in prison far away. Where are the children? Far away. What is going to happen to them? This doesn't say.

It does say that it is the policy of this administration to maintain family unity, as if it has always been the policy of the administration to maintain family unity. It doesn't announce that they are reversing the previous policy. It doesn't announce a new policy. It says that it is the policy to maintain family unity.

If it is the policy to maintain family unity, then why do I have this in my hand, this article from the New York Times, quoting Kenneth Wolfe, a spokesman for the Administration for Children and Families?

Realize this: When the Department of Homeland Security takes children away from their parents, it then ships them out to a different agency, the Administration for Children and Families, which is a part of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which is part of the Department of Human Services. So the children are torn away by Homeland Security, and then they are put in a different department over here, a subsection called the Administration for Children and Families. So here is the spokesman, and he says: "There will not be a grandfathering of existing cases." "Cases"—what a word to describe children ripped away from their parents. They are cases; no "grandfathering of existing cases," he said.

He goes on to say: "I can tell you definitively that is going to be [the] policy." Well, I can tell you definitively, I am going to fight that policy. I am going to fight that policy of failing to reunite these families after the administration says that it is policy to keep families together and then says: But not all the children we have already harmed.

This is pretty disturbing, but it is only the half of it. What is the other half? The other half is that the administration has not given up on its strategy of deterrence based on injuring children. It is a strategy laid out by Jeff Sessions, supported by Chief of Staff John Kelly, with Steve Miller chiming in to say: This will work. They want to deter people from seeking asylum here in the United States of America by mistreating those who arrive and try to seek asylum. They use the word "deterrence" to send a message of what will happen to you if you try to come here.

There is no moral code in the United States of America or in the world that would support hurting children to send a message to families still overseas. There is no religious tradition on this planet that supports injuring children to send a message overseas. But here we have Mr. Wolfe speaking definitively that nothing is going to be done for those children, those more than 2,000 children who have been separated from their parents.

Moreover, the other half of the policy is that for those now coming in, it will

be the official strategy of the United States of America to incarcerate the children along with the parents. That is the plan. We have already gone down that path in the past. Experts have already weighed in, saying that incarcerating children with their families—they may not be separated, but they are incarcerated. They can't go to school. They can't play on the playground. To continue this policy of deterrence, that is another strategy of injuring children. That is deeply, deeply disturbing, and it is profoundly unacceptable.

We have done this before. We have put families together in prison camps. We did it in World War II. We took our Japanese-Americans, and we put them into prison camps. It was a profoundly disturbing chapter in our history. Now the President says that is his new plan—to put families together in prison camps.

So, no, I am not happy that the President has ended the policy of family separation because he hasn't ended the strategy of harming children. The fight must continue. The pressure must continue. The weighing in by religious group after religious group needs to continue. The legal challenges need to continue. The debate here on the floor of the Senate needs to continue. We cannot accept family prison camps here in the United States of America.

I was struck by the fact that we had a program that was working pretty well. That program is called the Family Case Management Program. Here in my hand is the report from the Office of the Inspector General of Homeland Security. This is the inspector general's analysis of the Family Case Management Program to keep families together and out of prison and to make sure they show up for their hearings, their asylum hearings. This report is from just a few months ago, November 30, 2017.

For those who want to look it up online, just look up OIG—for Office of the Inspector General—18-22. That is OIG-18-22, and you will immediately see a copy of the inspector general's report. It takes a look at this program, the Family Case Management Program, which addresses this challenge in a whole different way.

Here is what it says, in summary:

As of March 30, 2017, ICE reported that it expended \$17.5 million in program costs to enroll 781 active participants in FCMP—

the Family Case Management Program—

across all five locations. According to ICE, overall program compliance for all five regions is an average of 99 percent for ICE check-ins and appointments, as well as 100 percent attendance at court hearings.

It doesn't get much better than 100 percent of people showing up for their court hearings. This didn't require a family prison camp. This got 100 percent by treating people with respect and having a case manager who actually spoke their language check in with them, making sure they had their cell

number and their home number and knew where they were living, and making sure they knew the date and understood the importance of showing up both for their check-ins and appointments and their court hearings.

They didn't have 80 percent show up for their court hearings; they didn't get 60 or 40 percent. They got 100 percent.

So there is no argument—no argument—that you have to incarcerate people to have them show up for a hearing, and there is no morality in continuing to injure children in order to send a message of deterrence to people overseas.

Then we have the plan, through all of this incarceration, to build prison camp after prison camp. We have a picture of the tents.

There are children in this new prison camp that is near El Paso, TX. They ran out of room. They ran out of room at Casa Padre. Casa Padre is a big former Walmart that was serving as a detention center for children—children who were unaccompanied minors and children who were separated from their parents. They said earlier this year that they had 300 children there, and in April they had 500 children there.

When I went down there 2 weeks ago and stood outside that Walmart, trying to gain entry after having been denied a waiver to visit it with less than 2 weeks' notice, I said that I had heard from refugee advocates that there were hundreds of kids behind those doors in Walmart—hundreds—and there might even be as many as 1,000 children behind those doors. Even as I said those words, I thought: That is not possible. It is not possible that 1,000 children are locked up in that Walmart.

What did we find out 2 weeks later? A congressional delegation going down and getting a waiver to be able to visit—there weren't 1,000 children there. There weren't 1,100 children there, not 1,200, not 1,300, not 1,400. They had gotten a special adjustment to their permit to allow 1,500 children to be in that Walmart. There were 1,500 children sleeping, living, spending the day, apparently trying to go to class—1,500 in this one building. They said they actually were at capacity. They said: We do have a few slots. But it was something like 1,467 kids. So maybe they had one busload that they could add.

That is why the government is building this tent city—for all the children they are detaining, for all the children they are ripping away from parents.

Now the administration says: We will take these same tent cities, these same prison camps, only we will put whole families in there. By the way, for those children we see in this picture—the almost 1,500 boys I saw at Casa Padre—they don't get to be united with their families because Kenneth Wolfe, the head of the Administration for Children and Families, says that there will not be a grandfathering, meaning those kids are out of luck. For as long as

their parents are incarcerated, they are out of luck.

Now, a lot of parents were told: You are only going to go through a court proceeding. It will just take a day or two, and you will be united with your children. That, in many cases, is a lie. If they were asserting asylum, the administration has decided to keep the parents incarcerated until their asylum hearing which, at this point, could be many months into the future, sometimes over 1 year into the future.

There is one woman who said that she came here expecting to be able to assert her asylum claim. She didn't know if it would be judged to breach the standard for asylum in the United States, if she would have enough evidence to demonstrate legitimate fear of return and that she had been persecuted before she came. She didn't know if she would meet those standards, but she said: What I have learned is that my child has been shipped off. She actually said "children." She had several children. She said: It may be that I will be in prison for a year. So I have two choices. One is to give up my asylum claim and be shipped home; the other is to be in prison for a year. She said: For my children's sake, I will ask my sister to adopt my children. She was trying to find some decent way, with asylum blocked and threatened with a year in jail, just to get an asylum hearing.

For those Members of the Senate who have family histories with people who have come from abroad—and I would say it does include every single Member of this Senate; I don't think a single Member of this Senate is 100 percent Native American; so every Member here has a family history with all of these branches going out for generations—imagine your grandfather, your great-grandfather, your great-great-grandmother, and what would have happened if they had arrived in the United States and they told them: You must leave your children aside and be in prison for a year, knowing what harm it will do to your children, and knowing that at the end of the year you might not be granted asylum anyway when you got that hearing.

So let's wrap this up. I believe that we must return to the vision of the Statue of Liberty. I believe that our Nation is a Nation that deeply resonates with the understanding that when those individuals flee persecution—they flee persecution—they should be treated with respect and dignity when they arrive on the shores of the United States.

We absolutely must not go to a family policy of incarceration. That is handcuffs for all, and it is completely unacceptable. We had, under family separation, handcuffs for the parents, and now the administration proposes handcuffs for all of the people and to put them in prison.

This must not stand. We must resist it with every particle of our being and

return to treating those who flee persecution with graciousness and fairness and dignity.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:45 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 9:45 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:45 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 21, 2018, at 9:45 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

DINO FALASCHETTI, OF MONTANA, TO BE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF FINANCIAL RESEARCH, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE RICHARD B. BERNER, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

RODNEY HOOD, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 2, 2023, VICE RICHARD T. METSGER, TERM EXPIRED.

BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

KATHLEEN LAURA KRANINGER, OF OHIO, TO BE DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE RICHARD CORDRAY, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

JOHN FLEMING, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, VICE ROY K. J. WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL A. HAMMER, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

JULIA AKINS CLARK, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD FOR THE TERM OF SEVEN YEARS EXPIRING MARCH 1, 2021, VICE ANNE MARIE WAGNER, TERM EXPIRED.

FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY

PETER GAYNOR, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR, FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE JOSEPH L. NIMMICH.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

KIMBERLY A. REED, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021, VICE FRED P. HOCHBERG, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

MARK MONTGOMERY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE R. DAVID HARDEN.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

ROBERT L. WILKIE, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE DAVID J. SHULKIN.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MARK D. KELLY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. MADDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JEFFREY L. HARRIGIAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CHRISTOPHER P. WEGGEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS A. BUSSIÈRE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH S. WILSBACH

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN M. TWITTY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS ASSISTANT COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 504:

To be general

LT. GEN. GARY L. THOMAS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

SAMUEL B. ALBAHARI
RICCARDO C. PAGGETT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

JOHNMARK R. ARDIENTE
NATHAN A. GUNTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RYAN J. BERGLIN
JEREMY O. JACOBSON
JAMES A. NARDELLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C. SECTION 624:

To be major

DAVID L. BURRIER
WILLIAM T. CIGICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JOSHUA V. ARNDT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER Z. FARRINGTON
DAVID J. GRISDALE
BRYAN Z. LIPE
ANDREW J. MCKINLEY
MONICA I. RIVERA
RANDY J. SHED
MICHAEL P. THOMAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RODERICK W. SUMPTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

DANIEL TORRES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL P. ANTECKI, JR.
MICHAEL L. ARNER
MICHAEL B. AVENICK
PETER C. BAKKE
BRIAN A. BEAM
RAYMOND W. BLAINE
CLAYTON D. BOWERS
JAMES D. BROWNE, JR.
JAMES A. DAHL
KIRK J. DANIELS
MATTHEW B. DAVIS
ADAM J. DYKSTRA
ROBERT P. FARRELL
DAVID A. FELDNER
CARL L. FRIEDRICH
ALEXANDRA L. HOBBS
JUSTIN M. HORGAN
THOMAS M. LACY
MATTHEW C. LINDSEY
LECARL B. LOCKLEY
JUSTINO LOPEZ
MARLON T. MALLORY
SCOTT W. MCCARTHY
COREY G. MCCOY
SHEILA MEDEIROS
BETTY P. MYRTHIL
RYAN M. NACIN
PHILIP L. NESNADNY
TAMISHA R. NORRIS
SEAN M. OHALLORAN
BENJAMIN L. QUIMBY
JONATHAN S. RITTENBERG
JASON R. SABOVICH
TIMOTHY J. SIKORA
RYAN G. TATE
JAMES N. TURNER
TIMOTHY P. UNGARO
ZACHARY R. VOGT
JASON WATERS
MARK M. YEARY
SAMUEL S. YI
D014175

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

LISA M. ABEL
ELLIOTT ACEVEDO
KENDALL P. ADAMS
ROMAINE M. AGUON
DAVID G. ALEXANDER
JAMES P. ALLEN
JASON A. ALLEN
JORGE ALMODOVAR
DOMINIC L. AMANTIAD
MATTHEW T. AMSDELL
JARMARLE O. ARNOLD
KATIA S. AROSEMENA
SAUL A. ARROYO
FIDEL ARVELO
BRIAN H. ASTWOOD
DANIEL J. AZZONE
ERIC J. BANKS
MARK E. BEERBOWER
SEAN M. BELL
WILLIAM R. BENNETT
KEVIN R. BENTZ
DAVONNE L. BIVINS
FORREST L. BLACK
LISA D. BLACK
NIKKI M. BLYSTONE
JASON P. BOOK
BRYAN J. BOYEA
SIDNEY N. BRADY
FELICIA S. BROOKS
JAMARCUS A. BROOKS
CHRISTOPHER A. BROWN
DREWRY L. BROWN
ROBERT M. BROWN
JEFFREY W. BUCKNER
GREGORY A. BUTLER
PAUL E. CACCIA
TOMAS F. CAMPBELL
ANGEL M. CARDENAS
CHRISTOPHER L. CARTER
RIAN M. CARTER
THOMAS A. CARVER
STEPHEN C. CHENG
SHAWN M. CHUQUINN
HWAJIN CLARK
MARK J. CLEARY
JAY C. COATS
HUGH H. COLEMAN III
MARSHALL E. COOPER
BARBARA P. COOTE
MARWIN Z. CORTES
CHARLES H. COSTELLO
BRANDY M. CULP
ISAAC V. GUTHBERTSON
SHAWN O. DANIEL
RUDY V. DELAGARZA
RUDY L. DELAROSA
ERICH O. DELAVEGA
AMALIO DELEON, JR.
JONATHAN L. DELOACH
KARLETON M. DEMPSEY
SUSAN M. DEPIESSYTER
JOAQUIN H. DEQUINTANAROO
MAYRA I. DIAZ
JOHN R. DICKENS

STANLEY L. DIEHL II
MICHAEL P. DIETZ
CHARLES M. DIGGS
KATARINA DLUGOSZ
LEE W. DOGGETT
SEAN P. DONOVAN
HEATHER D. DORAN
ROBERT B. DOSPOY
DAMIAN E. DOUGLAS
CORBY R. DUNCAN
DAVID A. DYKEMA
THERESA A. ECHEVARRIA
MARLON U. ELBELAU
JOEEN FIGUEROA RODRIGUEZ
DAVID P. FLEMING
GUSTAVO FLORES
SARAH L. FORSTER
JACKIE L. FORTENBERRY
ALAN R. FOWLER
SAMANTHA J. FRAZIER
RICARDO FREGOSO
DANIEL M. GALLOWAY
HANEDA L. GARNER
COURTNEY J. GARY
DANIEL S. GONZALES
FERMIN GONZALES, JR.
SEAN M. GREEN
KARIN R. GRESHAM
JOHN G. GUBITOSI
ANGELA L. HABINA
JEFFREY P. HALLADAY
VINITA E. HAMBRICK BROWN
DAVID J. HANKINS
TODD A. HANZES
ARON T. HAUQUITZ
ROBERT J. HEATHERLY
LARRY W. HESLOP
BRANDON J. HILL
JOHN P. HOLCOMBE
MICHAEL D. HOPKINS
MELISSA A. HORVATH
KERRY M. HOUCK
SHELLA L. HOWELL
STEVEN E. HUBER
BRADLEY W. HUDSON
SONIA I. HUERTAS
JAMES T. IANITELLI
BRENT R. IRISH
ONWE R. IVORY
INA S. JACKSON
MARTY L. JACKSON
HARLEY F. JENNINGS
JEFFREY L. JENNINGS
ALICIA J. JOHNSON
JAMES S. JOHNSON
JOSHUA M. JOHNSON
TROY S. JOHNSON
ANDREW R. JOHNSTON
TYRONE JONES, JR.
ROBERT F. JORDAN
LEAH M. KENFIELD
BRIAN B. KIBITLEWSKI
JASON M. KNAPP
ANDREW J. KOCSIS
TERRANCE L. KRATZ III
JAMES E. KYLE
NAIM R. LEE
CALEB A. LEWIS
KEVIN M. LINZEY
JONATHAN D. LIPSCOMB
CHRISTINA L. LOGAN
OYIYI K. LOGAN
MICHAEL T. LONG
JOSEPH L. LUCHETTA
KARL H. LUDEMAN
JENNIFER A. LUDWICK
BETH L. LUTHER
HUNG T. LY
PATRICK T. LYONS
RACHELLE M. MACON
JASON S. MALONE
CHARLES C. MANNING
CHARLES L. J. MARKLEY
DAVID MARSHALL, JR.
DEDRICK J. MARSHALL
GREGORIO MARTINEZ CHAVEZ
ZORAIDA I. MATHER
JOSHUA W. MATTHEWS
BRADLEY M. MAY
JOSEPH J. MCCARTHY
JOHN F. MCGEE
JAMES S. MCKENZIE
SCOTT P. MCLENDON
MATTHEW T. MCMANNES
CARPER H. MCMILLAN
MICHAEL S. MCVAY
JOSE A. MEDINA
ERIC MENDOZA
KEVIN H. MENSING
KEVIN L. MERCER
CARLOS J. MERINO
DEMOND J. MERRICK
MATTHEW D. MEYER
MICHAEL A. MIGNANO
REBECCA A. MILKOWSKI
JAMES R. MILLER
KARMA A. MILLER
MICHAEL J. MILLER
ROY N. MILLER
STEPHEN E. MILLER
JERRY D. MOIZE
BERNARD K. MONROE
ADAM B. MOODIE
LILIU P. MOODY
TIMOTHY S. MOON
KERRY J. MOTES
PARKER S. MOYE

WILLIAM R. MULKEY
TROY JOHN C. NAPUTI
PHUONG H. NGUYEN
VINH B. NGUYEN
KATHRYN M. NILSEN
KELLY M. NOCKS
BRENT A. ODOM
AKANINYENE A. OKON
AYOKUNLE O. OLADIPOFANIYI
CARLOS C. OQUENDO
CHRISTOPHER T. ORLOWSKI
RICARDO ORTIZ ROSARIO
MICHAEL L. OSMON
JOHN P. OSULLIVAN
JOSHUA PANEK
ERIC J. PARTIN
MICHAEL C. PAVLISAK
JAMIE C. PEER
JESUS A. PENA
LEONEL A. PENA
ERNESTO PEREZ
JESSICA R. PERRITTE
DAVID N. PETERS
EDWARD R. PHELPS, JR.
ADRIENNE M. PREM
GARY L. PRICE
ALBERT A. PRIDE
BRIAN L. PURDY
JENNIFER E. RATAJESAK
PHILIP S. RAUMBERGER
TORRIONNE RECHE
RICHARD I. REEVES II
CESARIO J. RENDON
PAUL R. C. REYES
HASSAN K. REYNOLDS
CHRISTOPHER M. RICHARDSON
JANINE A. ROBINSON TURNER
CARMEN J. ROSADO
PEDRO J. ROSARIO
JOHN M. ROY
EDWARD R. RUNYAN
JEROME RUSSELL, JR.
CHADRICK M. RYG
MAXIMO A. SANCHEZ GERENA
PAUL F. SANTAMARIA
EDGAR O. SANTANA
TOSHIIHIDE SASAKI
AMELIA H. SCHULZ
CHARLES M. SEABERRY
JOHN D. SEITZ
MAX V. SELF
SCOTT L. SHAFFER
SCOTT D. SHANNON
JONATHAN I. SHARK
ALEX B. SHIMABUKURO
JAMISON R. SMITH
STEVE C. SMITH
THOMAS C. SMITH
TEX W. SOTO
CHERYL N. SPARKS
BENJAMIN A. STEADMAN
ALAN L. STEPHENS
CHRISTOPHER R. STEWART
TODD F. STULL
JONATHAN M. SWAN
DELARIUS V. TARLTON
AARON C. TELLER
KRALYN R. THOMAS, JR.
MICHAEL E. THOMAS
SHANNON N. THOMPSON
LASHANDA M. THORNTON
TONY L. THORNTON
SOON M. TOGIOLA
MARYGRACE P. TOMOMITSU
RICKEY J. TORRES
CHRISTOPHER M. TRAMONTANA
BRIAN M. TRAVIS
JAY S. VANDENBOS
JOSHUA M. WALTER
DAVID D. WALTERS
OLIN L. WALTERS
DOUGLAS R. WARREN, JR.
MICHAEL C. WATSON
CHAD B. WATTS
HEATH R. WEAVER
WILLIAM G. WEAVER
MARCUS J. WHITE
KEMAU A. WHITTINGTON
ALLIN L. WHITTLE II
GREGORY W. WILEY
OLRIC R. WILKINS II
ADAM C. WILLCOXON
LISBON J. WILLIAMS, JR.
JEFFREY L. WITHERSPOON
EDWARD K. WOO
SIMEON J. WOOD
CHRISTOPHER C. WURST
TRACI J. B. YAMADA
TRACY L. YATES
RAYMOND K. YU
SARAH K. YUN
JOSEPH C. ZABALDANO
CODY L. ZACH
D011081
D012500
D012612
D013025
D013276
D014169
D014651

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DREW Q. ABELL

CHRISTINA R. ACOJEDO
JONATHAN M. ADAMS
ROBERT N. ADAMS
GREGORY J. ADY
KWADWO AGYEIAYE
SABRE M. AJYEMAN
JARED J. ALBRIGHT
MICHAEL A. ALLARD
DEAN P. ALLEN
JASON E. ALLEN
NATHANIEL A. ALLEN
IVAN M. ALVARADO
ALFRED C. ANDERSON, JR.
STEPHEN C. ANG
ROMAE M. ARAUD
JIMMY ARCHANGE
JOSE A. ARIAS
MICHAEL E. ASTIN
JARED D. AUCEY
BRIAN C. BABCOCK LUMISH
MILES A. BAKER
ERIC A. BALOUGH
JAY T. BAO
CHARLES V. BARRETT
ROBERT A. BARRY
CLIFTON D. BASS
JOHN A. BAUMANN
ERIKA P. BEAM
JONATHAN H. BECKMANN
ERHAN BEDESTANI
JASON M. BELKNAP
STEVEN R. BELTZ
TIMOTHY M. BENNETT
PHILIP R. BERRY II
BRIAN L. BERTHELOTTE
MAYA C. BEST
TIMOTHY N. BIBLE
JONATHAN E. BISSELL
KEVIN E. BLAINE
WILSON C. BLYTHE, JR.
BENJAMIN C. BOEKESTEIN
ELIZABETH A. BOTTANO
JOEL M. BORKERT
CRAIG M. BOUCHER
ZAH K. BOURJELI
CHRISTOPHER O. BOWERS
SONYA A. BOWMAN
DAVID H. BRADLEY
BRADFORD M. BRANNON
JASON C. BRAY
LENNY T. BRAZZLE
JAMES L. BREDEMAN
JEFFREY J. BRIZEK
STEWART N. BROWN
JOHN M. BRUGGINK
CARRIE A. BRUNNER
DANIEL J. BURKHART
MICHAEL J. BURNS
PHILIP M. CALA
KEITH J. CALDWELL
EBONY CALHOUN
ROBERT H. CALLAHAN
JOSHUA P. CAMARA
MATTHEW J. CAMEL
KYLE I. CAMPBELL
THOMAS G. CAMPBELL III
GABRIEL CAMPUZANO
JASON E. CANNON
ROBERT J. CARPENA
ANDREW M. CARRIGAN
ROGER A. CARVAJAL
LEE J. CASTANA
JERROLD D. CASTRO
MATTHEW L. CAVANAUGH
ROBERT P. CHAMBERLAIN
ANDRUS W. CHANEY
JAMES T. CHASE
SAPRIYA CHILDS
JASON J. CHOI
KIP M. CHOJNACKI
ANTHONY W. CLARK
ERIC A. COLLINS
JAMES B. COLLINS
JENNIFER G. COLLINS
CHRISTOPHER A. CONNOR
NOAH B. COOPER
SETH T. COTTRELL
DENNIS A. COX
MATTHEW A. CRAWFORD
STEVEN R. CREWS
CATHERINE R. CROMBE
JAMES A. CRUMP
RIVERA E. CRUZ
LUIS S. CRUZ RAMOS
SHAWN P. DALRYMPLE
JASON W. DAVENPORT
EVERETTA J. DAVIS
ROGER S. DAVIS
CHRISTOPHER P. DEAN
ALICIA R. DEASE
TRISTAN P. DEBORD
ANDREW W. DECKER
WENDY K. DEDMOND
PARSANA DEOKI
CHRISTOPHER M. DICKINSON
DAVID DILL Y
CHARLES R. DIXON
RYAN M. DONALD
NICOLE L. DOWNS
ERIN T. DOYLE
CHRISTINA L. DUGAN
NICKOLAS A. DUNCAN
WILLIAM R. DUNCAN
TIMOTHY J. EASTMAN
NESTOR J. ECHEVERRIA
GREGORY C. EDGREEN
MATTHEW H. ELLETT

PATRICK R. ELLIOTT
 JOEL P. ELLISON
 CARMEN V. ELSTON
 JOEL G. ELSTON
 PETRUS J. ENGELBRECHT
 JAIME A. ESPEJO
 MARCUS T. EVANS
 JORDON T. EVERS
 ISAAC J. FABER
 MATHEW A. FEEHAN
 JOHN J. FELBER
 GARRET D. FETT
 EDWARD A. FIGUEROA
 CHRISTOPHER J. FINNIGAN
 MICHAEL FLEISCHMANN
 ANGEL FLORES
 DUANE G. FOOTE
 ANDREW J. FORNEY
 JORDAN M. FRANCIS
 JABULANI H. FULLER
 MICHAEL M. GACHERU
 JOSEPH GAINEY
 ELLIS GALES, JR.
 VIJAY M. GALLARDO
 COREY D. GAMBLE
 MICHAEL D. GAMBONE
 JASON L. GARNEAU
 JONATHAN A. GENDRON
 PETE J. GODBEY
 SHAWN GOLDWIRE
 VICTOR J. GONZALEZORTIZ
 CHRISTOPHER D. GOODRICH
 ELLIS Z. GORDON
 GEORGE C. GREANIAS
 MATTHEW A. GREB
 VERNON D. GREER
 NICHOLAS E. GREGOIRE
 ROBERT T. GREINER
 ADAM C. GROW
 JOSE R. GUANDIQUE
 JAMES W. HALE
 CARTER J. HALFMAN
 VALLIANT A. HALLER
 KURTIS S. HANSON
 TODD J. HARKRADER
 AUDRICIA M. HARRIS
 GLENROY HASKINS
 AMANDA J. HATCH
 DORIS J. HAYNES
 MATTHEW B. HAYNES
 DARTANION J. HAYWARD
 JACQUELINE L. HEARNE
 ANDREW H. HENDERSON
 SHANNA M. HENDRIX
 BRIAN HOLLOWAY
 STACY M. HOPWOOD
 MATTHEW J. HORTON
 JARED T. HOWARD
 ANDREW P. HUBBARD
 MARGARET D. HUGHES
 DAVID J. HUMPHREYS
 DAMON M. HUNT
 CALVIN K. HUTTO
 RYAN T. IRWIN
 JOSH T. W. JACQUES
 VICTOR A. JAFFETT
 CHRISTOPHER C. JOHNES
 ANDRE E. JONES
 KENTON E. JUSTICE
 GEORGE S. KAFFER
 JUAN C. S. KAPLAN
 TARL E. KAROLESKI
 GARRETT J. KAYE
 GRACE K. KELLY
 EVELYN M. KEMPE
 JOHN A. KENDALL
 JASON P. KENDZIERSKI
 LOGAN J. KERSCHNER
 CHRISTOPHER E. KETZ
 ASFANDYAR KHAN
 DANIEL K. KILCORE
 MATHSTO KINGSADA
 CHRISTOPHER R. KLIOWER
 KEVIN M. KNOWLEN
 MATTHEW A. KOHLER
 JEFFRY T. KOONTZ
 JEFFREY J. KORNBLUTH
 RYAN W. KORT
 MICHAEL A. KOTICH
 KIP E. KOWALSKI
 SUNNY C. S. KUEHL
 ALFREDA A. LACEY
 ADDISON F. LADIERO
 CHARLENE A. LAMOUNTAIN
 NICHOLAS A. LANE
 MARIA M. LANFOR
 ERIK R. LARSEN
 LAWRENCE R. LEE
 KRISTIAN K. LEIBFARTH
 JAMES A. LEIDENBERG
 JOHNATHAN L. LEMING
 STEVEN E. LEWENTOWICZ
 TYRONE A. L. LEWIS
 TILISHA C. LOCKLEY
 RYAN W. LOOMIS
 JOHN W. LORD
 ANDREW E. LOVEJOY
 DEREK K. LOVELAND
 MELVIN E. LOWE
 JASON O. LUCKEY
 PHILIP X. LUU
 AUSTIN C. LY
 ANDREW T. MAAS
 SEAN M. MADDEN
 BARRY L. MADETZKE
 JOSEPH E. MALONE
 HOLLY Y. G. MANESS

BRITT T. MANOR
 TRAVIS J. MAPLES
 FEDERICO MARTINEZ II
 WILLIAM P. MASON
 GERALD A. MATHIS
 MITCHELL A. MCCANN
 MICHAEL G. MCCLURE
 MICHAEL K. MCCOY
 KAROLYN M. MCWEEN
 JEREMY A. MCHUGH
 GABRIELLA M. MCKINNEY
 THOMAS P. MCQUARY
 KEVIN A. MCQUEARY
 ROBERT C. MCVAY
 EVA M. MILLARE
 DEWEY M. MILLER
 JACOB M. MORANO
 JOHN F. MORRIS
 BRENDAN P. MURPHY
 FRANCIS X. MURPHY
 CASEY L. C. NAPUTI
 JEFFREY M. NICHOLSON
 WALLACE C. NICHOLSON
 GLIDDEN NIEVES
 JENNIFER L. NIHILL
 OLIVIA J. NUNN
 ROBIN L. OCHOA
 KATHERINE M. OGLETREE
 AMOS Y. OH
 ERIK W. OLSEN
 MARCUS D. ONEAL
 CHRISTOPHER D. OPHARDT
 KATHERINE R. OPIE
 FERGAL J. OREILLY
 RYAN C. OREILLY
 JOHN V. OTTE
 DETRICK L. OUSBY
 ROBERT B. PADGETT
 CARMEN A. PAGLIO
 JEFFREY T. PAINTER
 ROBERT C. PARMENTER
 ERIC L. PARTRIDGE
 SCOTT A. PATTON
 KATHRYN K. PEGUES
 AHLON K. PEOPLES
 ANDREW V. PESATURE
 NATHANAEAL W. PETERSON
 TOBIAS S. PETROS
 JOSIAH D. PICKETT
 ANGELIQUE A. PIFER
 DEREK K. PING
 CHRISTOPHER D. PISKAI
 DARIEN M. PITTS
 SCOTT C. POLASEK
 MAYDELINE G. PORTILLO
 THOMAS S. POWELL
 DONALD E. PRATT
 ANDREW S. PRUETT
 MANOJ T. PUTHENPARAMPIL
 GRETCHEN M. RADKE
 DONALD L. RAINES
 CHRISTOPHER L. RAPP
 ZACHARY A. REED
 ROBERT G. RHODES
 KENNETH C. RICH
 MARY A. RICKS
 NATHAN A. RIEDEL
 JOHN A. RIZZUTO
 JEREMY S. ROCKWELL
 JOHN P. RODER
 JOSHUA L. RODRIGUEZ
 MICHAEL G. ROE
 WALLACE A. ROHRER
 JOHN M. ROSE
 DOUGLAS J. ROSS
 JIMMY M. ROSS
 MATTHEW H. RUFF
 GILBERTO RUIZ
 SHAWN P. RUSSELL
 ROBERTREL A. SACHI
 ANTONIO SALAZAR, JR.
 SCOTT A. SALAMON
 LIZETTE SANABRIAGAJALES
 EDDIE N. SANCHEZ
 CRAIG A. SANDERS
 SELMER C. SANTOS
 JEREMY L. SAUER
 FRANCIS X. SCHAFFER
 ROSS T. SCHEINBAUM
 MATTHEW J. SCHLOSSER
 NATHAN L. SCHMUTZ
 CORY N. SCOTT
 RYAN C. SHEERAN
 KRISTEN M. SHIFRIN
 MATTHEW D. SHIRLEY
 E. R. SHISLER
 MATTHEW R. SHOWN
 CASEY D. SHUFF
 DAVID F. SIDMAN
 CHARLIE SILVA
 SILVINO S. SILVINO
 DHRAMEN P. SINGH
 JASON A. SLUTSKY
 ELLIS H. SMITH II
 JOSEPH B. SMITH
 KEMELLE D. SMITH
 ROBERT L. SMITH
 SCOTT J. SMITH
 TROY D. SMITH
 RICKY SNEILL
 ROBERT G. SNYDER
 ANDREA R. SO
 FRANCIS X. SPERL III
 ADAM C. SPRINGER
 DANIEL J. SQUYRES
 LAURA E. STANLEY
 JAMES K. STARLING

JONATHAN J. STEIGLER
 JEFFREY A. STEINLAGE
 JAY D. STERRETT III
 ANDREW P. STRINGER
 GABRIEL M. SUAREZ
 ROBERT R. SUDO
 NELSON P. SUNWOO
 DAMIAN R. TAAFFEMCMENAMY
 JOHN W. TAGGART
 JAMES C. TETERS II
 TRAVIS R. THEBEAU
 MICHAEL J. THOMAS
 EDWARD T. THOMPSON II
 SPENCER T. TIMMONS
 ROBERT H. TOPPER, JR.
 KEVIN J. TOTH
 MELISSA TOVAR
 BRADLEY R. TOWNSEND
 KIRILL A. TSEKANOVSKIY
 JOHN D. TURNER
 JAMES R. ULL
 MATTHEW P. UPPERMAN
 MARK B. VANGELDER
 TAMARA B. VANHOOSEPALL
 MARK E. VANHORN
 BRANDON L. VANORDEN
 ALEX VERSHININ
 AARON T. VEVASIS
 AMANDA M. VIOLETTE
 WILLIAM H. WAGGY II
 RUSSELL W. WALTER
 MALLORY A. WAMPLER
 BRIAN A. WARD
 ALEXANDER E. WARING
 RYAN C. WATERS
 JOHN M. WEATHERLY
 SOLON D. WEBB
 KEVIN J. WEBER
 MATTHEW T. WEHRI
 CHRISTOPHER P. WELSH
 CREYONTA N. WEST
 MICKEY M. WEST
 DONALD S. WHIFFEN III
 JOSEPH S. WIER
 JERIMIAH A. WILDERMUTH
 DOMINICK J. WILKINSON
 DUANE M. WILLIAMS
 EUGENE U. WILLIAMS
 DERECK K. WILSON
 JASON S. WIMBERLY
 MICHAEL M. WINN
 ADAM M. WINOGRAD
 STEVEN W. WOJDAKOWSKI
 JASON C. WOOD
 TIMOTHY J. WYANT
 JOHN C. YUNGBLUTH III
 D006024
 D010469
 D010957
 D012294
 D012600
 D012640
 D012795
 D012868
 D013215
 D013311
 D013449
 D014179
 D014294
 D014340
 D014585
 G001131
 G001231
 G010122
 G010139
 G010141
 G010177
 G010242
 G010271
 G010354
 G010393

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

ELI S. ADAMS
 JERROD C. ADAMS
 JASON N. ADLER
 MATT M. ALDRICH
 ERIC B. ALEXANDER
 MARVIN ANDERSON
 BRETT E. ANDRINGA
 RENATO E. ANGELES
 UZOMA A. ANINIRA
 DANIEL A. ANTOLOS
 ADAM D. ANTONINI
 SYLVIA D. APONTE
 NEIL G. ARMSTRONG
 BEAU J. ASHLEY
 ANDREW P. ASWELL
 RYAN S. ATKINS
 PETER M. ATKINSON
 SCOTTY M. AUTIN
 DARBLY L. AVILES
 MATTHEW P. BAIDEME
 JOHN M. BAKER
 JAMES D. BALLARD
 KENTON R. BARBER
 BRETT N. BARDO
 CORNELIUS A. BATTS
 JOSHUA A. BAUER
 ROBERT K. BEALE
 SAMANTHA R. BEBB
 JOSEPH C. BELL
 RICHARD R. BELL

BRET M. BEMIS
CHRISTOPHER E. BERGE
BARBARA A. BERNINGER
JOSHUA M. BETTY
NICHOLAS J. BILOTTA
DOMINIC D. BLACK
DUSTIN A. BLAIR
JARROD R. BLAISDELL
KWAME O. BOATENG
ADAM R. BOCK
GEORGE E. BOLTON, JR.
BRYAN J. BONNEMA
JOSHUA S. BOWES
VANESSA R. BOWMAN
JOHN B. BRADLEY
ADAM R. BRADY
JAMES E. BRANT
JEFFREY O. BREWSTER
DEXTER E. BRICKEN
CHARLES J. BROWN
LARRY G. BROWN, JR.
MARK L. BROWN, JR.
TERRY L. BROWN
ANTHONY H. BRUNNER
MICHAEL E. BRYANT
MARK E. BUSH
PHILLIP B. CAIN
MICHAEL CALDERON
DAMION M. CALVERT
DANIEL G. CAMPBELL, SR.
DEREK W. CAMPBELL
JOHN W. CAMPBELL
MATTHEW C. CAPRARI
MATTHEW C. CARLSEN
SEAN T. CARMODY
CHRISTOPHER L. CARPENTER
CHRISTIAN A. CARR
ALLAN B. CARROLL
CHRISTOPHER J. CARTER
PATRICK W. CAUKIN
WALTER S. CHALKLEY
MATTHEW J. CHAMBLESS
DAVID A. CHARBONNEAU
MATTHEW B. CHASE
WILLIAM B. CHASTAIN
RICHARD T. CHILDERS
BRADY R. CLARK
JAMES D. CLAY
JESSIE R. COLLINS
NATHAN M. COLVIN
BRADLEY T. COMRIE
CHRISTIAN G. COOK
DENNIS A. COOK
ROBERT L. CORNELIUS, JR.
FRANCISCO A. CORTEZ III
CRAIG S. COTNER
MICHAEL J. COTOVSKY
ADA L. COTTO
ANTHONY B. COULTER
SAMUEL V. COWART
YANSON T. COX
TIMOTHY A. CRANE
JAMES L. CRENSHAW
PETER CRUZ
RYAN A. CRYER
FREDERICK M. CUMMINGS
JODY J. DAIGLE
JOSHUA P. DALLAY
DAVID W. DAKE
BRIDGET E. DALZIEL
RANJINI T. DANARAJ
JUSTIN E. DUBERT
ERIK A. DAVIS
JOHN R. DAVIS, JR.
LARINZOL A. DAVIS
RYAN M. DAVIS
NICOLE E. DEAN
PATRICK M. DEFOREST
DOMINIC P. DEFRANCISCO
CHRISTOPHER R. DERUYTER
JOHN A. DILLS
JOHN R. DIXON
MICHAEL D. DO
GERARDO F. DOMINGUEZ
SEAN T. DUBLIN
SCOTT W. DUNKLE
DAVID M. DURANTE
MICHAEL G. DVORAK
KEVIN M. EASTER
RICHARD E. EATON
JOSHUA E. EGGAR
RYAN L. EISENHauer
MYCHAJLO I. ELIASZEWSKYJ
SHARON ENGELMEIER
DONALD B. ERICKSON
MICHAEL E. ERLANDSON
ROBERT L. EYMAN
JEFFREY R. FARMER
JON B. FAUSNAUGH
SCOTT M. FERRIS
MARK N. FINNEGAN
BRIAN D. FISHER
THOMAS C. FISHER
CARLOS D. B. FLYNN
PATRICK I. FLYNN
MICHAEL B. FOGARTY
ANTHONY L. FORSHIER
CHRISTOPHER E. FOWLER
STEPHEN S. FOY
NICHOLAS C. FRANKLIN
MELANIE L. T. FUATA
ROBERT K. FURTKICK
CAMERON G. GALLAGHER
JASON C. GALLARDO
TIMOTHY R. GARLAND
CHRISTOPHER S. GEMMER
DEMETRIOS A. GHIKAS

CRAIG A. GIANCATERINO
ROBERT M. M. GICHERT
JEFFREY L. GILTZOW
JEREMIAH A. GIPSON
DARREN C. GLENN
JOSHUA G. GLONEK
PAUL D. GODSON
JESSICA D. GOFFENA
JONNY GONZALEZ
MICHAEL H. GOURGUES
PAUL J. GOYNE
EDWARD B. GRAHAM
CORNELIUS O. GRANAI IV
JOSEPH GREEN, JR.
RICHARD W. GREENWOOD
DANIEL A. GREGORY
ERIC J. GUST
KEVIN L. HADLEY
ERIN D. HADLOCK
RYAN P. HANRAHAN
CORRIE A. HANSON
BRIAN C. HARBER
SHAWN P. HARKINS
ROBERT B. HARLESS
ERIC S. HARRISON
JOSEPH M. HARRISON
RICHARD W. HARTFELDER
BRADLEY C. HAYES
JOSEPH D. HEATON
PAUL F. HENDERSON, JR.
ADAM D. HEPPE
TODD R. HERTLING
WALTER L. HICKS
TERRENCE I. HIGGINS
GRANT H. HILL
JAMES R. HOCK
JIM R. HODSON
DANIEL J. HOEPRICH
MATTHEW J. HOFMEISTER
DARRELL P. HOLDEN
JOSEPH P. HOLLAND
JONATHAN T. HOLM
JEREMY B. HOLMAN
STEVEN C. HOLMBERG
NICHOLAS C. HOLTEN
DANIEL J. HORST
BRIAN R. HORVATH
SIDNEY D. HOWARD III
RICHARD E. HULL
DANIEL E. HURD
JUSTIN P. HURT
CHRISTOPHER M. INGENLOFF
MATTHEW J. INGLIS
BENJAMIN E. JACKMAN
LACREDERICK R. JACKSON
PRESTON JACKSON
RAHSAAN H. JACKSON
SAMUEL A. JACKSON III
ERIC G. JAMES
REGINALD A. JAMO
GREGORY A. JENEMANN
BENJAMIN D. JOHNSON
GEORGE H. JOHNSON III
JAMES O. JOHNSON
KIMBERLY D. JOHNSON
MICHAEL A. JOHNSON
STANLEY B. JOHNSON
JOSHUA W. JOPLING
JEREMY L. KACZOR
PATRICK H. KAIN
CHRISTOPHER R. KANE
JOEL R. KASSULKE
PATRICIA N. KAST
SCOTT M. KATALENICH
PETER J. KATZFEY
BENJAMIN E. KAVANAGH
STEVEN L. KELL
MATTHEW R. KELLEY
RYAN G. KELLY
JOHN A. KERIN
JAMES K. KERNS
SIMON Y. KIM
JOHN R. KIRCHGESSNER
THOMAS J. KITSON
CHRISTIAN D. KNUTZEN
MICHAEL L. KOLODZIE
ANDREW J. KULAS
JODIE L. KUNKEL
MICHAEL W. KURTICH
JOSHUA A. LADD
THOMAS E. LAMB
CALEB G. LANDRY
RALPH E. LAUER III
ALEXANDER B. LAZATIN
JOHN D. LEITNER
KEVIN R. LEWIS
DAVID D. LITTLE
DENISE R. LITTLE
ANGEL M. LLOMPARTMONGE
CLEMENT D. LOCHNER
BRIAN T. LONEY
RICHMOND R. LUCE
MICHAEL A. LUECKEMAN
REVEROL A. E. LUGO
VICTOR L. LUNDERMAN
TIMOTHY B. LYNCH
MITCHELL D. MABARDY
PHILLIP D. MADSEN
MATTHEW D. MAGENNIS
MICHAEL L. MAGILL
MATTHEW L. MAKARYK
CHRIS B. MANGLICMOT
RICHARD MANSIE
TODD B. MARABLE
MICHAEL A. MARCHETTI
MATTHEW D. MARFONGELLI
WILLIAM D. MARSHALL

MICHAEL R. MARTIN
LUIS D. MARTINEZ
MATTHEW C. MASON
ANTHONY D. MASSARI
FRANK F. MAXWELL
CARRICK E. MCCARTHY
JOSEPH A. MCCARTHY
RANDY L. MCCLENDON
KEVIN MCCORMICK
KIRSTEN S. MCFARLAND
HEATHER R. MCGRATH
SCOTT A. MCGRATH
PAUL M. MCMANUS
ROBERT M. MCTIGHE
ERNEST D. MEADOWS
RAUL M. MEDRANO
ERIC MEGERDOOMIAN
LUKE E. MERCIER
VIRAK A. METCALF
SAMUEL A. MEYER
RINGO L. MIDLES
MICHAEL J. MILAS
NICHOLAS D. MILKOVICH
MATTHEW R. MINEAR
NATHAN N. MINOTT
ROBERT C. MISKE
CHRISTOPHER A. MOLINO
MATTHEW M. MOLLY
JASON M. MONCUSE
RICHARD A. MONTCALM, JR.
PAUL J. MORIARTY
CHRISTOPHER V. MORO
DANIEL C. MORRIS
JOHN L. MORROW
JACOB K. MOULIN
TIMOTHY J. MURPHY
DERRICK D. MURRAY
DAVID NASH
DAVID J. NELSON
MICHAEL S. NELSON
SAMUEL J. NIENBERG
HANY S. NOUREDINE
MICHAEL W. O'DONNELL
ETHAN A. OLBERDING
TYLER B. OLIVER
ABRAHAM N. OSBORN
JASON B. PALERMO
EUGENE W. PALKA
BRIAN D. PANARO
DALE A. PAPKA
ANTHONY W. PARKER
JAMES R. PASCOE
JEFFREY L. PAULUS
MICHAEL S. PENN
ANDREA M. PETERS
DERRICK A. PETERS
TRUC T. PHAM
ANTONIO M. PITTMAN
TODD L. POINDEXTER
ADAM F. POOLEY
DONALD R. PORTER, JR.
SIMON J. POWELSON
JOSHUA S. POWERS
MATTHEW R. PRESCOTT
JUSTIN M. PRITCHARD
RYAN N. PROBST
RYAN J. PURSEL
PATRICIA R. QUIGLEY
MATTHEW F. QUINN
ROBERT P. QUINT, JR.
RENEE E. RAMSEY
ROSEMARY M. REED
WALTER A. REED IV
RYAN T. REICHERT
DUKE W. REIM
JOSE A. REYES
MARLON S. RINGO
REINALDO RIVERA
CORY L. ROBERTS
KELVIN N. ROBINSON
KENDALL A. ROBINSON
NICHOLAS D. RYAN
MATTHEW C. SACRA
VICTOR S. SALTER
BRIAN A. SANSOM
MICHAEL A. SARRO
EDWARD B. SAUTER
DANA L. SAVAGE
PETER V. SCHMITT
CHRISTOPHER J. SCOTT
RYAN J. SCOTT
THOMAS J. SEARS
KENNETH P. SELBY
JOEL C. SEPPALA
MICHAEL W. SERVER
HOUSTON B. SHEETS
JASON M. SHICK
LURA E. SHIPLET
LEAH C. SHUBIN
BENJAMIN L. SHUMAKER
KEVIN W. SIEGRIST
JOSEPH E. SIMS
JOSEPH M. SINCERE
NICHOLAS C. SINCLAIR
ARCHIE L. SMITH
MATTHEW J. SMITH
JASON S. SNELGROVE
DANIEL F. SNOW
JAMES M. SNOWDEN
STACY R. SOUTTER
MICHAEL V. SOYKA
COLE A. SPITZACK
LLOYD E. SPORLUCK
JAMES T. STARTZELL
SCOTT D. STEELE
KRISTIN E. STEINBRECHER
PATRICK M. V. STEVENS

VAUGHN D. STRONG, JR.
DANIEL R. STUEWE
JOSEPH D. SWINNEY
MARVIN E. SWITZER, JR.
NICHOLAS R. TALBOT
JASON M. TAYLOR
JOSHUA D. TEITGE
CHRISTOPHER D. TERRILL
HANS J. THOMAS
MARLON A. THOMAS
RUSSELL B. THOMAS, SR.
JOHN D. THOMASON
ANTHONY R. THOMPSON
MICHAEL R. THOMPSON
NICHOLAS R. THOMPSON
ROBERT L. THOMSON
BRANDON E. THRASHER
DANIEL S. THRELKELD
JOHN C. TISSERAND
WENDY R. TOKACH
TODD M. TOMPKINS
KEVIN E. TOMS
BENJAMIN L. TORPY
JEREMY W. TRENTHAM
MICHAEL J. TRUJILLO
CURTIS J. UNGER
ROBERT L. VANAUKEN
MATTHEW R. VANGILDER
JAMES S. VCHULEK II
ADRIAN VILLA
ISRAEL VILLARREAL, JR.
JASON T. VINCENT
JAMES W. WADE
DAMON T. WAGNER
CHRISTOPHER E. WALSH
ROGER A. WANG, JR.
DANIEL J. WARD
ELIJAH M. WARD
STEPHEN P. WARD
PHILLIP S. WARREN
JASON B. WASHBURN
ELIZABETH A. WEAVER
DAVID A. WEBB
BRIAN H. WEIGHTMAN
ALEXANDRE E. WEIS
KEVIN G. WERRY, JR.
HARRY B. WHITE
JACOB E. WHITE
WILLIAM G. WHITE
BRYAN S. WHITTIER
DAVID G. WILLIAMS
EDWARD E. WILLIAMS
KEITH R. WILLIAMS
WESTON T. WILLIAMS
JEREMIAH J. WILLIS
TAMEKA R. WILSON
JASON M. WINGEART
BRIAN R. WINKELMAN
CONOR M. WINSLOW
LUKE A. WITTMER
ERICA J. WITTY
GABRIEL M. WOLFE
ROBERT W. WOLFENDEN
JERRY L. WOOD, JR.
GUY F. WORKMAN
SHANNON R. WORTHAN
ADAM WOYTOWICH
SCOTT R. YANDELL
JONATHAN T. YASUDA
ROBERT W. YERKEY
PETER C. ZAPPOLA, JR.
MICHAEL E. ZIEGELHOFFER
KURT P. ZORTMAN
D010870
D011034
D011285
D011754
D011805
D012594
D012613
D012711
D012725
D012874
D013090
D013271
D013679
D013863
D013940
D013959
D014007
D014083
D014147

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHAEL T. ANDERS
MARK C. ANDRES
AARON ANGELL
MATTHEW T. ARCHAMBAULT
JAMES M. ASHBURN
JOHN A. ATILANO II
ARIEYEH J. AUSTIN
MICHAEL S. AVEY
TODD E. BAJAKIAN
MATTHEW S. BALINT
FRANKLIN F. BALTAZAR
ELLIS H. BARNES IV
JEREMY D. BELL
LAWSON F. BELL
BENJAMIN A. BENNETT
ANDREW M. BEYER
DANIEL D. BLACKMON
JOSHUA R. BOOKOUT
JARED D. BORDWELL

DAVID D. BOWLING
JEFFREY A. BRACCO
JAMES A. BRADY
KENNETH J. BRAEGER
JEFFERY J. BRAGG
KARST K. BRANDSMA
BRUCE A. BREDLOW
COREY A. BRUNKOW
ROBERT K. BRYANT
ALEXANDER L. BULLOCK
MATHEW F. BUNCH
DAVID R. BUNKER
JEFFREY T. BURGOYNE
STEPHEN E. CAPEHART
DANIEL A. CASTRO
JEREMY J. CHAPMAN
CARL A. CHASTEEN
VARMAN S. CHHOEUNG
CURRAN D. CHIDESTER
BRENT A. CLEMMER
AARON K. COOMBS
WILLIAM N. CRAIG III
MICHAEL P. CRANE
ERIC D. CRISPINO
PAUL B. CULBERSON
JOHN K. CURRY
MATTHEW W. DALTON
JASON S. DAVIS
ANDREW J. DEATON
SCOTT M. DELLINGER
NICHOLAS J. DICKSON
ROBERT J. DUCHAINE
ANTWAN L. DUNMYER
JAMES R. DUNWOODY
THOMAS P. EHRHART
JAMES R. EMBRY
CHRISTOPHER T. FAHRENBAACH
STEPHEN A. FAIRLESS
MARK D. FEDEROVICH
EUGENE J. FERRIS
DEREK S. FINISON
CHAD R. FOSTER
WILL B. FRED'S
THOMAS L. GALLI
THOMAS M. GENTER
JOHN E. GIANNELLONI
JUDSON B. GILLETTE
PETER C. GLASS
ANDREW R. GRAHAM
TRAVIS M. HABHAB
SAMUEL H. HALL
MATTHEW J. HARDMAN
MATTHEW F. HARMON
REGINALD R. HARPER
DAMON K. HARRIS
DAVID J. HASKELL
RALPH R. HEIDEL, JR.
BRIAN J. HENDERSON
MARK R. HIMES
TODD W. HOOK
MATTHEW R. HOWELL
JAMES D. HOYMAN
TIMOTHY D. HUMMEL
MATTHEW L. ISAACSON
JOSEPH A. JACKSON
KEVIN L. JACKSON
ROBERT L. JENKINS
MICHAEL C. JENSIS
MICHAEL S. JOHNSON
JASON A. JOHNSTON
MICHAEL A. JOHNSTON
JACKIE K. KAINA
CHARLES W. KEAN
DON M. KING
BRYAN G. KIRK
MICHAEL F. KLOEPPER
JASON M. KNIFFEN
STEPHEN J. KOLOUCH
JASON A. LACROIX
JONATHAN C. LAUER
GERALD S. LAW
THEODORE J. LEONARD
HEATHER A. LEVY
KIRK M. LIDDLE
BRENT W. LINDEMAN
MATTHEW W. LUZZATTO
CHRISTOPHER S. MAHAFFEY
AARON M. MARTIN
ALICIA M. MASSON
EDWIN D. MATTHAIDESS III
KEVIN E. MCHUGH
TRAVIS L. MCINTOSH
WILLIAM B. MCKANNAY
DAVID M. MCNEILL
JUSTIN T. MEISSNER
DANIEL G. MILLER
HAROLD E. MILLER
HABARI M. MILLER
YVONNE C. MILLER
KENNETH D. MITCHELL
CORNELIUS L. MORGAN
RYAN J. MORGAN
JAMES A. MOYES
ALEXANDER C. MURRAY
JEREMY S. MUSHTARE
LOI M. NGUYEN
DAVID W. NOBLE
DENNIS E. NUTT
STEPHEN W. OWEN
MICHAEL D. OWENS
IAN C. PALMER
JOSEPH H. PARKER
GITTIPOONG PARUCHABUTR
DAVID J. PASQUALE
ROBERT S. PERRY
STEPHEN C. PHILLIPS
JOHN M. POOLE

JAYSON H. PUTNAM
LYNN W. RAY
JAMES V. RECTOR
JAMES C. REESE
JUSTIN Y. J. REESE
MONICA M. REID
JENNIFER A. REYNOLDS
JOSEPH C. RICHEY
PATRICK M. RODDY, JR.
CHAD M. ROEHRMAN
MATTHEW B. ROGERS
CURTIS L. ROWLAND, JR.
JASON M. SABAT
BRYAN D. SCHOTT
RYAN D. SEAGREAVES
JOSHUA P. SEGRAVES
THOMAS J. SIEBOLD
PETER M. SITTENAUER
THOMAS B. SMITH
NEIL N. SNYDER IV
NATHAN R. SPRINGER
PAUL W. STAEHEL
DONALD E. STEWART
RUSSELL C. STEWART
MICHAEL C. STULL
FRED W. TANNER
RHETT A. TAYLOR
TERRY R. TILLIS
EDWARD S. TWADDELL III
SHAWN P. UNDERWOOD
ERIC A. VANEK
TONY K. VERENNA
SCOTT M. VIRGIL
MICHAEL P. WAGNER
LELAND W. WALDRUP II
MATTHEW W. WEBER
RYAN K. WELCH
GABRIEL D. WELLS
MICHAEL R. WEST
JOHN D. WILLIAMS
EARL D. WRIGHT, JR.
RYAN B. WYLIE
JAMES R. YASTRZEMSKY
MICHAEL A. ZOPFI
D005492
D010675
D010067
D014325
D014361
D014380
D014519
D014523
D014641

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHAEL J. ADAMSKI
JEREMIAH A. AESCHLEMAN
ERIC A. ANDERSON
JORGE A. ARREDONDO
CHRISTOPHER A. BACHL
STEPHANIE A. BAGLEY
DANIEL J. BARNARD
TIA L. BENNING
ERIC R. BJORKLUND
MATTHEW B. BOCKHOLT
MICHAEL A. BONURA
MARIA C. BORBON
RANDY BOUCHER
STEPHEN C. BROWNE
MICHAEL L. BURGOYNE
CHRISTOPHER J. BYRD
PETER H. CHAPMAN
TEDROSE H. CHARLES
JASON P. CLARK
SPENCER J. CLOUATRE
GEORGE I. CORBARI
JEFFREY A. COULON
ANTHONY J. COVERT
DAVID F. COY
NICOLE H. CURTIS
MARC D. DANIELS
KEITH W. DEGREORY
JONATHAN S. DUNN
MATTHEW D. EBERHART
ERIC J. EBERLINE
BRIT K. ERSLEV
TANYA T. ESTES
MARCUS M. FERRARA
IAN E. FRANCIS
ALEXANDER S. FURST
COREY S. GERVING
DOUGLAS F. GIBSON
JEREMY J. GRAY
JASON P. GRESH
CHRISTIAN A. HAFLEY
MAURICE S. HAJJAR
MICHAEL L. HALL
ERIC HARTUNIAN
MARVIN G. HAYNES IV
RYAN C. HELLERSTEDT
ARMANDO HERNANDEZ
AARON T. HILL, JR.
JONATHAN W. HUGHES
EARL J. HUNTER
AMANDA L. IDEN
KEE Y. JEONG
ALTON J. JOHNSON
ROBERT L. JONES III
MICHAEL R. KALOOSTIAN
GALEN R. KANE
EDWARD W. KENDALL
MATTHEW R. KENT
MARVIN L. KING III

ERIC T. KISS
 NED A. KRAFCHICK
 JACOB M. KRAMER
 JOHN P. KUNSTBECK
 MICHAEL J. KUZARA
 MICHAEL E. LEE
 KURTIS A. LEFFLER
 ANDREW M. LEONARD
 MICHAEL LEWCZAK
 JORIN C. LINTZENICH
 CHARLES C. LUKE
 KELLY G. MACDONALD
 MARK H. MADDEN
 CHRISTOPHER D. MARCHETTI
 CRAIG A. MARTIN
 MICHAEL W. MARTIN
 CHRISTOPHER T. MAYER
 HEATH L. MCCORMICK
 WILLIAM S. MCNICOL
 ALEXANDER S. MENTIS
 DANIEL R. MILLER
 BASEL M. MIXON IV
 NICHOLAS MONTALTO III
 JARROD P. MORELAND
 ANDREW A. MORRISON
 DAVID J. MULACK
 JOSEPH D. MUNGER
 JOHN J. MYERS
 TODD A. NAPIER
 KEVIN M. NEUMANN
 ANTHONY J. NEWTON
 CHI K. NGUYEN
 CURTIS W. NOWAK
 CHRISTY L. H. NYLAND
 PAUL S. H. OH
 TIMOTHY R. OSULLIVAN
 STEPHEN M. PARRISH, SR.
 REBECCA D. PATTERSON
 STACEY D. PATTERSON
 SHAW S. PICK
 ANTHONY F. POLLIO, JR.
 THOMAS S. PUGSLEY
 JORN A. PUNG
 KAREN F. RADKA
 PETER J. RASMUSSEN
 STANLEY M. REED, SR.
 SCOTT M. SANFORD, SR.
 MATTHEW J. SCHREIBER
 THOMAS A. SCOTT
 SCOTT B. SEIDEL
 JEFFREY A. SHEEHAN
 NICHOLAS R. SIMONTIS
 BRENT O. SKINNER
 SUSAN A. SMELTZER
 CHARLES D. SMITH
 ERIC J. SMITH
 JAY B. SMITH
 MICHAEL L. SMITH
 THOMAS W. SPAHR
 WILLIAM J. STARR, JR.
 KEVIN C. STEYER
 JAMES M. SWARTZ
 MOMOEVI S. TAWAKE
 MATTHEW A. TEMPLEMAN
 CHRISTIAN G. TEUTSCH
 MICHAEL S. TOKAR
 CHRISTOPHER L. TOMLINSON
 JOHN S. TRANSUE, JR.
 BRETT J. VERNETTI
 ROBERT D. WAGNER
 CHRISTOPHER D. WASHINGTON
 EDWIN B. WERKHEISER II
 CHRISTIAN L. WERNER
 JOHN F. WHITFIELD, JR.
 ANNEMARIE R. WIERSGALLA
 JOSEPH E. WILLIAMS
 TROY A. WILLIAMS
 PATRICK E. WORKMAN
 WALTER D. ZACHERL
 MARK M. ZAIS
 TIMOTHY M. ZAJAC
 ANTHONY E. ZUPANCIC
 D001025
 D011309
 D013109
 D013961
 D014349

D014511
 D014545
 G001345
 G010241

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

COURTNEY L. ABRAHAM
 ROBERT S. ADCOCK
 TROY V. ALEXANDER
 TODD J. ALLISON
 JASON M. ALVIS
 MATTHEW K. ANASTASI
 WILLIAM C. ARNOLD
 ELLIS R. BAKER
 MICHAEL A. BAKER
 BRAD A. BANE
 LOYD BEAL III
 BRIAN D. BEINER
 DEREK A. BIRD
 CATHERINE M. BLACK
 KEVIN D. BOUREN
 TERRY D. BRANNAN
 ANGEL M. BRITO
 CAPRISSA S. BROWNSLADE
 LAHAVIE J. BRUNSON
 WOODWARD H. CALDWELL
 LACHER M. CAMPBELL
 EDWIN L. CHILTON II
 STEVEN M. CLARK
 OCTAVIA T. COLEMAN
 TRENTON J. CONNER
 DOUGLAS W. COPELAND
 MYRTA I. CRESPO
 FRANKIE J. CRUZ
 SHANE R. CUELLAR
 BRADLEY T. CULLIGAN
 STEVEN M. DOWGIELEWICZ, JR.
 KIMBERLY K. FUHRMAN
 JOHN R. GAIVIN
 TIMOTHY M. GALLAGHER
 MILES T. GENGLER
 ANTHONY R. GIBBS
 PETER L. GILBERT
 SETH C. GRAVES
 JEREL R. GRIMES
 TODD W. HANDY
 FREDERICKA R. HARRIS
 RAPHAEL S. HEFLIN
 MARK P. HENDERSON
 CARL L. HENNEMANN
 JUSTIN S. HERBERMANN
 JOSHUA D. HIRSCH
 RUSSELL V. HOFF
 SCOTT E. HOLDEN
 JOEL R. HOLMSTROM
 IAN W. HUMPHREY
 LATONYA N. JORDAN
 LOUIS J. KARNES
 SEAN P. KELLY
 RUSSELL W. KLAUMAN
 JOHN W. KREDO
 BRIAN D. KUHN
 MICHAEL F. LABRECQUE
 ROBERT L. LEIATO
 MICHAEL L. LINDLEY
 MICHAEL E. LUDWICK
 SCOTT A. MADDRY
 SCOTT J. MADORE
 JOHN J. MAHER
 TRAHON T. MASHACK
 CARL E. MASON
 AMBROSE U. MBONU
 MICHAEL R. MCBRIDE
 JEFFREY A. MCCARTNEY
 PATRICK J. MCCLELLAND
 ERIC A. MCCOY
 CHRISTOPHER M. MCCREERY
 TIMOTHY D. MCDONALD
 CHARLES W. MCPHAIL
 ROBB A. MEERT
 CHRISTIAN B. MEISEL
 BURR H. MILLER
 ERIN C. MILLER

SAMUEL S. MILLER
 DANIEL MISIGOY
 JARRETT S. MOFFITT
 ROBIN W. MONTGOMERY
 ALTHERIA M. NILES, JR.
 DONNIE NOWLIN
 RYAN P. OQUINN
 MICHAEL N. PARENT
 JONATHAN M. PATRICK
 JAMES R. PECKHAM, JR.
 JASON D. PEREZ
 LETSY A. PEREZMARS DEN
 RICHARD H. PFEIFFER, JR.
 MICHAEL P. POST
 CLYDEA M. PRICHARDBROWN
 BRUCE R. PULVER
 RYAN L. RAYMOND
 NICOLE U. REINHARDT
 CHRISTINE H. RICE
 TRINA RICE
 ROBERT B. ROCHON
 HECTOR ROMAN
 EVANGELINE G. ROSEL
 JOHN C. ROTANTE
 JAY C. SAWYER
 BRYANT L. SCHUMACHER
 RICARDO L. SIERRAGUZMAN
 CHRISTOPHER W. SNIPES
 KELLY K. STEELE
 MARK W. SUSNIS
 MARK R. TAYLOR
 CHESLEY D. THIGPEN
 DOUGLAS C. THOMPSON
 TRACY L. WADLE
 JASON B. WAMSLEY
 MARIO A. WASHINGTON
 JAY J. WILLIAMS
 AARON M. WOLFE
 BRIAN P. WOLFORD
 ABEL E. YOUNG
 D012970
 D014311

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

GARY W. BROCK, JR.
 MICHELLE B. BRONELL
 MICHAEL F. DEROSIER
 STEPHEN S. HAMILTON
 RATASHA L. JACKSON
 WILLIAM R. KEATING
 MATTHEW J. LENNOX
 CHRISTOPHER J. LONGO
 KELVIN E. MOTE
 JOSEPH A. PUSKAS II
 MATTHEW J. SHEIFFER
 ROBERT M. THELEN
 ANDREW D. WHISKEYMAN
 JOHN M. WILSON

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by
 the President to the Senate on June 20,
 2018 withdrawing from further Senate
 consideration the following nomina-
 tions:

KIMBERLY A. REED, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE FIRST
 VICE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE
 UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2021,
 VICE WANDA FELTON, RESIGNED, WHICH WAS SENT TO
 THE SENATE ON OCTOBER 3, 2017.

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATION OF JEFFREY D.
 TILTON, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON MARCH 12,
 2018.

RONNY LYNN JACKSON, OF TEXAS, TO BE SECRETARY
 OF VETERANS AFFAIRS, VICE DAVID J. SHULKIN, WHICH
 WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON APRIL 16, 2018.