



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 14, 2020

No. 8

## Senate

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

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, You are high and lifted up. Deliver us from estrangement or dissension. Teach our lawmakers to disagree with respect, civility, and humility. Lord, lead them into a deeper reverence for You and one another as they remember that patriots reside on both sides of the aisle. May our Senators celebrate the pleasure You receive when colleagues of faith dwell together in unity. Let the words of their mouths and the meditations of their hearts receive Your divine approval.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for 1 minute in morning business.

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

### TAIWAN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, as President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, I want to recognize democracy working in Taiwan.

On Saturday, the 23 million proud people of Taiwan exercised their democratic right to select their own leaders. I congratulate President Tsai on her

reelection. I would also like to take this moment to congratulate all Taiwanese for being a shining light amidst dark times in other parts of East Asia. All of us remember what has been going on in Hong Kong for the last several months as they try to exercise just rights that the Chinese Government gave them in 1997, when they signed an agreement with the British Government turning back Hong Kong to China, and they would have the rights for the next 50 years to have the same democratic principles they had under the British Empire.

Despite continued intimidation by the Chinese Communist Party across the Taiwan Strait, this proud island stood up to protect its democracy and sovereignty. That is exemplified by the election Saturday.

Let us all congratulate the people of Taiwan for their remarkable accomplishment and continue to work in this Chamber to strengthen U.S.-Taiwan relations.

I yield the floor.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, tomorrow will be 4 weeks—4 weeks—since House Democrats impeached the President of the United States with purely partisan support.

Speaker PELOSI and Chairman SCHIFF did not wait to fill out the factual record. They did not even wait to see their own subpoenas through the legal system. They plowed ahead for two reasons: They said impeachment was too urgent to wait—too urgent to wait—and they said they had already proven their case.

But since then, House Democrats have spent 4 weeks contradicting both

of those claims. They spent 4 weeks demonstrating through their actions that impeachment is actually not that urgent—not that urgent—and they do not actually have much confidence in their case.

An arbitrary 4-week delay does not show urgency. These demands for the Senate to precommit to reopening the House investigation do not show confidence. There is a reason why the House inquiry that led to President Nixon's resignation took 14 months of hearings in addition to the separate special prosecutor. There is a reason why the Clinton impeachment inquiry drew on years of prior investigation and mountains of testimony from firsthand fact witnesses. That is because both of those Houses of Representatives knew they had to prove their case—prove their case before submitting it to the Senate for judgment.

Both situations involved legal battles over executive privilege and extensive litigation, both times not after a trial had been handed to the Senate but beforehand. When the cases were actually being compiled, there were mountains of evidence, mountains of testimony, and long legal battles over privilege. None of this discovery took place over here in the Senate.

The Constitution gives the sole power of impeachment to the House. If the House majority wants to impeach a President, the ball is in their court, but they have to do the work. They have to prove their case. Nothing—nothing in our history or our Constitution says a House majority can pass what amounts to a half-baked censure resolution and then insist that the Senate fill in the blanks. There is no constitutional exception for a House majority with a short attention span.

I think everyone knows this process has not been some earnest, factfinding mission with House Democrats following each thread wherever it leads. The Speaker of the House did not reluctantly decide to impeach after pouring over secondhand impressions of

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S167

civil servants. This was a predetermined political conclusion. Members of her conference had been publicly promising it literally for years.

That is why the investigation stopped long before the House had come anywhere near proving what they allege. They pulled the plug early because the facts were never the point. They were never the point. The point was to check a political box.

For goodness' sake, the very morning after the House's historic vote, Speaker PELOSI literally chastised reporters for asking too many questions about impeachment. She tried to change the subject to economic policy. She said:

Any other questions? . . . Anybody want to talk about the SALT tax. . . . I'm not going to answer any more questions on this—

Referring to impeachment.

Really? Really? You impeach a President of the United States, and the very next morning, there is nothing to see here? Does that sound like the Speaker of the House really thinks the survival of the Republic is on the line? Does anyone really think that if Democrats truly believe the President of the United States was a criminal who is imperiling our country, they would have abandoned the search for evidence because they didn't want to make time for due process; that they would have pulled the plug on the investigation just because it sounded good to finish by Christmas; that they would have delayed the trial for months while they test-drove new talking points; that they would have been trying to change the subject 12 hours after the vote?

I cannot say what Democrats do and do not really believe, but they certainly do not seem to display the urgency or the seriousness you would expect from people who actually thought they had proven the President should be removed.

On television last weekend, the Speaker bragged that "this President is impeached for life," regardless of what the Senate does—regardless of what the Senate does, as if the ultimate verdict were sort of an afterthought.

Likewise, the Senate Democratic leader recently said that as long as he can try to use the trial process to hurt some Republicans' reelection chances, "it's a win-win." That is what this is all about. The Democratic leader just laid it right out there in case anybody had any doubt.

What a revealing admission. Forget about the fate of the Presidency. Forget about the Constitution. As long as the process helps Democrats' political fortunes, our Democratic colleagues call it a "win-win." Do these sound like leaders who really believe we are in a constitutional crisis, one that requires the most severe remedy in our entire system of government? Does it sound like that?

Here is how deep we have come into bizarro world. The latest Democratic talking point is, if the Senate conducts a trial based on what the House itself

looked at, we will be engaged in a coverup. Did you get that? Unless the Senate steps outside of our lane and takes it upon ourselves to supplement the House case, it is a coverup?

Do they think the entire country has forgotten what they were saying just a couple of days ago? We heard over and over that the House case, on its own, was totally damning and convincing. That is what they were saying a few days ago.

Clearly, a majority of the House felt that it was sufficient to impeach, and a number of Senate Democrats were happy to prejudice the case publicly and suggest the House had proven enough for removal.

But now, all of a sudden, the story has reversed. Now, we hardly know anything. Now, the investigation is just beginning. Now, what the House has produced is so weak that they are calling their own investigation a coverup. Who would be the author of this coverup—Chairman SCHIFF?

We have arrived at a simple contradiction. Two things cannot both be true. House Democrats' case cannot simultaneously be so robust that it was enough to impeach in the first place but also so weak that the Senate needs to go fishing. If the existing case is strong, there is no need for the judge and the jury to reopen the investigation.

If the existing case is weak, House Democrats should not have impeached in the first place. I think I am beginning to understand why the Speaker wanted to change the subject to tax policy. Unfortunately, no matter how irresponsibly this has been handled across the Capitol, impeachment is not a political game, and the U.S. Senate will not treat it like one.

A House majority fueled by political animus may have started this with frivolity, but it will fall to the Senate—to the Senate—to end it with seriousness and sobriety. It will fall to us to do what the Founders intended: to take the long view, to move beyond partisan passions, and to do what the long-term good of our institution and our Nation demands.

#### IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, every day brings more repudiation of the conventional wisdom of the Democratic foreign policy establishment, breathlessly—breathlessly—amplified by the mainstream media, that the strike on Soleimani would unite Iranians behind the regime. Remember, that is what they were all saying, that the strike on Soleimani would unite Iranians behind the regime. Proud Iranians continue, however, to take to the streets not to rage against America or Israel but to vent their frustration against the corrupt, theocratic regime that has led Iran down a ruinous path.

I spoke about these protests before the strike on Soleimani, and I will continue to speak out about them. I have

long believed the United States should care about human rights and democracy, whether in Russia, China, Hong Kong, Burma, Cuba, Venezuela, Afghanistan, Syria, or Iran. The promotion of human rights and the defense of democracy should not necessarily be the driving force of our foreign policy, but it should be an important component.

I ask my Democratic colleagues who share this view to set aside their hatred for Donald Trump—even just for a moment—and to step back to look at what has been happening across Iran for years: the repression of women, the persecution of ethnic and religious minorities, and the brutal suppression of dissent.

Was the Obama administration right to meet the 2009 Green Revolution with silence?

Consider the story of Iran's only female Olympic medalist, who this week defected—defected—from Iran and requested asylum; or the Iranian state TV broadcasters who quit, apologizing to the public for years of lying on behalf of the mullahs; or the innocent protesters who are being killed and wounded by agents of the state.

These are well-known realities. They were well known when, 12 days ago, the United States took the most dangerous terrorist off the battlefield, but mystifyingly, many voices here in Washington and the media sought to blame the escalating tensions in the region on President Trump.

We heard from leading Democrats that the operation to eliminate Soleimani was one of the administration's "needless provocations"—needless provocations. We heard that the cycle of violence was America's responsibility. All of this—all of it—flies in the face of the reasonable analysis some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were offering before—before—Donald Trump became President.

In 2007, 30 Democratic Senators joined Republicans to support an amendment warning of the need to prevent "Iran from turning Shia militia extremists in Iraq into a Hezbollah-like force that could serve its interests inside Iraq, including by overwhelming, subverting, or coopting institutions of the legitimate government of Iraq." That was back in 2007, with 30 Democrats.

Few more prescient warnings have been pronounced by this body, but, unfortunately, it went unheeded by the Obama administration, which withdrew U.S. forces from Iraq, effectively abandoning it to Soleimani and his proxies.

As recently as 2015, the Democratic leader warned that the JCPAO failed to address Iran's destabilizing malign activities and that Iran would use its windfall to "redouble its efforts to create even more trouble in the Middle East and, perhaps, beyond." That was the Democratic leader in 2015.

Senator MENENDEZ hit the nail on the head as well. He warned: "If there

is a fear of war in the region, it will be fueled by Iran and its proxies and exacerbated by an agreement that allows Iran to possess an industrial-sized nuclear program and enough money in sanctions relief to significantly continue to fund its hegemonic intentions throughout the region.” Senator MENENDEZ.

So many of our Democratic colleagues understood all this quite clearly when a Democrat occupied the White House, and it came true. It came true. Iran’s aggression only accelerated after the Obama administration’s deal. The question for us is not whom to blame. That much is clear. The question is what to do about it.

As Iran’s aggression became focused on the United States, as the risk to our personnel and interests grew, after months of repeated warnings, President Trump took action. I am glad the strike against Soleimani has provided some justice—some justice—to his countless victims, hundreds of Americans and many more across the Middle East.

We don’t yet know if Soleimani will prove irreplaceable, but his death will significantly disrupt Iran’s death machine and will change Iran’s long-held misconception that they could literally get away with the murder of Americans without a meaningful response. President Trump’s strategy seems to have reestablished deterrence.

The Senate risks jeopardizing what we have gained with this strike if it ties the military’s hands and tells Iran that we have no stomach for this. America can hardly be defeated on the battlefield, but we can be defeated at home on the political front. We can allow ourselves to become divided and play into the hands of our adversaries. Our divisions at home are significant. Let us not allow them to pollute our judgment on foreign affairs. Let’s not make our adversaries’ lives easier by tying our military’s hands.

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Peter Gaynor, of Rhode Island, to be Administrator of

the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### IMPEACHMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the House of Representatives has impeached the President for a very serious offense: coercing a foreign leader into interfering in our elections, using the powers of the Presidency, the most powerful public office in the Nation, to benefit himself—to actually influence the election, which should be decided by American citizens, not by a foreign power. When debating the impeachment clause of the Constitution, the Founders worried about foreign capitals having undue influence over our country. Hamilton, writing in the *Federalist Papers*, described impeachable offenses as abuses or violations of some public trust.

In the impeachment of President Trump, the question the Senate will be asked to answer is whether the President did, in fact, abuse his public trust and, by doing so, invite the very foreign influence the Founders feared would be a corruption of our democracy. To answer that question, to decide whether the President merits acquittal and removal from office, the Senate must conduct a fair trial. A fair trial has witnesses. A fair trial has relevant documents as a part of the record. A fair trial seeks the truth—no more, no less.

That is why Democrats have asked to call four fact witnesses and subpoena three specific sets of relevant documents related to the President’s misconduct with Ukraine. At the moment, my Republican colleagues are opposing these witnesses and documents, but they can’t seem to find a real reason why. Most are unwilling to argue that witnesses shouldn’t come before the Senate. They can only support delaying the decision until most of the trial is over, like a magic eight ball that keeps saying: Ask again later.

The most the Republican leader can do is smear our request as some partisan fishing expedition intended to damage the President, but the leader himself has warned that the witnesses we have requested might not help the House managers’ case against the President. He is right about that. These are the President’s top advisers. They are appointed by him, vetted by him. They work with him.

We don’t know what those witnesses will say or what the documents will re-

veal. They could hurt the President’s case or they could help the President’s case. We don’t know.

We know one thing. We want the truth on something as weighty and profound as an impeachment trial. Does Leader MCCONNELL want the truth? Do Senate Republicans want the truth?

I would remind the leader that our request for witnesses and documents is very much in line with the Senate’s history. The Republican leader keeps citing precedent. Well, here is precedent, Mr. Leader. There have been two Presidential impeachment trials in history. Both—both—had witnesses. The trial of Andrew Johnson had 41 witnesses. There have been 16 completed impeachment trials in the Senate’s entire history. In every one, except one, the trial in 1799 of Senator William Blount, which was dismissed on jurisdictional grounds, every Senate impeachment trial in history has included witnesses.

You want precedent? Precedent says witnesses overwhelmingly.

The long arc of history casts a shadow on the proceedings we are about to undertake. It suggests something obvious—that the Senate has always believed trials were about evidence and getting the truth. Of the 16 impeachment trials, 15 had witnesses and 1 was dismissed early. Do Senate Republicans want to break that lengthy historical precedent by conducting the first impeachment trial of a President in history with no witnesses? Let me ask that question again. This is weighty. This is vital. This is about the Republic. Do Senate Republicans want to break the lengthy historical precedent that said witnesses should be at in impeachment trial by conducting the first impeachment trial of the President in history—in history, since 1789—with no witnesses?

I ask that question because that seems to be where the Republican leader wants us to be headed. The Republican leader has designed a schedule for a Senate trial that might—might—have us vote on witnesses and documents after the presentations from both sides have been concluded—the judicial equivalent of putting the cart before the horse. Of course, Leader MCCONNELL has made no guarantee that he will support voting on witnesses and documents at that time—only that supposedly he will be open to the idea.

I want my Republican colleagues to bear in mind that if we consider witnesses at a later date, it could extend the trial by several days, maybe several weeks, as witnesses did during the Clinton trial.

Leader MCCONNELL has said that after the arguments are made, we should vote and move on. Do my Republican colleagues really believe Leader MCCONNELL will have an open mind about witnesses at a later date when they might extend the trial much longer than he wants? I am not in the prediction business, but I can bet that

when the time comes, Leader McCONNELL will say that we have heard enough, that the trial shouldn't drag on any longer, that the Senate doesn't need witnesses and documents, and that we should, just as he once said "vote and move on."

Before Senate Republicans are so quick to reject the Democratic proposal for a limited list of relevant witnesses and documents, I want them to consider that our proposal would save the Senate time. We want to confront the issue now, not be forced to extend the trial later. We want both the House managers and the White House defense counsel to have time to incorporate the testimony of witnesses into their presentations. That is the proper way to proceed. That is what happens at trials—collect all the evidence at the beginning, not at the end.

All we are asking is for the President's own men, his appointees, to come forward and tell their side of the story. The American people want a fair trial in the Senate. The American people know that a trial without witnesses and documents is not a real trial; it is a sham trial. And the American people will be able to tell the difference between a fair hearing of the facts and a coverup.

#### IRAN

Madam President, on Iran, the Senate will soon consider Senator KAINE's War Powers Resolution, which would prevent further hostilities with Iran without congressional approval. It is a crucial vote that will correctly assert this body's constitutional authority over matters of war and peace, and it is certainly timely.

The past few weeks have highlighted the President's impulsive, erratic, and often reckless foreign policy, the consequences of which have made Americans less safe and unnecessarily put our Armed Forces in harm's way. From North Korea, to Syria, to Russia, it is impossible to say the world is a safer place today than when President Trump took office, and it is very possible to say that President Trump, by his impulsive, erratic, and ego-driven actions, has made things worse.

With respect to Iran, the President's recent actions have increased the risk of further hostilities in the Middle East. The President campaigned on getting the United States out of "endless wars" in the Middle East, but the President has deployed thousands more U.S. troops in the Middle East with hardly an explanation to Congress or to the American people.

I have long been concerned that the President's chaotic, impulsive decisionmaking might stumble us into war. With Iran, like with many other places around the globe, the President's policy has brought us closer to the kind of endless war the President promised we would avoid.

It is past time for Congress to place a check on this President. On matters of war and peace, congressional oversight and congressional prerogatives

are not optional. I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote in favor of the Kaine resolution.

Senator SANDERS also has a bill that would deny funding for a war with Iran, of which I am a proud cosponsor. The Senate should consider that legislation as well. As the situation with Iran continues to evolve, the administration must come back and brief Congress on all major developments, troop deployments, and long-term strategy in the region.

#### CHINA

Madam President, finally, on China, tomorrow the United States will complete a signing ceremony for the so-called phase one trade agreement with China. After 18 months of negotiations, the phase one deal is remarkable for how little it achieves at an enormous price.

President Trump has agreed to scale back some tariffs on Chinese goods in exchange for temporary assurances that China will increase its purchase of U.S. exports over the next few years, particularly in agriculture.

For all the effort and turmoil over the past few years, the deal President Trump will sign tomorrow hardly seems to advance the United States past square one. It fails to address the deep structural inequalities in the trade relationship between China and the United States.

For the past decade, China has stolen American intellectual property through forced technology transfers of our companies and through outright cyber theft. The President's phase one deal doesn't even address this issue. China has routinely subsidized its most important domestic industries. Not just labor-intensive industries but even industries like Huawei are subsidized to gain unfair advantage over American companies. China has dumped goods illegally into our markets. It has manipulated its currency to keep prices low. The President's phase one deal doesn't address any of these issues.

Not only does this deal fail to make any meaningful progress toward ending China's most flagrant abuses, what it does achieve on the agricultural side may well be a day late and a dollar short. China has already made long-term contracts with other producers of soybeans and other goods in places like Argentina and Brazil. American farmers have already lost billions over the last 2 years, watched their markets disappear, and too many American farms have gone bankrupt in the time that it took President Trump to reach this deal.

I have publicly praised the President when he is tough on China, at some political cost. I have said he has had better instincts on China than previous administrations. Few politicians have been talking about securing real reforms to China's economic policies longer than I have. But I fear that with an election around the corner, the President is taking the easy way out—

settling for a weak deal that will cost American businesses, American farmers, and American workers for years and years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

#### IRAN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, this week we expect to vote on a War Powers Resolution related to operations in Iran. I am pleased that the President's demonstration of strength has restored our position of credible deterrence. Some have challenged that the President's action was escalatory, but the reality is that Iran had become increasingly bold. The United States responded in self-defense, and, as the President has said, it appears that Iran is standing down.

Hopefully Iran's tragic error in shooting down a civilian passenger plane has served as a sobering check on the regime's activities. We have seen thousands of Iranians rallying in the streets in recent days protesting the bringing down of the passenger plane and calling for change. I hope the people of Iran are able to organize and demonstrate in safety and that their hopes and prayers for change are answered.

Soleimani's death provides an opportunity for Iran to rethink its direction, to move away from brutally oppressing its citizens and fomenting violence throughout the Middle East. We should encourage such rethinking by continuing to make it clear through the sanctions the President has imposed and other measures that we will not accept Iranian aggression against Americans or our allies.

#### IMPEACHMENT

Madam President, on an issue closer to home, at the end of last week, Speaker PELOSI announced that she was finally ready to send over the Articles of Impeachment—the next step in a saga that began 3 years ago. That is right, on January 20, 2017—Inauguration Day—the Washington Post ran an article entitled "The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun."

It is important that we not forget this. We need to remember how we got here. Democrats would like to think that this impeachment was the result of a high-minded, impartial, thoughtful procession. It wasn't. It was the result of a 3-year-long partisan crusade to damage or remove this President.

It is fair to say that the actual impeachment process was the most rushed, most biased, and least impartial impeachment process in history. For evidence, look no further than the Democrats' behavior in the wake of the impeachment vote.

Democrats rushed the Articles of Impeachment through the House because, we were told, it was urgent that the President be removed from office. One Democrat even said that the House was acting hastily because there was "a crime spree in progress." And then what did Democrats do? Instead of

sending the Articles of Impeachment over to the Senate so the Senate could conduct a trial, Speaker PELOSI and the House Democratic caucus sat on the articles for close to a month.

The delay was so flagrantly unjustified that even Senate Democrats started to express their impatience with the House. "If it's serious and urgent, send them over." That is a quote from the highest ranking Democrat on the Senate Judiciary Committee. She went on to say: "If it isn't, don't send it over." A fair point. But House Democrats never really believed in the seriousness and urgency of the articles. If they had, they would have sent them over to the Senate immediately.

Of course, while Senate Democrats have gotten impatient with the House, Senate Democrats have also demonstrated a healthy dose of partisanship around the impeachment.

Senate Republicans have proposed modeling the rules for the first phase of this impeachment trial on the rules that governed the Clinton impeachment trial—rules that were agreed to unanimously by Democrats and Republicans at the time—but Senate Democrats are having none of it. These rules were eminently fair and, as I said, were supported by every single Democrat before President Clinton's impeachment trial. These rules gave both sides—the House impeachment managers and the President and his team—an opportunity to make their case, and they gave Senators an opportunity to question both sides and only then make a determination as to whether additional information or witnesses were needed. These rules were good enough for Democrats and Republicans back then; they ought to be good enough for Democrats and Republicans today.

I am glad Speaker PELOSI is finally sending over the articles so we can move forward with this process and then get back to doing the work the American people sent us here to do, but I am saddened by the damage Democrats have done to the institution and the processes of government.

The overturning of an election—the overturning of the American people's choice—is a very serious thing. It is a remedy to be wielded only with careful deliberation, in the most serious circumstances.

The Democrats have spent the past 3 years treating impeachment not as a remedy of last resort but as a way of overturning an election where they didn't like the outcome. That is not what impeachment was intended to be. By hijacking the impeachment process for political purposes, Democrats have made it clear that they believe election outcomes don't matter and that they believe it should be the Democratic Party, not the democratic process, that decides elections. And that is profoundly disturbing.

This fall, the American people will have a chance to render their verdict on the Trump Presidency. In fact, Presidential primary voting begins in just a

few short weeks. It is a great pity that Democrats have sought to preempt the next Presidential election with a partisan impeachment process in Washington, DC.

I hope we can move beyond this impeachment and the hyper-partisanship the Democrats have engaged in over the past 3 years. This institution should be in the business of governing, not endlessly trying to overturn an election. I hope in the future we can keep impeachment as a serious remedy for the most serious of crimes, not as a political weapon to be used whenever a partisan majority in Congress despises the occupant in the White House.

We will do our constitutional duty in the Senate over the next few weeks, and after that, I look forward to getting back to the business of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, the Senate as it is currently meeting is in the normal course of business, but in just a few days, this Senate Chamber will change. It will no longer be the Senate considering resolutions and legislation; it will be a Senate considering an impeachment proceeding. It will be a piece of history for those who watch. This will be only the third time in the history of the United States of America that the Senate will be convening for an impeachment proceeding relative to the President of the United States. It is a matter of the most serious constitutional gravity, and I hope all of us as Members of the Senate will consider it and approach it that way.

Under the Constitution, we have a unique role as Members of the Senate. We are the jurors; we are the jury. There are 100 Senators who will decide whether the Articles of Impeachment should be voted on and whether the impeachment of the President of the United States should proceed.

We are also in a unique role under the Constitution in that we aren't just jurors sitting silently in the jury box. We are also judges in one respect. We set up the procedure, the way the trial moves forward.

Before I was elected to Congress, I used to practice trial law, and jurors had the ultimate word in terms of the fate of my clients, but the jurors didn't decide the procedure of the trial. That was decided by a judge. When it comes to an impeachment proceeding under the Constitution, the actual process or the procedure of the impeachment trial is decided by the jurors, the Senators. It is very unusual, but it was a decision made by our Founding Fathers to put this ultimate test of impeachment in the hands of the Senators.

Why pick the Senate? It could have gone to the Supreme Court or some other tribunal. Alexander Hamilton said that there were two reasons they wanted to bring the impeachment trial to the floor of the Senate. He said that the Senators, by their nature and polit-

ical composition, would be "independent and dignified"—his words, "independent and dignified." I hope he is right.

I was here 20 years ago during the Clinton impeachment trial, and I can remember very well how the temperament and mood and environment on the floor of the Senate changed when the impeachment proceedings began. There was the arrival of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in his judicial role to sit where the current Presiding Officer of the Senate is sitting and to preside over the trial. Instantly, when you walked into the Chamber and saw the Chief Justice, you knew this was different. This was a new challenge. This was being treated differently by the Constitution.

Then, of course, each of us, having been sworn in to be Senators representing the States that sent us, take a separate oath when it comes to our responsibilities under impeachment. That oath is fairly routine, but it includes one phrase that stands out when I read it. We swear that we will impart "impartial justice" as impeachment jurors—impartial justice. We hold up our hands and swear. We sign the book on the desk at the front of the Senate, as a matter of history, that we have made this oath for impartial justice. That is why I have been troubled, as we lead up to this impeachment proceeding, when I hear some of the statements and speeches that have been made on the floor of the Senate.

The Republican leader from Kentucky said very openly several weeks ago that he was going to work with the President's defense team to prepare for how he would handle the impeachment proceedings in the Senate. I understand there are some elements of this that just make sense that there would be conversation with the managers of the impeachment as to the procedure to be followed. But what we have heard, even today, on the floor of the Senate is more than just cooperation in setting up the workings of the impeachment proceeding. What we have heard from the Republican majority leader is nothing short of an opening statement at a trial. He has come to the floor even today to question, challenge, diminish, even ridicule the entire impeachment proceeding. To me, that steps over a line—a line where we were sworn to show impartial justice in this proceeding. When the Senator from Kentucky comes to the floor and says, for example, that this is a hurried process, he raises the question as to whether the impeachment proceedings in the House were appropriate. He is correct when he says that the previous impeachments have had lengthy investigations leading up to them. In fact, one I recall before I was elected to Congress involving President Nixon went on for months on questions of the Watergate scandal, which was at the heart of the proposed Nixon impeachment. There were special prosecutors and investigators and people who worked

constantly for month after month after month before the Articles of Impeachment were being prepared. You may recall that President Nixon resigned before the actual impeachment proceeding.

But, then again, there was the Ken Starr investigation under President Clinton. It, too, went on for months with sworn testimony and depositions and videotaped proceedings of witnesses that led up to the impeachment.

This is different. The case is being brought to us by the House of Representatives for the impeachment of President Trump. It is true that in comparison it had a shorter investigative process, shorter than the two I just referenced. But it is also true that the second count of the Articles of Impeachment raises the question as to whether the President cooperated in providing witnesses and evidence that led to the Articles of Impeachment in the House, and that is one of the counts of impeachment against him—that he didn't participate and cooperate.

For the Senator from Kentucky to stand here and say that it should have been a lengthier proceeding in the House—there should have been more witnesses; there should have been more evidence—is to ignore the obvious. One of the counts of impeachment raises the question as to whether the President appropriately denied any cooperation with the House impeachment proceeding.

Secondly, the Senator from Kentucky comes to the floor and consistently says that the suggestion that we should allow witnesses and evidence to be considered is evidence of the weakness of the case coming out of the House of Representatives. Well, there aren't an exact number of parallels between ordinary civil and criminal litigation and impeachment proceedings, but in the world of law and trials, there is usually an opening pleading or proceeding through a grand jury that leads to charges against an individual. I have been through that many times on the civil side—rarely, but once in a while, on the criminal side. The trial itself takes that initial pleading, that initial statement of a case, and elaborates on it, opens up, brings in evidence and witnesses on both sides.

When we talk about witnesses and evidence coming before the Senate on any impeachment proceeding with President Trump, it isn't just on one side of the case. What we are suggesting is there should be witnesses from both sides. Let the President bring those who he believes can speak most convincingly to his innocence. Let the House managers supporting impeachment take the opposite position and find those witnesses who they think tell the story from their side of the case. That is the nature of a trial. The American people have seen it over and over again in their personal lives and in what they have witnessed on television and other places. Both sides

put on their best evidence, and, ultimately, the jury decides the truth of the matter. That is all the Democrats are asking for here.

We are asking that the impeachment proceeding witnesses be allowed on both sides, evidence be allowed on both sides, and, ultimately, as Senator SCHUMER said earlier, we get to the truth of the matter; we make our decision in the Senate; and the American people get to witness this democratic process.

Senator MCCONNELL has said in many different places that he resists this idea of witnesses and evidence, but I hope he will reconsider. I hope at least four Republican Senators will reconsider—if they are in Senator MCCONNELL's position—and opt, instead, for the historic precedent of witnesses and evidence at a trial.

The Senate will change this week. If you are witnessing it through C-SPAN or in the audience in the Galleries, you will notice it. First, the Senators will be on the floor of the Senate, which is rare, and second, with the Chief Justice presiding, there is a much different air in the proceedings and business of the Senate.

The final point I want to make is that I am troubled by the continued suggestion that the prospect of an impeachment trial is holding the Senate hostage, that we cannot consider serious legislation because of the possibility of an impeachment trial. It is true that once the trial starts, we devote ourselves to it. But that hasn't happened.

So how do the leaders of the Senate on the Republican side explain the year 2019? It was a unique year in the history of the Senate. It was unique for what we failed to do. During the course of the entire year, the Senate considered 22 amendments total. There were 22 amendments on the floor of the Senate. Six were offered by the junior Senator from Kentucky, all of which, I believe, failed. But there were 22 amendments in a year. I can tell you that it is not unusual if you look at the history of the Senate for us to consider 22 amendments in the course of a week, sometimes in the course of a day. But in the entire year, there were only 22 amendments. Why? Because Senator MCCONNELL, who has the power under the Senate rules, decided there would be no business before the Senate but for the filling of judicial vacancies and other Executive appointments. That was it. A handful of other pieces of legislation were considered—the Defense authorization bill and, finally, a massive spending bill—but never with amendments. So to suggest that the impeachment trial has something to do with the inactivity in the Senate is to ignore the obvious.

Last year, before there were any Articles of Impeachment, Senator MCCONNELL, under his leadership, called for virtually nothing to be debated and considered on the floor of the Senate. I have said this before, and I stand by it.

This is a Senate Chamber, but too many days, in too many respects, it is a storage facility. We are storing the desks of the Senate, once occupied by Senators who came here to work. They offered bills, offered amendments, had real debates and votes. We look at these desks and say: Boy, it must have been a great day in the Senate when you actually did that.

For the Republicans to blame the impeachment process for the inactivity of last year defies common sense. For that reason, I hope that when the impeachment trial ends, Senator MCCONNELL of Kentucky, the Republican majority leader, will consider at least 1 of the more than 200 bills that the Democratic House of Representatives has sent us to consider—bills relating to healthcare, bills relating to the price of prescription drugs, bills relating to student loans, bills relating to immigration. They are all sitting somewhere in a file cabinet and a computer somewhere in Senator MCCONNELL's office. Maybe we can be the Senate after the impeachment trial. It is in the hands of Senator MCCONNELL to make that decision.

#### WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Madam President, let me speak to an issue that has been raised this morning, which is timely and critically important. The President tweeted last week to the country: "All is well." As we were teetering on the verge of war with Iran, he tweeted: "All is well."

But now details have come to light, and it is clear that all is not well. U.S. servicemembers of Ain Al-Asad Air Base in Iraq faced a sustained hour and a half of Iranian retaliatory attacks last week—a barrage described by one of the most senior commanders on the base as "designed and organized to inflict as many casualties as possible." Contrary to the tweet by our President that all is well, reports from witnesses suggest that despite heroic planning, we were, in fact, very fortunate—if not lucky—that none of our U.S. personnel were killed.

This gets me to the issue that needs to be brought before the Senate, one that goes to the heart of this Senate's critical, often neglected, constitutional responsibility. It is not whether Iranian General Soleimani was an enemy with American blood on his hands—that is a fact—but it is too simplistic to stop there. We have known that fact for a long time. Previous Presidents of both political parties have known General Soleimani's background—it is not in dispute—but it is a distraction to stop with that conversation.

The real question is whether President Trump, when he made the decision to target General Soleimani, considered the possibility that it would quickly escalate into a much larger confrontation with Iran, which is the possibility of a war—a distinct possibility and one never authorized by Congress.

Based on the administration's briefing last week, which I sat through, I

doubt if even they think they need congressional authorization to ask our sons and daughters, grandsons and granddaughters to participate in another war in the Middle East. The first question asked by Senator McCONNELL at the briefing, which was attended by the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, was whether there was a need for authorization under the War Powers Act before the United States continued to have its conflict with Iran. The answer that came from the Secretary of Defense was that there was no authorization necessary. He went on to say that he thought even the debate over authorization could be unsettling and troublesome for our troops if it appeared that we were uncertain as to whether we were ready to go to war.

Based on that briefing, I doubt this administration believes any congressional authorization is needed for the military action that has been taken or that might even be contemplated. Quite simply, the fact that the Senate has not exercised its constitutional right, authority, and responsibility to determine whether we should go to war with Iran troubles me. I am deeply concerned that if Iran retaliates further or if the President decides to escalate the confrontation, this Chamber will not even recognize—let alone act on—its constitutional responsibility under Article I, Section 8.

That is why I have joined my colleague and friend Senator TIM KAINE, of Virginia, in invoking the War Powers Act—a law passed over President Nixon's veto after Presidents of both parties deliberately misled the American people on the Vietnam war. It is hard for those who did not live during that era to appreciate what that war did to this Nation. First and foremost, it cost us almost 50,000 American lives, and hundreds of thousands of Americans were injured—men and women in uniform who bravely served our country. They gave their lives and came home with the scars they carried for their lifetimes. The billions of dollars that were spent and our involvement in that war, which divided this country at its core, are hard to put into words in just a few moments.

At the end of it, though, Congress realized that it had failed in its own responsibility to even declare a war against Vietnam. So we passed the War Powers Act and set up a process that said we are not going to let that happen again, that the American people will participate in any future decisions about whether we go to war, and that they will do it through their elected Congressmen and elected Senators.

The War Powers Act passed the Congress, and it was sent to President Nixon. He vetoed it and said we didn't want to give that additional authority to Congress. Then, in a rare, rare moment, Congress overrode President Nixon's veto, and the War Powers Act became the law of the land. That War

Powers Act, I believe, applies to the current situation that is escalating with Iran. That is why I have joined with Senator KAINE in his invoking the War Powers Resolution.

What I find particularly troubling about the administration's march to war in Iran is that the administration's own actions have contributed to the current tensions and problems we have with Iran. Before taking office, Iran's nuclear weapons program was halted because of an historic agreement President Obama negotiated. In cooperation with our allies in Europe, as well as with China and Russia, President Obama negotiated a treaty that required international inspectors to be on the ground in Iran to make certain that Iran lived up to its terms. Of course, Iran was not happy about these inspectors, but it accepted them. On several different occasions, we had representatives of those inspectors come and say, yes, that they had had virtually unlimited access to Iran in order to make certain Iran didn't violate the nuclear agreement. Iran continued in its malign behaviors in the region, but containment was easier without the threat of an Iranian nuclear bomb.

During the campaign, President Trump said the first thing he would do would be to eliminate that international agreement that required international inspectors, which is what stopped Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It made no sense for the President to take the position that he did, but that is the position that he announced during the campaign, and that is exactly what he did after he was elected President. He withdrew the United States from this agreement that stopped Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Then he increased sanctions on Iran, and the tensions between our countries grew.

The President pursued a policy of regime change that is very difficult to explain, if not to justify—trying to flatter on one day and to confront on the next day. He proposed to meet with President Rouhani, of Iran, to negotiate a supposedly bigger deal, a better deal. Then he threatened Iran militarily and tightened sanctions soon after. These efforts went nowhere except to increase tensions between the United States and Iran. Iran lashed out on American interests. We were alienated from many of our allies, particularly those who were party to the nuclear agreement, and Iran inched closer to restarting its nuclear program.

In recent weeks alone, President Trump has managed to reverse the recent Iraqi protest settlement that warned Iran to stop meddling in its particular politics, which has led to the real possibility that American troops in Iraq that are critical to countering ISIS will be expelled.

Similarly, after months of anti-government protests in Iran, President Trump has almost instantaneously united the Iranian public opinion against us with the targeting of Gen-

eral Soleimani. Iran has now announced it will exceed the limits of the nuclear program that were imposed by the nuclear agreement, from which President Trump walked away, and our interests around the region are on high alert for fear of a retaliatory attack by the Iranians.

So there are real questions as to how President Trump's Iran policy serves long-term American security interests and as to whether this body is ready to at least debate the possibility of another war with Iran.

Before President Trump plunges us into another reckless Middle East war, shouldn't we first remember how we were fooled into invading Iraq in the first place? I remember full well.

I was a Member of the Senate when we were given the proposal of taking military action against Iraq because of its purported possession of these military devices that were threatening to the United States and to the region. Many of us were skeptical. The weapons of mass destruction charge didn't have the evidence that we thought was convincing. In the end, 23 Senators—22 Democrats and 1 Republican—joined in voting against the invasion of Iraq. I was one of those Senators. I was not convinced there were weapons of mass destruction. After the invasion and after careful inspection, it turned out that there were no weapons of mass destruction—the single event that really brought us into the conflict.

Then, as now, we were led to believe there was an urgent spiraling of events that required U.S. military intervention. Mark me down as skeptical—skeptical as to whether another invasion by the United States of a Muslim nation in the Middle East is in the best interest of national security.

Many around President Trump, particularly Secretary of State Pompeo, have been speaking of this conflict with Iraq for a long period of time. Some of them are the same people who endorsed the invasion of Iraq almost 20 years ago. We are still in Iraq. We have given up more than 5,000 American lives, with many having been injured and with \$1 trillion or more having been spent.

It is possible the Iraqis will just ask us to leave. Think of that. After all that we have put into their country, their legislature—their Parliament—voted several weeks ago to tell us to leave. In fact, one of the great tragedies of the Iraq war and one that few of its architects ever owned up to was that the Iraq war was actually empowering Iran in the region. Iran became a potent force because, in many respects, in its efforts in the Middle East, the United States created that opportunity.

These same unrepentant voices are again beating the drums for regime change in Iran and another war in the Middle East. They do so with a President who has made more than 15,000 false or misleading statements while he has been in office—15,000—with his



even going so far as to trust Vladimir Putin, the leader of Russia, over our own intelligence sources, making it impossible to trust anything he says when it comes to matters as grave as war.

Some have even had the audacity to argue that the 2001 authorization for use of military force in Iraq is somehow a permission slip for the invasion of Iran. That is preposterous. I cannot imagine anyone here who took that vote 18 years ago thought that he was authorizing for future Presidents 18 years later to invade another country in the Middle East. I certainly didn't. The Constitution is clear. Article I, section 8 says the power to declare war is an explicit power of Congress, as it should be. One should never send our sons and daughters into war without having the knowledge and consent of the American people. Our Founding Fathers were wise in making sure this awesome power did not rest with a King or a Queen or anyone pretending to be but with the people of the United States and their elected Representatives.

I have made this same argument and much of the same speech in the past regardless of whether the occupant of the White House was a Democrat or a Republican. This Congress, already afraid to stand up to many of President Trump's worst instincts, must not do so in a march to another war in the Middle East. As such, I urge my colleagues here to do our job and reaffirm the Senate's constitutional role in matters of war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senator from Texas.

#### IMPEACHMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on January 20, 2017, at 12:19 p.m., the Washington Post ran a story with this headline: "The campaign to impeach President Trump has begun." Donald Trump had been President for only 19 minutes when that headline ran.

As we have since learned, it has been made abundantly clear that many of our Democratic colleagues simply don't recognize the President as having been legitimately elected, and they have been doing everything they can to remove him from office since he was first elected in 2016.

This has now taken a new form, that of impeachment—an impeachment that occurred 27 days ago when the House voted for two Articles of Impeachment. Their impeachment inquiry lasted 12 weeks, but it became clear that Speaker PELOSI and Chairman SCHIFF and Chairman NADLER were in a big hurry to get those Articles of Impeachment voted out of the House before the holidays. In the end, only the Democrats voted for these partisan Articles of Impeachment. Then the Speaker and the Democrats in the House declared victory.

That is when the breakneck pace of the impeachment process came to a

screeching halt. It appears Speaker PELOSI got cold feet when she realized the President would be afforded a fair trial in the Senate. That was not good enough for her. When we offered President Trump the same terms that President Clinton received during his trial, that wasn't good enough for Speaker PELOSI, for she wanted guarantees from the Senate. The Speaker of the House flatly refused to send the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate in order for her to somehow gain leverage over Senate trial procedures—a responsibility that falls far outside her job description. She was seeking assurances from the majority leader that he would redo the House's shoddy investigative work—something that is not part of our job description under the Constitution.

After weeks of holding the articles hostage with nothing to show for it, the Speaker has, apparently, finally caved. In holding the articles, she managed to accomplish something all too uncommon these days: she brought together Republicans and Democrats from both Chambers. Unfortunately, for the Speaker, this bipartisan, bicameral chorus of voices stood in firm opposition to her decision to withhold the articles.

Last week, she finally announced that she would be sending over the articles this week, and it now looks like a vote is scheduled for Wednesday, tomorrow, where impeachment managers will be identified, and the process of sending it to the Senate will begin in earnest. In a letter to her House colleagues on Friday, Speaker PELOSI indicated she would be sending the articles this week, and it looks like we are rapidly closing on the start of that trial.

As the majority leader has made clear from the beginning, this should be a far cry from the partisan impeachment process we saw in the House. We simply don't want to repeat the circuslike, partisan rush to impeachment that we saw in the House. Our responsibilities as Senators is to sit as a court—literally, as a jury—to consider the case that is being presented by the impeachment managers in the House as well as the President's lawyers.

Despite the Speaker's insistence, we, the Senate—the jury—are not going to be handpicking the witnesses before the trial begins. In no courtroom in America does the jury decide how the case before them will be tried. That is decided by the parties to the lawsuit, whether it is the prosecution in the case of a criminal case and the defense lawyer or the plaintiff and defense counsel in a civil case. The jury's job is to sit and listen and to weigh the evidence and to reach a verdict.

The Senate will—instead of the process Speaker PELOSI is advocating for—follow the only modern precedent we have, and that is the Clinton impeachment trial. If it was good enough for President Clinton, it is good enough for President Trump. We are going to fol-

low that precedent and provide for some order and fairness in the process and, again, not repeat the circus we saw in the House.

Just as we did in 1999, in the Clinton impeachment, we will begin with opening arguments. The impeachment managers, Speaker PELOSI's lawyers, will come over and present their case and argue their case. Then we will turn to the President's lawyers who will have a chance to respond. They can refer to some of the testimony of the 17 witnesses who testified during the House impeachment inquiry. They could offer additional evidence for the Senate to consider.

This is not a question of witnesses or no witnesses. That is a blatant misrepresentation by those who are trying to somehow work the public's understanding of exactly how this will proceed. As in the Clinton impeachment trial, all 100 Senators will have an opportunity to hear the case from both sides before making a decision whether we, the jury, want to have additional witnesses presented. That is what happened in the Clinton case, and that is what should happen with President Trump.

We will have an opportunity to ask written questions, which will be transmitted to the Chief Justice, who will then put those questions to the lawyers representing the impeachment managers and the President. Then we will be able to get information from them based on those questions.

The more I thought about it—ordinarily, in a trial you would have disputed facts, and then you would have the law applied to the facts as found by the jury, but the more and more I have heard about this impeachment inquiry, the more and more I am inclined to believe that the facts are not disputed. If the facts are not really disputed, why would you need additional witnesses?

There are people with opinions, there are people who draw inferences, and there are people who draw their own conclusions, but in the end, that is our job, not the witnesses' job. The witnesses' job is to provide the facts, should they be disputed, and it is our job then to decide whether this meets the constitutional standard of treason, bribery, or high crimes and misdemeanors.

What I find so amazing about these impeachment articles is neither one of them claim that President Trump committed a crime. Unlike the Clinton impeachment, where he was charged with perjury—with lying under oath—President Trump is not charged with any crime.

In the first Article of Impeachment, basically, what we have is a disagreement in the way in which the President handled aid voted by Congress that would then be given to the Government of the Ukraine. That is what this impeachment is about. This is not about high crimes and misdemeanors.

This is about political differences. This is about stylistic differences. This



is where diplomats and others disagree with the way the President handled himself. Well, fair enough, you are entitled to your opinion, but that doesn't make impeachment the appropriate remedy.

Here we are 11 months more or less until the next general election. I, for one, think it is dangerous to have 535 Members of Congress essentially be asked to convict and remove a President 11 months before the next general election; in other words, to substitute our views with those of the voters, the American people. I think that is very dangerous. If it succeeds here, I guarantee this will not be the last time.

Unfortunately, the House has normalized this concept of impeachment essentially for political differences. That is a dangerous concept, and it would be a dangerous precedent if we were to accept it.

This is the third time in American history—the history of our entire country—where this process will go forward in the Senate. We need to be very careful, very sober, very serious, and very deliberate in how we conduct ourselves and how we conduct this trial.

Unfortunately, Speaker PELOSI has violated her own admonition when, in March of 2019, she said that impeachment is too divisive, and it is just not worth it unless it is bipartisan, unless it is compelling. Well, this impeachment is neither bipartisan nor compelling. Speaker PELOSI apparently got stampeded by the more radical members of her caucus into this position, which now she is trying to find some face-saving way out. That is what this is about.

In the end, we know the politics, unfortunately, will continue in the Senate. We know that under the present circumstances, it is highly unlikely that 67 Senators, based on the record we know now, would vote to convict and remove the President. So what is all this posturing and grandstanding about with regard to witnesses or no witnesses—which I said earlier is a false choice. There will be witnesses, and there will be evidence. We are going to let the parties present it, and we are going to listen and make a decision.

This is about the Democratic leader trying to put incumbent Senators who are on the ballot in 2020 in a tough position. That is what this is all about.

In the end, this is not about President Trump. This is about who is going to maintain the majority in the Senate—whether Republicans will or whether the Democratic leader will accomplish his life's dream and become the next majority leader. That is what this is about.

Well, unfortunately, the Speaker's senseless delay tactics have robbed us all of the valuable time that we could have spent conducting this trial and moving on to more constructive business. We are waiting for the Speaker to deliver the articles, but in the meantime we are not sitting around twiddling our thumbs.

#### UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. President, last week, the Senate Finance Committee overwhelmingly passed the U.S.-Mexico-Canada trade agreement, which will replace NAFTA and guide our trade with Mexico and Canada into the future. This is a big deal for Texas and a big deal for the country. About 13 million jobs depend on trade between Mexico, Canada, and the United States.

We waited a long time for the opportunity to take up the USMCA. The heads of all three countries initially signed the deal back in November of 2019, and for over a year this is another example of the House foot-dragging.

At several points, we were left wondering whether the Speaker would intentionally blow up the trade deal over their own political motivations, but fortunately that didn't happen. We had a long delay, but we are finally to the point where the Senate can take up and pass the USMCA now that the House acted just before Christmas. This week, several Senate committees will review various portions of the agreement, and I hope we can actually get this trade agreement approved before we go to the impeachment trial. We will have the War Powers Resolution, which is privileged, and so that will come first, but hopefully there will be an opportunity to pass the USMCA before we go to this impeachment trial.

I have heard from countless of my constituents whose livelihoods depend on strong international trade, particularly with our southern neighbor, and they are eager to see this USMCA put to bed. It is frustrating that this process has already been prolonged and uncertainty has prevailed and kept farmers, ranchers, and manufacturers waiting for months on end, not knowing what ultimately would happen with the USMCA.

So I am ready for the Speaker to deliver her promise and finally transmit the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate so we can conduct that sober, deliberate trial according to the Constitution and then move on from these partisan games and get back to the work we were sent here to do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to finish my remarks before the vote is called. I don't anticipate I will take very long.

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

#### NOMINATION OF PETER GAYNOR

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Peter T. Gaynor to be the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA.

I have known and worked with Pete Gaynor for over a decade. Before taking over as FEMA Deputy Administrator in 2018 and becoming the Acting Administrator in 2019, Pete was the

emergency management director for the city of Providence and then the State of Rhode Island.

As a U.S. marine, he was on duty near the Pentagon on September 11, 2001, and helped direct important aspects of the response and recovery efforts in the days and weeks that followed. Later, he went on to serve in U.S. operations in Iraq before returning home to Rhode Island.

As EMA, emergency management agency director in Rhode Island, Pete led the response to federally declared disasters in our State and worked to successfully earn national emergency management accreditation for both the Providence and Rhode Island emergency management agencies. I know he will tap this full experience to serve the American people as FEMA Administrator, and FEMA needs solid leadership.

Indeed, as the flagship Federal Agency for disaster preparedness and response, FEMA faces extraordinary challenges, confronting the very real effects of climate-related disasters, reforming the National Flood Insurance Program, administering critical grant programs, and helping ready the Nation for possible chemical, biological, and radiological attacks.

Make no mistake, I have deep concerns about many aspects of the administration's approach to disaster recovery. Puerto Rico is a case in point. Now it is facing new challenges. As ranking member of the Transportation-HUD Appropriations Subcommittee, I have been dismayed by the Department of Housing and Urban Development's slow-walking of billions of dollars of disaster recovery assistance for Puerto Rico.

As the lead Agency for disaster response and recovery, FEMA must set the standard for professionalism and compassion for people and communities going through the worst experience of their lives. It is my expectation and my confidence that Peter Gaynor will work to make sure it happens.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to confirm him.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending nomination of Peter Gaynor to be the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

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

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER),

the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 12 Ex.]

#### YEAS—81

Alexander	Feinstein	Peters
Baldwin	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Reed
Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rounds
Braun	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Capito	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Carpenter	King	Shaheen
Casey	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Sinema
Coons	Lee	Smith
Cornyn	Loeffler	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tester
Cotton	McConnell	Thune
Crapo	McSally	Tillis
Cruz	Merkley	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	Wyden
Ernst	Perdue	Young

#### NAYS—8

Brown	Menendez	Udall
Gillibrand	Schumer	Van Hollen
Harris	Stabenow	

#### NOT VOTING—11

Booker	Johnson	Murphy
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sanders
Cramer	Klobuchar	Warren
Inhofe	Markey	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority whip.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### RECESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:04 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

#### MORNING BUSINESS—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

#### WAR POWERS RESOLUTION

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, in the next few days, Senate Democrats will move to discharge a War Powers Resolution to tie the President's hands in defending this Nation against Iran and terrorist masterminds like Qasem Soleimani. Let's think about how we got here and the implications of this reckless action.

Qasem Soleimani has the blood of thousands of Americans on his hands and hundreds of thousands of innocent souls across the Middle East. For more than 20 years, he was the Supreme Leader's most trusted lieutenant, Iran's terror mastermind, and the man responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan by supplying the most deadly kinds of roadside bombs soldiers ever faced. He and his proxies and Iranian leaders like him are responsible for bombings of our Embassies in places like Lebanon and Kuwait. They are, in no small part, responsible for the ongoing horror of the Syrian civil war, for the civil war in Yemen. There is no doubt, based on the intelligence we have and this bloodthirsty past, that Qasem Soleimani was in Baghdad on January 2 to plot something very dangerous and very big that was going to target Americans once again.

We should all be thankful that Qasem Soleimani no longer walks the Earth, and we should be proud of the troops who executed that mission. The world is a safer place and America is a safer nation because of it. The people of Iran have been given a voice against the man who was responsible for mowing them down in protests over the years and whose death they have been out on the streets celebrating even though they risk being mowed down by their own security forces once again.

Yet, over the last 2 weeks, the Democrats have been able to do nothing but express their regret for the President's decision to eliminate Qasem Soleimani. And make no mistake—this War Powers Resolution is not about the future; it is about delivering an implicit or, if you listen to their words and don't just read the resolution, an explicit rebuke to the President for ordering the killing of Qasem Soleimani. They certainly want to prevent the President from doing anything like that in the future. That is why they have introduced this War Powers Resolution.

We should always remind ourselves when we are having a war powers debate, as we do from time to time, the War Powers Resolution is unconstitutional. It was passed by a liberal Congress in 1973 at the height of Watergate, and not a single President since then has acknowledged its constitutionality—not a single one, to include all the Democrats.

I hear a lot about the Constitution these days and reclaiming our authority to declare war and to constrain the Executive. I guess all those constitutional experts missed the Federalist Papers and their authoritative explanation of the Constitution and why we have the government we do. We have a House of Representatives with 435 people to be the institution that is most closely tied to popular opinion. We have a Senate to act as the cool and deliberate sense of community. And we have a single President—a single President—to act on behalf of the entire Nation in moments of peril.

Federalist 70, if they would just open up that authoritative explanation of the Constitution, says why there is one President, not a council of two or three or four, as some of the States had at the time of the founding. Because of the division of opinion and perspective and temperament that an executive council would have, there is one President—one President—who can act, as Federalist 70 said, with energy and dispatch and, yes, in some occasions, with secrecy. So if the Founders didn't think we should have an executive council of 3 or 4 or 5 people, imagine what they would have thought about 535 commanders in chief making operational decisions about when to take action on the battlefield.

These debates about War Powers Resolutions are really about how many lawyers and armchair rangers can dance on the head of a pin. Do you think wars and battles are won with paper resolutions? Those wars and battles are won with iron resolution. Do you think the ayatollahs are intimidated by "whereas" clauses and joint resolutions? The ayatollahs are intimidated, deterred, and scared when we incinerate their terror mastermind and we tell them that we will do it again if they harm another American.

Even if you grant the War Powers Resolution constitutional, look at the actual text of this resolution. It makes no exception for Iran developing a nuclear weapon. The ayatollahs could hold a press conference tomorrow or the Supreme Leader could tweet that they are going to rush to a nuclear breakout. The President would have to come to Congress if he would want to take any kind of action to deter it. It makes no exception for designated terrorist organizations and individuals, like the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and its Quds Force, who have killed so many Americans and continue to target them today. It makes no exception for attacks on our allies in the Middle East, nations like Israel.

The sponsor of this resolution will say: Oh, it makes an exception for imminent attacks.

We have seen what that gets us over the last couple of weeks—again, lawyers and armchair rangers arguing about the meaning of “imminence.” Well, I have to say that whether an attack is imminent looks pretty different if you are a soldier on patrol in Iraq than if you are a comfortable Senator sitting behind secure walls and armed guards.

None of this means Congress has no role in matters of life and death on the battlefield. It is very far from it, in fact, and I will take a back seat to no one in asserting that constitutional authority. I would remind my colleagues that when we had an opportunity to insist that Barack Obama’s nuclear deal with Iran be submitted to this Chamber as a treaty, there was one Senator who voted to insist on that—only one. This guy. Ninety-eight other Senators were perfectly willing to create some made-up, phony-baloney procedure that allowed Barack Obama to submit a nuclear arms agreement with a sworn and mortal enemy that chants “Death to America” and put it into effect with a large majority opposed to him, as opposed to the two-thirds majority that our Constitution requires for treaties.

We do have a tremendous degree of constitutional authority in the Congress. We regulate interstate commerce, which means sanctions. We confirm Ambassadors. We confirm the President’s Cabinet. We declare war, which we have done only a few times in our past despite hundreds of instances of introducing troops. But most importantly, and the way to constrain the Executive if this Congress thinks he should be constrained in a particular case, we have the spending power—in particular, the spending power for our Armed Forces. That is the way the Congress—any Congress with any President—can control the use of the Armed Forces by the President. It is something this Congress has done a lot in the past. We did it in Vietnam, did it in Nicaragua, and did it in Somalia.

There were plenty of times where the President has acted in some ways in a much more aggressive and far-reaching fashion than President Trump did just a couple weeks ago—the first Taiwan Strait crisis, Granada in 1983, Libya in 1986, and Iran in 1988. I would even say Libya again in 2011, although most of my Democratic colleagues like to send that down the memory hole since it was a Democratic President.

So I would simply say that if you disagree with the President’s decision to kill the world’s most sadistic, blood-thirsty, terrorist mastermind and you want to stop him from doing so again, file your bill to prohibit the use of any taxpayer funds for such operations. It is very simple. It is one page. I will help you write it, if you need help—one page: No funds will be used to support operations by the Armed Forces against the Government of Iran or any

of its officials. Do it. Have the courage of your convictions.

Why are we not seeing that bill? Because it failed just last year. All of these same politicians offered language on our annual Defense bill to try to prohibit the use of any funds in operations like we just saw, and it failed. We passed a defense bill, as we always do, by overwhelming majorities, which means they don’t have the votes because they know their position is not popular with the American people. Not surprisingly, the American people don’t want their elected leaders to act as lawyers for the ayatollahs.

So if you are not going to act in what is our true constitutional power, spare us the unconstitutional and dangerous War Powers Resolutions and simply let the people who are serious about our national security—from troops on up to the top—do what is necessary to keep this country safe.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to mark another major milestone for the landmark U.S.-Mexico-Canada Trade Agreement. This morning, Madam President, with you in the committee in voting, the Environment and Public Works Committee overwhelmingly passed the USMCA. With the approval of our committee, the USMCA is now one step closer to final passage in the Senate.

We all know that it isn’t perfect, but, still, it is an important deal that benefits all Americans. Passing this deal provides much needed certainty for America’s manufacturers. Our ranchers and our farmers—certainly, in Wyoming but across the breadbasket of the country and the Rocky Mountain West—are counting on it as well.

Americans have waited patiently now for over a year. Speaker PELOSI was the roadblock and held this hostage for an extended period of time. She finally allowed the House to vote on it. Now the Senate is working to move this critical piece of legislation forward and to the President.

Passing USMCA will start the next chapter in the American economic success story. The deal is going to increase our gross domestic product by \$70 billion. Above all, it is a win for American workers. It is going to create 180,000 U.S. jobs, and you know that is just the start. Already, our strong, healthy, and growing economy has been setting records across the board.

It is thanks to Republican pro-growth policies. That is what we look to and point to when we take a look at the record job growth we have had since President Trump has taken office.

In just 3 years, we have created over 7 million new jobs in America. The unemployment rate is at a 50-year low. It is astonishing. Wage growth is the fastest it has been in a decade, especially benefiting lower income workers. Everyone is better off with this growing economy. There is still some untapped potential, and we need to unlock it now.

My home State of Wyoming is poised to reap huge benefits not only from USMCA; our State has much to gain from new trade agreements with China and with Japan as well. The China trade agreement is scheduled to be signed tomorrow and Japan on January 1. Together, these America-first trade deals mean expanded access to export markets. Wyoming farmers and ranchers are very eager to seize these opportunities for future growth.

I would just say, as I conclude, that here is the bottom line. Passing USMCA means more jobs, and it means economic growth. It means more certainty and more stability for our job creators. It means more opportunity and more prosperity for America’s working families. That is the real measure of this. It is time now for the Senate to pass the USMCA.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

#### FREEDOM PROTESTS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, we are in the wake of another global event or happening, if you will. No matter what it is, we always have people who come in on the back side and, as I say, are a bunch of armchair quarterbacks and Monday morning quarterbacks, and they are trying to put their spin on what should have been done and what wasn’t done. I think that is probably a pretty good analogy when we think about the football game that took place last night.

What ought to be a serious discussion about national security or human rights inevitably devolves into a political argument about who should be allowed to score the most points off the blood and bravery of people who are fighting half a world away. Here is a suggestion for each of us: In times of conflict or unrest, instead of looking to the pundits and listening to a lot of pundits, why don’t we look to the people themselves who are involved in these conflicts?

After the U.S. strike that took out Qasem Soleimani, armchair quarterbacks calling plays for the left picked up on what the propaganda arm of the Iranian regime was selling. Bear in mind, I just said the propaganda arm. After Tehran downed its own jet though, shouldn’t the conversation have pivoted to the outraged protests

not against Americans but against the Iranian Government? After all, those protests were fueled not by the act of one man but by months of domestic turmoil and decades of brutal repression by the Iranian regime against the people of Iran. Of course, it didn't pivot. The false narrative of the mad American President prevailed, even as the people of Iran railed against the brutality of the ayatollahs and the inexplicable recklessness of their own military. They were saying one thing, and the media said something else.

In a stunning display of bravery, the people of Iran risked their lives—yes, they are risking their lives. In November, 304 got shot taking to the streets. The Revolutionary Guard brought about by Soleimani were shooting this week at people who were protesting and begging—begging for a little bit of freedom. It is amazing to me that it doesn't get acknowledged.

The decisive elimination of Soleimani exposed the regime's extreme vulnerability on the global stage, and I think the ayatollahs in Iran know this. This is why we saw them respond with threats against America at large. It is why they strong-armed the Iraqi Parliament into its foolish stand against American troops, why they arrested the United Kingdom's Ambassador for attending a peace vigil, and why they violently retaliated against civilian speech. They knew they are losing this argument. Tehran failed at silencing dissent. Their goal is to convince the rest of the world to ignore the protests of the Iranian people.

Authoritarianism is not bound to one particular region or ideology. As we saw last year, the repressive behavior of Communist China backfired on officials in Beijing. In their case, there wasn't an airstrike or an incursion. There was just a simple but disastrous piece of legislation that would have jeopardized the already-strangled human rights of every citizen in Hong Kong—not just a few but everybody, blanket coverage. Don't be caught speaking out against China and against Beijing.

The fallout from that violation is now legendary. Millions took to the streets on behalf of democracy and self-determination and turned Beijing's agenda on its head. Their protests captured the attention of the entire world and inspired others struggling to survive under Communist rule to speak up.

This past Saturday, the people of Taiwan poured some additional salt on Beijing's wounds by delivering a stunning electoral rebuke against the Communist Party. Taiwanese citizens cast a record number of ballots, pulling the pro-democracy ruling party out of a 2-year skid and validating President Tsai's embrace of anti-Beijing protesters in East Asia. Let me tell you, China knows exactly who is to blame for this, but in official statements they are writing off the results of the elec-

tion as a mere fluke, and they are blaming—get this—foreign interference for their humiliation. They couldn't possibly be responsible for this.

I have to tell you, the election may be over, but you can count on China to find other ways to coerce Taipei into submission. They will likely continue to pressure Taiwanese businessmen and workers living on the mainland to toe the party line and engage in more military drills around Taiwan, with the goal of muscling away diplomatic support. It is all part of their playbook.

Threats gilded in official policy are standard operating procedure for authoritarian regimes, but overt crack-downs on dissent still loom large over the heads of their people. Last December, China threatened to sanction the non-governmental organizations that backed pro-democracy legislation in Hong Kong. On Sunday, they suddenly refused entry to activists from Human Rights Watch without even pretending to provide a plausible explanation. Imagine that. They have moved so far in repression, they wouldn't even let Human Rights Watch in the country to see what it is that they are doing to their people.

Make no mistake, regimes like those in China or Iran are vicious and powerful, but right now, they are running on nothing but fear of their very own people, their own citizens. The fear is what drives them to repression, abuse, and murder, but time and again they forget that someone is always watching. The same technology that allows them to spy on and manipulate their adversaries allows freedom fighters to tweet, to live stream, and broadcast some of these crimes that are being committed by these oppressive regimes.

The people of Iran and China have flung themselves onto the frontline of a global fight for individual rights and individual freedom, but don't neglect those risking life and limb in places like Lebanon, where peaceful opposition to authorities is labeled as criminal defamation—imagine that, criminal defamation if you peacefully oppose the authorities—or in Morocco, where journalists have been jailed with impunity for unveiling corruption. You find corruption, you report it in the press, and they lock you up for telling the truth—or Burma or India or Algeria. There are dozens more examples.

If you want to understand what is happening, look to the people. Listen to them and pay attention to their history as they seek to write their future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be al-

lowed to engage in a colloquy with my friend and colleague, the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. ENZI.

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

#### REMEMBERING JERALYN JOY "JERRY" BROWN

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, we have here a picture of Jerry Brown—Jeralyn Joy Brown—age 89, who passed away peacefully on Wednesday, January 8, 2020, at the Hot Springs County Memorial Hospital in Thermopolis, WY. She was surrounded by her loving family.

For many years, Jerry was a dominant force in Wyoming. For the last 12 years, she was the single most influential voice with the Wyoming Senate delegation. She is my wife Bobbi's mom. Yet Senator ENZI knew her long before I did.

Senator ENZI.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Senator.

I got to meet this delightful lady in Thermopolis, WY, some 70 years ago. I need to tell you a little bit about Thermopolis, WY, and how I wound up there.

During the war, my dad was a welder on ships, and after the war, he moved around the country doing different welding projects, one of which took him to Thermopolis, WY. He welded on the dam there. Dams in the West are used to control floods. They are big projects, and they have a huge impact on communities. This particular one not only controlled floods, but it turned into a great fishery.

My folks went to Thermopolis, WY, and they also built a trailer park. It was the first modern trailer park in Thermopolis. By "modern," I mean there was a central building that had indoor showers and flush toilets.

You need to understand a little bit about Wyoming. We are small. At that time, there were two cities in Wyoming. To be a city, you had to have more than 3,000 in population. As soon as you had 3,000 in population, you could declare yourself a first-class city. In those early days, Casper—the energy capital at that time—and Cheyenne—the State capital at that time—exceeded 3,000.

What effect did that have on the communities? The Presbyterians, the Methodists, and the Congregationalists got together and divided up the towns that were small, realizing that they couldn't support all three churches. There was one town that was so small that they actually got together and formed a community church.

What is a community church? That is where these three denominations worked together. At one time, there would be a Presbyterian minister who was there, and 2 years later, there would be a Methodist minister who was there and, 2 years later, a Congregational minister who was there. That is where Jerry Brown was the Sunday school teacher, and that is how I came to meet her.

One of the big realizations, because of this community church thing and the changing of the pastors every 2 years, is that I thought every 2 years the Lord's Prayer changed. She helped me to understand that dilemma.

That is where I got to meet Mrs. Brown. She was a Sunday school teacher, and I wound up in her Sunday school class. She taught the kindergarten class. When we first started, she actually moved up a couple of times with me as the classes got combined and as I got older.

At that very first one, for Bible school, we held it outdoors underneath the pine tree—a huge pine tree. I can still remember sitting there, enthralled with her descriptions as I held my New Testament. Of course, since I was in kindergarten, I couldn't read, but she filled in for that and gave me a great background.

Later, of course, I ran into a book by Robert Fulghum titled, "All I Really Need To Know I Learned in Kindergarten." For me, it was kindergarten Sunday school. And my teacher, of course—well, she was my first Sunday school teacher and my last living Sunday school teacher.

Some of the things she taught were to share everything; play fair; don't hit people; put things back where you found them; clean up your own mess; don't take things that aren't yours; say you are sorry if you hurt someone; and be aware of wonder. And "wonder" is, if you put some seeds—and we did this—in a paper cup with dirt and you water it, the plant goes up, and the roots go down. Some people would say nobody knows why or how, but Mrs. Brown said: That is not true. God has a plan. He knows you. He watches out for you. If you see things going wrong, check your direction because it might not be where God wants you.

All of this was a good basis for my life. I have always appreciated seeing her through the years, particularly when we have visited that church again, which is still a community church, although most of the towns have split those up into more than one denomination. But I have to say that if the criteria is 3,000 people, by the time the town gets to a first-class city size, the one church is so well established that it is hard for another one to actually get established in a small community like that.

As long as there are wonderful people like Mrs. Brown teaching kindergarten, first grade, second grade, and other kids in small communities, this country will be a great place.

I thank her for all the background she gave me and ask for your prayers for her family.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARRASSO. I thank Senator ENZI.

She was born May 29, 1930, in Casper, WY—the youngest of eight children—to the Dodge family. As Senator ENZI talked about building the dam in the Thermopolis area, the family lived in

Alcova during the construction of the dams and the reservoirs in that area before moving to Thermopolis, where the family owned and ran the Wigwam Bakery. They had the best bread, doughnuts, and anything you could ever imagine.

She worked a number of places—certainly at the family bakery, but also she worked at the First National Bank. Jerry always volunteered to take the mail from the bank to the post office because she had caught the eye of a young postal employee, Bob Brown. The two were married on September 18 in 1949, and as the Senator knows, they recently celebrated their 70th wedding anniversary.

As newlyweds, Bob was sent to Korea. He had been in World War II. He was sent with a whole group from the basin area of Wyoming, as part of the National Guard, to Korea. They first went to Fort Lewis, WA, and Jerry followed. To pay her way, she had to pick filbert nuts. She was telling me at Christmas the size of the bag that they had to fill with these filbert nuts before they got any pay. Well, it was a full day's work, so the lessons she taught Mr. ENZI about hard work, she knew it personally.

She was a hard worker. She worked at the bakery. She also worked for Dr. Nels Vicklund, Vicklund Pharmacy, in Hot Springs County. She worked for the Hot Springs County treasurer's office. Her really great joy was when she owned and operated her own store in downtown Thermopolis called Country Charm.

As the Senator knows, she was dedicated to her children, Bobbi and Mike, and adored her granddaughter, Hadley. She taught them to work hard, to be kind, and to always do their best.

She was a talented crafter, she enjoyed playing bridge, and she was a collector. She collected Santa Clauses, she collected chickens and pictures of chickens, and she collected rocks from around the world. No matter where I went, I needed to bring back a rock for Jerry. She also, as the gentleman knows, collected friends and memories. She had an encyclopedic memory of Wyoming names, Wyoming places, and Wyoming relationships—who was married to whom and whose cousin was who. She rarely left anywhere without a hug and really loved being everyone's favorite Aunt Jerry. She was also an avid reader—and an NBA fan, of all things. She loved God, loved America, and loved our flag. She was a longtime member of the Community Federated Church, the Order of the Eastern Star, and, as we were talking about in the cloakroom, she was State president of PEO.

Jerry Brown dedicated her life to her family, to her faith, and to her friends. She was committed to her church and her community. She had a well-deserved reputation for being a joiner, a goer, and a doer.

We will celebrate her life on Saturday, January 18, in Thermopolis at the

Community Federated Church, and we miss her dearly. May she rest in peace.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## IRAN

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, as we go back through the calendar just a few months and get some context of what has been building for a while, in May of 2019, four different vessels that were traveling just outside of the Gulf of Oman were hit by mines laid by Iranian leadership. In June, just a month later, two different vessels hit Iranian mines. Those mines weren't just placed in the water flipantly; they were actually placed on the ship. In June of 2019, a U.S. Navy surveillance drone was flying through the Strait of Hormuz in international airspace and was downed by an Iranian missile attack.

As we continue to move forward, we tracked an increase in Iranian activity in cyber attacks across the United States, but at the same time, individuals within our military bases in Iraq were facing more and more of a push against them in not just an external conversation, an actual kinetic attack.

Our supply lines in the fall of last year, as trucks that were leaving from Baghdad and driving down to Kuwait for our supply lines there, were increasingly facing improvised explosive devices, something we had not seen in a long time. Those explosive devices were created and placed by Shia militias with materials provided by Iran.

Then, in October, there were multiple attacks on our facility in Baghdad. In November, there were multiple attacks again on our facility in Baghdad. In December, there were multiple attacks again, each time increasing with more and more attacks.

We hear that term "attack," and it seems almost flippant, but we realize, for the thousands of Americans who work in that area of that diplomatic mission that is there in Iraq, there is a day that happens—it could be the middle of the night, it could be the middle of the afternoon, but a moment happens, month after month, week after week, and sometimes within that, day after day—where the sirens go off, and everyone on campus runs into a bomb shelter, and then the explosions begin around the grounds.

These were not just random attacks. These were designed kinetic rocket attacks coming into our Embassy that built up toward an attack on the U.S. Embassy on December 31, where thousands of people broke through the outer section, setting fires to the building, attacking the facility, smashing

against the glass, trying to get into the next layer that they were not able to penetrate—into the inner layer in the Embassy. But thousands and thousands of rioters were moving toward the base.

As calm was restored on the outside and a security perimeter was established on the outside, they could read what was written on the walls, spray-painted now on the Embassy: "Soleimani is our leader."

I was interested in talking to a friend of mine just a couple of weekends ago, and he made an interesting comment to me. He said: I didn't know who Qasem Soleimani was. I had never heard that name before, and then I went back and started doing some research to find out who this guy is and what he is all about.

His comment to me was: I went back and did some research and found out he is a bad guy.

I said: Yes, you don't know the half of it.

Soleimani is the leader of the Quds Force for the Iranians, was responsible for training the Shia militias in Iraq on how to kill Americans. Over 600 Americans died because of the training and equipping that Soleimani did for the Iraqis who were fighting against us at that time, specifically the Shia militias that Soleimani actually directed.

My neighbor was surprised to learn that Soleimani was the one who actually organized all things with Hezbollah in Lebanon. He had organized Hezbollah also in Iraq. He is the one who was coordinating all that was happening in Yemen, in the civil war that is currently ongoing in Yemen.

He was surprised to see that he was in Syria working with Bashar Assad and to see all that he was doing for that ruthless leader that murdered thousands of his own people. That was Soleimani.

For those of us who are tracking the direct threats against the United States, we are very aware of who he was and what he was all about because he was the point person to try to take the fight to the United States. In the past 6 months, that fight had gone from an "I am going to try to find individuals within Hezbollah or Shia militias somewhere to attack the United States" to being more strategic to bringing the attack directly from his forces under his command to try to take the attack to us. He had become more and more overt and more and more obsessed with attacking the United States.

Over the course of that time period, the Trump administration, over and over again, sent a message to the Iranian leadership: You are playing a very dangerous game, continually attacking American facilities, launching rockets randomly in there, starting fires, stirring up militias to attack us at every turn, attacking our supply lines. If an American is killed, President Trump made it very clear, the United States will respond.

In December, Soleimani pushed it to a whole new level, with a multiple

rocket attack into an American facility, killing an American and wounding four others. The President responded with a very reasoned response: taking an attack to where the Shia militias and Hezbollah were storing the munitions they were using to attack us, destroying that facility, destroying those munitions, taking the fight to four different training facilities where they were equipping the people to bring the attack to us but then also tracking very carefully the person who was actually planning the next set of attacks—Soleimani himself.

The time came in January, when Soleimani had been traveling through Syria, through Lebanon, working with Hezbollah, and then back into Iraq, and he was personally meeting with another terrorist leader in Iraq—one terrorist leader, Soleimani, leading a terrorist organization, meeting with another terrorist leading a terrorist organization there. Both of them were planning together and met up that morning at the airport. A little after 4 o'clock in the morning, they left from the airport, headed to go have their next meeting and planning their next set of attacks.

At that time, the Trump administration took the opportunity, while they were both far from civilians and no one else was on the road, to have a surgical strike and take out two different terrorist leaders, both in the process of planning their next attacks.

What has been interesting to me has been the response of the U.S. Senate and the U.S. House and some of the debate there. We should debate issues like this. These are difficult moments in difficult days. We are not at war with Iran, nor should we be at war with Iran. There are millions of peaceful people in Iran. Thousands and thousands of those people are protesting on the streets right now in Iran against their own government. They are furious at the corruption in their government. They are furious that the people in Iran can't get food and can't get fuel because the regime there is spending their money attacking Yemen, attacking Syria, feeding money to Hezbollah and Iraq, feeding money to Hezbollah and Lebanon. The money that should be going to help their own people, the Iranian regime is sending out all over the region to spur their terrorism.

The people there are frustrated and upset with their own government, and they are taking it to the streets under a threat of their own life. In the not-too-recent past, Iranians—whether it be the Green Revolution 10 years ago or just in days past and months past—had taken to the streets by the thousands, and some of them have faced all kinds of retribution coming back at them.

We should be supporting the good people of Iran who are miserable living under that regime. We are not at war with the people of Iran, but we are very clear as a nation, when you are planning an attack against us, and we are

aware of that attack and you have shown the due diligence to take prior attacks, we know you are not just thinking about it. You are actually planning it and about to carry it out.

We have learned our lesson from 9/11, and for the last three administrations, the policy has been very clear. If we know you are in the process of bringing an attack to us in the days and weeks ahead, we will strike first to protect American lives. We will not wait until you kill Americans to come bring a strike to you. That is what happened with Soleimani.

The debate that is happening on the floor now about a War Powers Resolution has been interesting to me because much of the language just affirms the current law. It almost seems to imply the Trump administration didn't follow the law when they did. The Trump administration continued to track an imminent threat that was coming into the United States. There has been some argument about how imminent is imminent. Some of my colleagues want to know that Soleimani was in the process of carrying out an attack within the next 30 minutes, and if he wasn't carrying out an attack immediately, in the next day or next hours, we shouldn't respond. I will tell you, intelligence is not that exquisite. You only know in the movies that someone is about to attack an exact spot at an exact time. That is not real life. With real-life intelligence, you gather information to track what you think is coming, but you don't get exact dates and exact locations like that.

We knew he was planning this attack. They were zeroing in on the locations, but he was very specific as to the Americans he was coming after.

To be able to bring the attack to him and to notify Congress within 48 hours, which is the law, is consistent with the War Powers Resolution. The President did follow the law. He was justified in being able to carry out the strike against a known, declared terrorist leader—in fact, two of them—in the process of planning their next attack against Americans.

The key thing I join my colleagues in talking about is not trying to be able to press back on the administration but to say that none of us want a war in Iran, including the Trump administration. In every conversation I have had with anyone in the administration, they have all been very clear. They are not planning a war with Iran. They don't want a war with Iran, but they do want Iran to stop their belligerent terrorist activities against us, against our allies, and against any American they seem to find in the region. I join my colleagues in warning Iran and assuring Iran at the same time that we have no desire for a war with the regime or with the good people of Iran. We should be able to find a way to work together.

Since 1979, when this regime was coming into power, they have taken the fight to Americans and to all of our allies. It is time we pushed back and



said: Stop shedding blood, and let's sit down at the table and be able to work this out.

In the meantime, let's not assume that Soleimani was some innocent bystander. He had a lot of American blood on his hands. Let's take into real life what it really means to live in Baghdad and serve in our diplomatic mission and hour after hour run to bomb shelters as rockets are raining down randomly on your facility. There is plenty of provocation. Now it is time for diplomacy. Let's get this worked out.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROMNEY). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, first, I want to say to my colleague from Oklahoma that I appreciate his remarks. I was on the floor last week talking about this issue. He is absolutely right. Soleimani was a recognized terrorist, not by the Trump administration but by the global community, including the Obama administration, the United Nations. The two organizations that he had were both considered terrorist organizations. He was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of our constituents and thousands more who were maimed or injured.

When I have been at these briefings, I am sort of getting a different briefing than, apparently, some of my colleagues are. The briefings have been very explicit about the degree with which this particular individual had already attacked and killed so many Americans and, in fact, there were more plans, of course, in the future. That is why he was traveling around the Middle East, meeting with other commanders, including the commander of the Islamic militia group in Iraq that very day.

I think this is a time for us, as the Senator from Oklahoma has said, to be sober and to be realistic about the great threat that he posed to us, and not just in this administration but in previous administrations, and now talk about a way forward, avoiding war with Iran but making sure Iran is held accountable.

To the people of Iran, I say today that we are with you. We understand the fact that your country is one where your own rights have been repressed and you have not had the ability to achieve your dreams. We want that for you, as well. Our arguments are not with you. They are with the Government of Iran.

#### REMEMBERING CHRIS ALLEN

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about something very sad. Last week, my staff and I were informed that a colleague of ours, Chris Allen, a Senate staffer in the Senate Finance Committee, passed away unexpectedly.

Chris was an amazing guy. He was diligent, hard-working, and an expert on pensions and tax-exempt organizations. He was a very valued colleague.

I got to know him particularly well over the last couple of years as we worked together on pension issues. He was the one who, along with Charlie Bolton in my office, really focused on the complicated issue of multiemployer pensions and other retirement security issues.

We have a crisis in our country right now. The pension system is in big trouble. Chris Allen played a pivotal role in ensuring that this very important issue was brought to the fore and that we have responsible solutions for it. He was developing a framework to prevent the collapse of that longtime employer system. He also recently prevented pension cuts to over 92,000 retired coal miners through his work. He is the one, I think, most responsible from all of the staff on the Hill for ensuring that we expanded 401(k)s to millions of part-time workers left behind by current law.

Last month, Congress enacted and the President signed the SECURE Act. It is going to help millions of Americans to have more peace of mind in retirement. I don't believe it would have passed the Senate at the end of last year but for Chris. That is how important he was. Through his quick wit and tenacity, he is the one who built the coalitions to get that done, and he built the momentum for it when, frankly, a lot of others had given up. As a result, all Americans are better off.

In this difficult time, my thoughts and my prayers are with his wife Lynda-Marie, his daughters Sophie and Lucie, and all of his family and his many, many friends, as we mourn the loss of a true public servant. I also want to express condolences to Chairman GRASSLEY and the entire staff of the Senate Finance Committee.

Chris will be dearly missed as a friend, a retirement expert, and a model public servant.

#### SENATE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here today to talk about the path forward on legislation and commonsense solutions that my constituents and all of our constituents would like to see this year. The Senators in this Chamber came back to town this week, along with Members of the House, at one of the most partisan times in our Nation's history.

We just learned that the House is now going to send us Articles of Impeachment. This will be the third Presidential impeachment trial in our entire history and only the second one in the last 151 years.

It will be the most partisan one ever. I agree with the NANCY PELOSI of a year ago, who said: "Impeachment is so divisive to the country that unless there is something so compelling and overwhelming and bipartisan, I don't think we should go down that path because it divides the country." I think she was right about that. Yet, unfortu-

nately, without meeting those criteria, here we are going down that path.

While we face a lot of contentious issues ahead of us, I still believe we can legislate for the benefit of the people we represent, and we must. That is our job. We can't let partisanship cause us to lose sight of all the opportunities we have here every day to come together, to find common ground, and to pass commonsense solutions to address the issues our constituents care most about.

In fact, I would say that under the radar and without fanfare, we have recently done that. At end of last year, we enacted a number of bills and provisions on a bipartisan basis that helped people. I talked about the SECURE Act a moment ago. Despite the headlines about gridlock and dysfunction and impeachment, we have been working on both sides of the aisle to find solutions to some of these real problems—like growing our economy, protecting national security, promoting conservation, or helping the most vulnerable.

#### OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, one area where this Senate and the Congress, in general, along with the administration, have made significant progress is combating the ongoing drug addiction crisis in America that has affected so many families represented by all of us in this Chamber.

In my home State of Ohio, we have been on the frontline of this crisis for years. Opioids, in particular, have taken a heavy toll in our communities. In fact, in 2017, our opioid overdose rate in Ohio was almost three times the national average, with nearly a dozen Ohioans dying from these dangerous drugs every single day, making it the No. 1 cause of death in Ohio, surpassing car accidents.

Since 2017, we have begun to make progress, finally, to be able to turn the tide on opioids. In 2018, after a decade of increased overdose deaths every year for the previous dozen years, we finally had a reduction, a 22-percent reduction in overdose deaths. By the way, that led the Nation in terms of the percent decrease. It is still way too high—unacceptably high—but we are starting to make progress.

A lot of it goes back to what is being done here at the Federal level, but also the State level and local level, to address this problem. We have dramatically increased funding here for treatment for recovery, including providing Narcan as a way to save people's lives. It is a miracle drug that reverses the effects of an overdose. We have done some things that are very important. More recently, we have sent these resources through legislation that the President signed into law just last year. There are resources also provided by the State opioid response grants and also by our bipartisan Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, or CARA, helping our first responders to be able



to use innovative and new approaches to ensure that individuals whose overdoses are reversed go into treatment rather than just overdosing again and again.

The good news is that at the end of the year, the spending bill that Congress passed secured a record \$658 million in funding for these Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act grants, or CARA grants. I was the author of that legislation, initially, along with SHELDON WHITEHOUSE on the other side of the aisle. We started off with closer to \$200 million. Now, we are at \$658 million. Why? Because it is working.

I have been back home, going from place to place, seeing how it works. I have watched some of these first responders in action with social workers and treatment providers who are going into people's homes and getting people into treatment who previously were not. We can't rest on our laurels because we have to do a lot more to address all forms of addiction that are increasingly becoming a problem.

We have seen in Ohio and around the country that psychostimulants have now come back with a vengeance. This would be crystal meth from Mexico and cocaine. It is surging in communities across our State. According to our deputy attorney general in Ohio, law enforcement officials in 2018 tested double the amount of methamphetamine samples as they had in 2017 and triple the amount from 2016. In other words, crystal meth is growing. Higher and higher amounts of it are coming in and more and more people are being affected by this. I heard this at roundtable discussions around the State.

I was in Knox County last year, learning that the prosecutor's office estimates that 80 to 90 percent of all drug incidents included crystal meth. Opioids used to be their biggest problem in Knox County, as it has been in all 80 counties in Ohio until recently. Now it is pure crystal meth coming in from Mexico.

I am pleased that the spending bill at the end of last year that we passed just last month changed the way in which our funding is delivered in the fight against addiction. Specifically, included in that is my Combating Meth and Cocaine Act. This is an important bill that allows States the flexibility to use the roughly \$1.5 billion in grant funds allocated specifically to combat opioids. The 21st Century Cures grants, now called the State response grants, can all be used for the treatment and recovery services for new threats like crystal meth and cocaine.

Giving our local communities that flexibility is incredibly important. I have heard it constantly when I am back home. We have now done that. We have been able to help even further to try to reverse the effects, not just of the opioid crisis but of the drug crisis and all forms of addiction.

We have made significant strides in ensuring that we can respond to this

ever-changing addiction crisis. I am proud we are able to do it. As I said at the beginning of this speech, this is a pretty divisive time in Washington, to say the least. No one can deny that. What I hoped to show by highlighting these achievements over the past year is that even in a highly partisan environment, it is possible to bring people together to get things done and pass laws that make a fundamental improvement to the lives of the people we represent.

While lots of time finding that common ground takes more work, it is worth it. The extra effort goes a long way. Fortunately, we are coming into this new session of Congress having already laid the groundwork that we need to do to continue to fight this addiction crisis.

Critical right now to that fight is passing bipartisan legislation that will help us to push back against a particular kind of opioid, the synthetic opioid called fentanyl. Fentanyl came on the scene 5 or 6 years ago with a vengeance. Just as we were making progress on reducing the use of heroin and prescription drugs, suddenly, this fentanyl arrives. It is a synthetic opioid. It is 50 times more powerful on average than heroin. It is now the No. 1 killer. It has been the last few years. In States like mine, Ohio, when you look at the numbers over the past few years, although we are making progress on other opioids, we are not making progress on fentanyl. Why? Because it is being mixed into all kinds of other drugs, including crystal meth, including opioids, including all street drugs. The improvements we have seen are significant, but fentanyl continues to be the No. 1 killer.

Fentanyl, unfortunately, knows no ZIP Code and is devastating individuals and families all across the country. According to the most recent data available from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there were 72,000 drug-related deaths in the United States in 2017, and 40 percent of those deaths were involving fentanyl. That data showed that the overdose deaths due to fentanyl had increased at a rate of 88 percent per year, on average, since 2013.

It is a real threat to our States. In 2017 alone, we had a record 3,500 overdose deaths in Ohio that were attributable to fentanyl. Last fall, our Narcotics and Gun Enforcement Task Force seized 45 pounds of fentanyl in a single bust in Montgomery County, in Dayton, OH. There was enough of the drug to kill the entire population of Ohio.

That is why the Drug Enforcement Agency made the right call in 2018 to make fentanyl-related substances illegal to possess, transport, or manufacture. This means they have been scheduled. Thanks to that designation, our law enforcement officials have been able to better protect our communities by seizing and destroying large amounts of these fentanyl-related sub-

stances, which are the analogs to fentanyl. So that is good.

Unfortunately, due to Federal law, the DEA was only able to make these dangerous substances illegal on a temporary basis. Think about that. You have this deadly drug that is 50 times more powerful than heroin. Back in 2018, we were able to finally make not just fentanyl but all of its analogs—fentanyl-related substances—illegal. Law enforcement was using that to begin to push back, and now we find it was only temporary. Guess what. We are fast approaching the end of that designation. Next month, on February 6, which is 3 weeks from this Thursday, fentanyl-related substances will once again be legal, and it will be much harder to keep vulnerable communities safe from these deadly substances. We cannot let that happen.

I met earlier today with former Iowa Governor Terry Branstad, who is now our Ambassador to China. For years, many of us have been pushing China to do more to crack down on fentanyl because most of the fentanyl that comes to this country and kills individuals in our communities comes from China. Most of it has been coming through our mail system. We have done a lot to stop that. We have passed the STOP Act, which tightens up the post office's screening process, which has worked very well over the last year. We have also provided more money under the INTERDICTION Act in order to provide better equipment not just to our Postal Service but also to the private carriers like DHL and FedEx.

What has happened is, China has also done a better job of making fentanyl illegal and scheduling the precursors and analogs to fentanyl, and we have pushed them very hard on that. I have myself been to China and have personally done that, and I know Ambassador Branstad has pushed China hard on this. Finally, China has begun to start addressing this rampant production in its country.

Terry Branstad told me today—and I agree with him—that the credibility of the United States to continue to provide pressure to China to do the right thing will be eroded dramatically if we don't continue to schedule fentanyl. As we are asking China to do it, we cannot let this designation lapse here. Obviously, what is most important is that we not let it lapse because it is the wrong thing to do and because it will affect all of our communities and all of our families who have been affected by this dangerous drug.

We can't let it happen. That is why, last fall, Senator JOE MANCHIN and I introduced a bill called FIGHT Fentanyl, which codifies the Drug Enforcement Agency's precedent to permanently schedule fentanyl-related substances. So forget these temporary designations that have caused these issues; let's permanently schedule these fentanyl-related substances.

It has very strong bipartisan support. In fact, as of a couple of weeks ago,

every single U.S. State's and territory's attorney general has now endorsed our bill. That is all 50 States and 6 territories. That doesn't happen very often. This is a bipartisan group of law enforcement officials who has said: We support this legislation, the FIGHT Fentanyl Act, that we introduced last fall. I am confident we can get it passed if it comes to the floor for a vote. There are other approaches to it as well that are slightly different than ours. I support those as well.

The point is, we need to pass legislation to ensure that February 6 doesn't come and go without our scheduling these fentanyl analogs. It is a good example of the need to continue working across the aisle on this issue. We have done a good job with it so far. As I have said, even in these contentious times, we have to do it again, and we have to do it soon. I am told that during impeachment, it is impossible or at least very difficult to legislate on any other topic without having unanimous consent. So we need to get this done before next week, before we get the Articles of Impeachment and before the U.S. Senate begins the impeachment trial.

I urge all of our colleagues to focus today on this issue. Join us in this commonsense, lifesaving legislation. Let's work together. The Committee on the Judiciary has been working on this, and others have worked on this. We have legislation at the desk to be able to solve it. I hope we can do it by unanimous consent, but we have to do it. This is lifesaving legislation to keep fentanyl from spreading its poison even further.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, whether it is tomorrow, later today, or sometime next week, I know there will be an effort here to restrict the President's ability to engage the Armed Forces of the United States in a conflict with Iran.

I think, any time you have something like that come up, there are two most important questions that need to be answered: No. 1, Why? Why do we need this law that you are pursuing? No. 2, What would that law do? Let me try to answer the "why." I can deduce two separate arguments.

The first is the argument that somehow the actions of the United States, for example, of pursuing a maximum pressure campaign against Iran and leaving the Iran deal—according to at least the language of the version I saw, which I know is going to be amended—have included economic, diplomatic, and military pressure and that this is raising the risk of retaliation against U.S. troops and personnel, which will lead to a cycle of escalating back-and-forth violence between Iran and its proxies and the United States, and that

these warnings have been proven to be correct. I guess the first argument is that we left the Iran deal and that this is the reason we are now on the verge of what some view to be an all-out war against Iran.

The second argument is rooted in the constitutional views that some of my colleagues hold that Congress has a role to play and that no extended military engagement should be allowed without there being congressional approval. These are two separate motivations, and I think it is possible to hold that second position and also be motivated by the first. I think, for many of my colleagues, it is solely a constitutional question, which I respect. So let's analyze the "why" for a second.

First of all, I think it is just not true that the reason Iran and its proxies are trying to kill Americans is that we pulled out of the Obama deal with Iran. Iran has most certainly responded with violence to our decision, but that is not what motivated Iran. For example, before there was even an Iran deal from which to pull out, it was already equipping and supplying Shia militias in Iraq with weapons that killed and maimed Americans in the hundreds. In fact, Iran's antagonism toward us predates any discussion about an Iran deal. It predates our presence in the region and the numbers that we currently have there. I think it is also flawed because, during the Iran deal—even when the Iran deal was in place—Iran was still sponsoring all of the same proxy groups with all of the same weapons and was undertaking all of the same targeting.

One of the flaws of the Iran deal and one of the reasons the Iran deal was not a good one was that it actually didn't deal with this activity. The only thing it dealt with was enrichment. It did nothing to limit Iran's missile program, and it did nothing to limit Iran's sponsorship of terrorism. In fact, the only impact it had on its missile program and on its sponsorship of terrorism was that it provided economic activity that generated revenue to fund those things.

Despite the denial and the repeated and bold-faced lies of some who have gone on TV and have said: Oh, there was never any cash transfer, there absolutely was. There was over \$1 billion delivered to the Iranians. They say these were funds that had been frozen. They say this was their money and that this is why it was released to them as part of this deal. The Iranians don't tell you that there is close to \$50 billion in unpaid claims that have been adjudicated in U.S. courts on behalf of Americans who have suffered at the hands of Iranian terror and who have not been paid.

Suffice it to say that the Iran deal was flawed. One of the reasons it was flawed is that it did nothing to prohibit the sponsorship of terrorism, and it actually generated economic activity and the delivery of over \$1 billion in cash. I assure you this was not used to build

bridges, roads, and schools but was used to fund these nefarious activities that Iran undertook before the Iran deal, during the Iran deal, and after the Iran deal.

So the fact that Iran is responding with violence to economic sanctions, which by itself is unacceptable, tells us the nature of this regime is to respond to economic sanctions—not to military action—with violence and efforts to kill Americans. It doesn't mean this is the reason Iran was doing that. Iran was already doing that. It has just been part of its response.

This leads me to the second point. Iran has already been doing it because Iran's goal is not simply to get us back into the Iran deal; its goal is to drive us from the region. Iran does not want an American presence there, and it does not want American influence in the region. Iran does not want it in Iraq, which it has been against from the very beginning, and it doesn't want it in Syria. Yet it is not just limited to Iraq and Syria. Iran doesn't want our presence in Jordan, in Kuwait, or in Bahrain. It doesn't want any American presence in Afghanistan. It doesn't want us anywhere in the region because Iran views it as an impediment to its desire to be a dominant regional power, and Iran views it as an impediment to its ultimate design of destroying the Jewish State.

Iran decided not last week, not last year, and not at the beginning of the Trump Presidency but well over a decade and a half ago that the way it was going to get us to leave the region was by inflicting costs—i.e., with the deaths and the injuries of American service men and women—and that Iran would make it so painful for us to be there and so painful for these countries to host us that we would ultimately leave. That is the reason Iran is undertaking these attacks.

Now, why are we there? It is a good question and a valid one to answer, and I will answer it in the cases of both Syria and Iraq.

We are not there on an anti-Iran campaign the way in which some describe. There is an element of prohibiting Iran from capturing Iraq and turning it into a puppet state. By the way, many Shia politicians in Iraq share that view. They may not want us to be the protector, at least openly, but they are nationalists just like they are Shia.

The fundamental and the principal reason we are in Iraq is as part of NATO's anti-ISIS mission and as a train-and-equip mission. We are there to train and equip Iraqis to fight against ISIS. It has been an effort that has been successful. It has worked. It is interesting that for a time, when Iran shared the same fears of ISIS, you saw Iran sort of stand down a little bit. Even after we pulled out of the Iran deal, Iran pulled back a little bit because it, too, wanted ISIS defeated. Now it argues that, in its mind, ISIS has been diminished and that it is time

for the Americans to go. If you will not leave on your own, then we are going to start killing people until you decide the price of being here is too high.

Here is the bottom line. The reason there are American troops in large parts of this region is for an anti-terror campaign. Iran has decided to use proxies and these deniable attacks—by “deniable,” I mean getting some other group to use the weapons you gave them to attack Americans—so Iran can say: It was not us, even though everyone knows it is Iran. That way, you can sort of try to avoid a direct war with the United States and international condemnation, but everyone knows it is you. That is why Iran is attacking us.

Now, I ask you: What is supposed to be the U.S. response?

First of all, it is in the law. It is a constitutional requirement, and the power resides in the Presidency—the right to defend U.S. service men and women when they come under attack. No. 1, there is a constitutional power and, in my mind, an obligation to defend, to prevent, to repel, and to respond to attacks against American troops who are deployed abroad.

No. 2, it is embedded in congressional authorization for that anti-terror mission to begin with. In both Iraq and Afghanistan, we are present at the authorization given by Congress over a decade and a half ago, and imbedded in that authorization is the right to self-defense.

The third point I would make is that if you look at this argument about AUMF, you would think what we are seeing here looks something like the run-up to the Iraq war or the run-up to the Afghanistan war. This is complete fiction. The Afghanistan war was one in which the Bush White House came to the Congress back then and said: Look, the Taliban is allowing al-Qaida to act with impunity from its territory, and we are going to go take them out. It was an offensive operation—an invasion. With Iraq, we all know the justification, which turned out not to be the case, about weapons of mass destruction and the like—again, an offensive military operation.

No one in American politics whom I see—certainly no one in the Trump administration—has talked about ramping up and sending 150,000 or 200,000 troops marching into Tehran. No one is contemplating that. The only thing the Trump administration has talked about is that if you attack our troops or if we think you are getting ready to attack our troops, we are going to prevent it if we can. We are going to repel that attack if it happens, and we are going to respond proportionately in return as a deterrent. You don't need congressional authorization to do that.

Imagine the practical implications if that were the case. The President of the United States would have to come to Congress on December 30 because we are under attack and ask us to recon-

vene; everybody fly in, take a vote, debate for a week and a half, and then decide. By that time we would have 300 dead Americans. It is ridiculous. It is not a requirement. It is not even practical.

So I don't understand the purpose of this AUMF. What war are you trying to prevent? Unless you believe that we brought this upon ourselves because we pulled out of the Iran deal—even if you believe that one of the reasons we stayed in the Iran deal was to prevent these sorts of attacks, which I don't think is justified—it is not a justified argument by the very fact that even during the Iran deal they were already doing some of these things and have a long history of doing that. If you argue it and believe it, you can't argue that attacking and killing Americans—violence—is an appropriate response to economic sanctions. You most certainly cannot argue that we cannot have a military response to protect our men and women and our interests in the region. Yet that seems to be the argument embedded in the AUMF.

Some will state that all it does is restate law, and it doesn't have any practical impact in the end. If the House doesn't pass the same thing, what is this really going to mean? That is true in a legal perspective. Let me state what the headlines already say and are going to say. Here is what they are going to say: “Congress votes to limit President's military options” or “Congress votes to limit Trump's ability to respond militarily to Iran.”

I want to be clear because I have heard this from others—the fact that they were being told not to debate this issue. Debate all you want, but those headlines and how they are read in places like Iran are very different than the debate we are having here. How they would read it is that the President has political domestic constraints about how much he can respond to what they do.

We already have a fundamental problem with Iran, and that is, unlike many countries in the world, they don't view or respond to things in the same way. For example, it is pretty clear that their view of what they can get away with is much higher than the reality of what they can get away with, as evidenced by the increasing scale and increasing magnitude of the attacks that their proxies were taking against the United States and the region. So the threat of miscalculation on their part is very, very high. Let's not forget that just a week ago they launched over a dozen rockets at a U.S. military installation where, by the grace of God, no one was killed. But they could have been. You don't launch that many rockets at a U.S. military installation and not expect that some Americans are going to die. So their internal calculus about what they can get away with is already twisted.

Imagine adding to that the perception that somehow the President's hands are tied: No matter what we do,

we can kill 100 Americans because he is really not going to be able to do very much because the Congress took away his power.

You can take the chance that these guys are somehow legal scholars in schools in the American legal system. You can take the chance that they read Congressional Quarterly or whatever publication or that they have read the latest issue of whatever the congressional research office has produced for the practical implications or you can worry that they will misinterpret this vote and its impact for what it means to what they can get away with.

If you want to have a debate, have it. I don't know what you are going to have a debate about. There is no one planning an all-out war against Iran. The administration's strategy is pretty straightforward: If they attack us or are getting ready to attack us, we will respond. If they don't, we won't.

The question of whether there is going to be armed conflict between the United States and Iran is not in the hands of the White House; it is in the hands of the Ayatollah. I assure you, no matter what we vote on here, it is not going to impact their decision over there.

No one—no one I know of—wants a war with Iran. That is not the goal. The goal, hopefully, is to have an Iran that doesn't sponsor terrorism, that doesn't want nuclear weapons, and that acts like a normal country. I bet that is the goal of millions of Iranians themselves.

In the interim, until that day comes, we have an obligation to protect our interests. We have an obligation to protect our men and women whom we have sent into harm's way. For the life of me, I just don't understand what this AUMF seeks to prevent—a war that no one is calling for.

I don't want to imply that we can't have these debates in America, because we can and we should. We are a free society. But I want everybody to be clear about how these debates can be misinterpreted and how these headlines can be misinterpreted by the people who actually have these rockets and control these proxy groups.

The bottom line is that Iran's goal is not just to get us back into the nuclear deal; their goal is to drive us from the region. They want us out, and they have concluded that the way to do that is to use other groups whom they are arming and equipping with increasingly more and more capabilities, meaning bigger and deadlier ammunition and rockets and the like to kill Americans, and the more Americans who die—even if they are there on an anti-terror mission—the likelier it is that we are going to have to pull them out of there. That is what they want. They want us to leave Iraq so that they can turn it into a puppet State.

They want all NATO and allied presence out of Syria so that they can control Syria entirely. They want to fracture our relationship with Lebanon so

that Hezbollah can control that country. They want to destroy our presence in Bahrain, where the Fifth Fleet is located. You can go on and on.

In the end, I think the question becomes, Are we prepared to retreat from that region entirely? You cannot come here and criticize the President for removing troops from the Syrian-Turkish border and abandoning the Kurds and at the same time argue: But you don't have the power unless we authorize you to defend those very troops if they come under attack by some Iranian proxy group. Yet that seems to be the argument.

You cannot argue: We cannot just pick up and leave the Iraqis at the mercy of the Iranian regime. I assure you that if the President announced tomorrow "I am pulling out of Iraq" or if he said before the Soleimani strike "I am pulling out of Iraq," the floor would be filled with people saying that we have abandoned our allies; we have abandoned the Kurds in Northern Iraq; we have abandoned the Sunnis, who are scared of the Iranians.

You cannot argue that and argue at the same time that you think we need to be present and continue to work toward the functionality of that State and at the same time say: But you need congressional approval to act in defense of the people we send there who wear the uniform—or our diplomats, for that matter. Yet that seems to be the argument behind this AUMF.

The vote is going to be what it is. We are going to have this debate. I remember about a year and a half ago, when tensions were high with North Korea, they wanted an AUMF for that.

You can disagree with this White House all you want. I don't think we have had a more anti-war President in my lifetime than the one we have right now. If you think about it for a moment, almost any other predecessor may have responded with a lot less restraint to some of the provocations and attacks we have seen from Iran and its proxies. He acted in a way that I think history will fully justify and in defense of American lives in taking out Soleimani and disrupting a near-term plot that could have very easily have killed dozens, if not hundreds, of Americans in the near term.

I chuckle when I hear people saying: Well, how do we know what Soleimani was doing? Well, that was his full-time job. He wasn't a stockbroker or realtor or diplomat. His full-time job was to travel the world to set up groups and equip groups so that when he told them to go, they could go kill Americans. That was his full-time job. That is what he was doing there.

I believe when all is said and done, history will fully vindicate the decision that was made.

We will have this debate at some point. I imagine that at some point it will move to the floor. It is a privileged resolution. I just think it is short-sighted, and I hope that some of my colleagues who have signed on to it

thinking that somehow we were exerting Congress's constitutional authority—I have no problem with asserting Congress's constitutional authority when it is actually being challenged, but there is no congressional constitutional authority that can prevent a President or should prevent a President from acting in defense of our men and women in uniform when we deploy them abroad. In my view, that is what this bill, which will shortly be before us, does. That is the practical implication of it, so I hope those who chose to be for it will reconsider.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAMER. 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. CRAMER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to express my opposition to the War Powers Act resolution that is making its way through Congress. I believe it is designed to hurt our President politically, while inflicting long-term damage to our national security and military readiness.

Iranian provocation is nothing new. In the last several months, they have drastically and intentionally escalated tensions in the region. After several measured responses, President Trump made the appropriate decision to eliminate General Soleimani, a terrorist mastermind who ordered and helped carry out many attacks on American personnel and our allies.

I want to emphasize an overlooked point here. General Soleimani was killed in Iraq, not Iran. He was in Iraq, in a car with another known terrorist, driving to meet militia members who recently fired rockets at Americans, killing an American contractor with rocket fire, and tried to storm our Embassy. I am going to remind everybody that our Embassy in Baghdad is sovereign U.S. territory.

Whether through an existing authorization to use military force or the War Powers Act, President Trump was well within his legal bounds to take action against a known terrorist sitting in Iraq plotting attacks against U.S. citizens. It would have been culpable negligence to not act on the intelligence informing us of General Soleimani's position, location, and his imminent plans to attack again soon. I thank God the days of appeasement are behind us and we learned from history. President Trump averted another Benghazi-like tragedy.

The President made Iranian leadership pay a price for its aggression. His decisive action made Iran realize that the cost of escalation was more than they can afford, and it worked. Without the loss of American life, while following our Constitution and laws, President Trump deescalated tensions with Iran and, through a clear message of strength, made war less likely.

My colleagues on the other side of this issue know all of this well. They watched it play out in real time, just like the rest of us. Yet, whether it is their deeply rooted disdain for this President or a misunderstanding of the threats that the United States faces every day, they want to limit the President's ability to protect Americans abroad.

The legislation they are promoting requires termination or in some cases complete withdrawal of our forces without any strategic or tactical considerations. Such actions are not based on military doctrine, the recommendations of senior military leaders, or even foreign policy experts; they would be based solely on politics and would constitute a strategic long-term loss in exchange for what they think would be a short-term political win.

Ultimately, my colleagues who support this resolution refuse to accept the undeniable reality that the concept of peace through strength works. Removing the powers and capabilities of our military leaders that keep our country safe will not make us safer.

Whether through personal animosity toward our President or a misunderstanding of the importance of deterring our enemies, some in this Chamber are advocating for changes that would make our country less safe. I will not support their efforts, and I urge the rest of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last week, the Senate Finance Committee voted on the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement. It is called USMCA. I did something I have never done. I voted for it. I have never voted for a trade agreement in my time in the House of Representatives and my time in the Senate. In fact, I helped to lead the opposition to the original NAFTA among freshmen Members of Congress because I recognized that every single one of these trade agreements basically had the template of corporate interests at the center of them. In other words, these trade agreements—whether it was NAFTA, or the North American Free Trade Agreement, whether a half generation later it was the Central America Free Trade Agreement, whether it was the free trade agreement with South Korea, or whether it was the Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—all of them were written by corporate interests serving the profitability of the executives and

the major stockholders of these companies.

They all tended to precipitate this under these trade agreements in this Congress, under Presidents of both parties, I might add. I disagreed with the first President Bush, then President Clinton, then the second President Bush, and then President Obama. All of them would submit trade agreements that were written for corporate interests, I believe, at the expense of workers.

What happened, typically, was that companies that lobbied Congress to pass these trade agreements would shut down production in Provo, UT, in the Presiding Officer's State, or Cleveland or Dayton, in my State. They would shut down production there, move their production overseas, get their tax breaks, and get their low-wage labor, often worked on by—almost always—nonunion workers, sometimes underage workers who were very inexpensive. The products would be manufactured and then sold back into the United States. That became the business model for company after company after company since the North American Free Trade Agreement, where corporations outsourced jobs in order to save money, always at the expense of communities, particularly in the industrial Midwest, always at the expense of workers, and always at the expense of the middle class.

It was welcome news to me when Candidate Trump, with whom I agree with on almost nothing, said he would renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement. So I tried to work with him. I told him that I supported his renegotiation.

I worked with Ambassador Lighthizer, the Trade Representative, the Ambassador for President Trump—the so-called U.S. Trade Representative. I said to them that we want workers to be the centerpiece of this trade agreement.

Well, what happened? A year into his Presidency, President Trump proposed the same kind of trade agreement that we had seen all along—a trade agreement where corporations were at the center of the agreement and workers were betrayed.

This is a President who has betrayed workers day after day after day. He refused to raise the minimum wage. He cut overtime pay for 50,000 Ohio workers. He put people in the courts who put a thumb on the scales of justice, choosing corporations over workers and choosing Wall Street over consumers. It is a White House that looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives except on Tuesdays and Fridays, when it looks like a retreat for a drug company executive. That is what the President proposed.

Speaker PELOSI, Senator WYDEN and I, and worker representatives—the AFL-CIO, the UAW, the CWA, the machinists, and the steelworkers—all said: No, we are not going to support another trade agreement that sends

jobs overseas. We want a trade agreement written for workers.

We said to the President and the President's Trade Representative: We are not going to support this unless you include strong labor enforcement standards for workers.

They basically ignored us. We had tried to work with them. They basically ignored us. They insisted we pass their bill.

Finally, after a year—more than a year—the administration came along kicking and screaming and agreed with us only because they knew they couldn't pass a trade agreement without it.

It took the language that Senator WYDEN and I submitted for workers. It works in this way: For the first time, a worker is empowered to challenge the violation of labor law. So a Mexican worker, where the company has broken the law by paying them a sub-minimum wage, where the company has broken the law by refusing them to organize or to allow unions to attempt to organize, where a company breaks the law on worker safety—a worker at that company, anonymously, at that worksite, can file a complaint and set off the clock of the process so we can actually challenge when they break the law.

We know why companies close factories in Ohio and in the State of my friend from Rhode Island, in Cranston, RI. They close factories and open them in Mexico because they can pay lower wages, and they can take advantage of workers who don't have rights. American workers can't compete with that. We know that, and we get a race to the bottom on wages.

What this agreement does is that it puts workers at the center. It allows for real labor enforcement, real enforcement of labor standards. So I voted for this agreement. It passed with only three “no” votes in the Senate committee. It will likely pass on the floor either this week or next week.

But I want to be straight with American workers. This isn't a perfect agreement. It is one trade deal that Democrats fixed. Democrats and labor fixed it. Republicans opposed the fix but are now voting for it because they still want USMCA, but it will not fix the rest of President Trump's economic policies that put corporations over workers.

Let me give you an example. If you are a company in Dayton, OH, you pay a 21-percent corporate tax rate. If you move to Mexico or you move to France or you move to China, you pay only a 10.5-percent corporate tax rate. So our government continues this because of President Trump's tax bill, the tax bill that caused us now to have a trillion-dollar-a-year deficit—the largest deficit we have had, except in times of recession. That tax bill still will make it attractive for companies to shut down and move overseas. This helps with that.

As I said, I voted yes for the first time on a trade agreement because by

including Brown-Wyden, Democrats have made this agreement, for the first time, pro-worker. We set an important precedent that, from now on, every trade agreement we negotiate—and, I believe, negotiated by Presidents in either party—will include language like Brown-Wyden, making sure that workers are at the table and that trade agreements look out for workers, unlike trade agreements in the past.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes in morning business.

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

#### CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the publication *Grist* did an article recently about climate change with a bunch of images. I grabbed a few of those images, and I have added a few in this speech because they give a pretty good overview of the mess that we are in on climate change.

Right now, the most devastating wildfires anyone can remember are ripping across Australia. Here, you see an iconic kangaroo going by a building up in flames. Those Australian fires have destroyed thousands of homes. They have killed an estimated 1 billion animals—get your head around 1 billion animals killed—and they have made a day of breathing the air in Sidney, Australia, the equivalent of smoking 37 cigarettes. In fact, I read in the news that in a tennis championship in Australia today, one of the competitors withdrew because the air was so bad that she couldn't finish her match.

Why is this going on? According to the Australia Bureau of Meteorology, Australia has warmed by about a full degree Celsius over the last century. That means a longer, hotter fire season, which loads the dice in favor of extreme winds and heat and bushfire, as they call it in Australia.

Why did it warm in Australia? The cause could not be more clear. This is the measurement of carbon dioxide levels in the Earth's atmosphere, going back hundreds of thousands of years—100, 200, 300, 400, 500, 600, 700, and 800,000 years. That is way back. There was no agriculture then, no wheel then, and, for sure, no Twitter—nothing.

Over time, we have seen this steady range of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels, running between about 180 and—here is the cresting out—just under 300 parts per million. So it is 800,000 years, all between 180 and 300 degrees. That is a 120-degree range.

We are now out of that range by more than the entire range itself. We are out by more than 120. This chart goes up to 400 parts per million. We are literally off the chart right now at 410 parts per million. Of course, this is connected to heat. That is not news.

The graphics here were compiled by Clayton Aldern and Emily Pontecorvo

of Grist. So let me take this opportunity to thank them.

This next chart shows the increase in carbon dioxide just in the last decade. This is from 2010 to 2019. If you took the previous graph, which is in here somewhere, this is just the tiniest little slice at the very edge of this—just 10 years out of 800,000. That is like one eighty-thousandths of that graph, that tiny little sliver.

In that tiny little sliver, here is what has happened. It has gone from below 390 parts per million up to 410. We hit the magic 400 back in about 2013 for the first time right here with this dot. That was a big deal. The measurement came from NOAA's Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii. Never, ever, ever before in human history, over those hundreds of thousands of years, had we seen 400 parts per million, and in just the last decade, it shot up by all this. In fact, in the last 7 years, it shot up more than 10 parts per million.

We know something about what happens as these CO<sub>2</sub> levels go up. We know that the planet warms. That is not news. We have known that since Abraham Lincoln was President. When Abraham Lincoln was riding around Washington in his top hat, scientists had already begun to write about and understand the link between greenhouse gases like carbon dioxide and global warming. Heck, even Exxon scientists knew about this decades ago, and their scientists warned the company about this in reports that we now have. Of course, Exxon did the wickedest possible thing with that information, which was to bury it, deny it, and try to convince the public that the opposite was true.

There is nothing new in any of this information. The science is totally established, and that level is unprecedented in humankind's history. As a result—guess what—things have started to go haywire. This chart shows the cost of annual billion-dollar disasters in the United States, the disasters that cost us \$1 billion each. There is a very clear trendline that draws through this, and it is climbing upward. If you don't believe me, ask an insurance company, ask a reinsurance company.

Now, bear in mind that these costs, the cost of natural disasters, are just one of the big economic threats from climate change. We have warnings about coastal property values crashing. Those come from Freddie Mac, of all places. We have warnings about the carbon bubble crashing. Those come from the Bank of England and many other sovereign banks. We have warnings about insurance markets and about the bond safety of coastal communities.

In fact, those numbers—the numbers of the cost of natural disasters—are actually pretty tiny so far compared to what is projected. What is projected is an estimated tens of trillions of dollars by 2100.

One way this plays out is in my home State. This is northern Narragansett

Bay. Here is Providence, our capital city. Here is Warwick. Over here is Bristol. Everything that is blue on this map is land today. On these blue parts people have homes; people have businesses; the State has infrastructure; there is economic activity; and, my God, there are memories. Well, the blue disappears. The blue disappears. The blue disappears at 10 feet of sea level rise. That is what this measures. This comes off a program called STORMTOOLS run by the Coastal Resources Management Council, our Rhode Island CZMA agency.

Our State officials, based on the latest information from NOAA and from our University of Rhode Island and from the Coastal Resources Management Council, are preparing for scenarios up to 9 feet of sea level rise in Rhode Island by the end of the century—not storm surge, just bathtub-level sea level rise. Add in storm surge, and you not only get over 9 feet; you get over the 10 feet that is displayed here in this graph. The damage to my State is going to be very serious. The very map of Rhode Island will change because of this. Now, some of my colleagues think this is all funny, that this is something we can just yuck it up about and mock the science and call people alarmists when they take this seriously.

It is deadly serious. In fact, a 2017 report from the real estate database company Zillow identified over 4,800 homes in Rhode Island with a collective value at over \$3 billion that would be underwater by 2100 using only a 6-foot bathtub sea level rise figure—\$3 billion just in my small State. That doesn't count the value of the memories. If you have a house near the shore, you very likely have family memories. Some of these places in Rhode Island go back generations—even small, small houses. People have had them. Their grandfather had them. They have memories. All of that is at risk to be lost. So don't think I am not going to fight about this just because somebody else thinks this is funny.

The reason that is happening is the oceans are warming. When you warm water, it expands, so it rises—in addition, of course, to all the trillions of gallons pouring off of Greenland and other land-based icecaps. Look at how the ocean has warmed. The red is the 3-month average. It has more variation in it. The black is the annual average. The blue is the 5-year average that smooths it out a little bit more.

The ocean is absorbing intense amounts of heat. I will tell you how much heat the ocean is absorbing. If you took the Hiroshima atom bomb and you captured all of its energy as heat—it produced light; it produced a variety of other things—the rate at which the ocean is warming is the equivalent—I usually use—of between three and four Hiroshima-sized nuclear detonations per second in the ocean—per second. So, in the time of this speech, there will be dozens, probably

100, Hiroshima-sized nuclear explosions' worth of heat that the oceans have to absorb.

Today a new report came out that says that the number is actually five Hiroshima-sized explosions per second. As they measure it better, as they see it increase more, we are seeing that number. It is not just that they are warming. That would be bad enough. They are becoming more acid. They are becoming more acid because they absorb carbon dioxide at the surface. This is a chemical interface. This took away 90 percent of the extra heat that our fossil fuel emissions have caused, the absorption of the heat by the oceans. At the same time, while it was absorbing 90 percent of the heat, it was also absorbing 30 percent of the carbon dioxide.

Imagine for a second if we were not an ocean planet. Imagine if we were a fully terrestrial planet and we didn't have the oceans to buffer this. You would have to add back that extra third of CO<sub>2</sub>, which would be a 50-percent increase on the lower base, and you would have to multiply by 10 the increase from heat. You put those two factors together—this is a very rough number, and the scientists on my staff would be mad at me for saying this, but maybe 15 times the result that we are seeing right now. We are experiencing a fraction of what we would face without the cooling and buffering oceans. Without our oceans, Australia wouldn't just be one location on fire; the whole planet would be a catastrophe.

Those are the chances that we are taking. Why are we taking these chances? We are taking these chances because politicians don't dare say no to the crooked fossil fuel industry that profits from this mess. That is just the sickening political fact that we have to deal with here.

That is steadily moving because the public is beginning to understand this. Notwithstanding a long and very, very expensive campaign of misleading propaganda by the fossil fuel industry, people are starting to catch on. These are the numbers—from 60 up to 72 percent—of people who believe that warming is happening. The number of people who are denying went from 20 percent down to 12 percent. Understanding is up. Denial is down. Ditto for that it is caused by us: 46 up to 59 percent, and 35 down to 30 percent denying. Understanding is up. Denial is down.

So the other thing that is good that is happening behind these numbers is that Americans of a whole variety of persuasions actually favor the solutions that scientists and economists recommend to solve the climate change problem. Now, the fossil fuel industry, in its portfolio of lies, tells you that the remedies to solve climate change will be painful. That is just another fossil fuel lie, and Americans are catching on to that one too. An October 2019 Pew poll found that two-thirds



of Americans want the Federal Government to do more to combat climate change.

One thing that we are getting rid of in a hurry is coal. This represents the cumulative retirements of coal plants. Coal plants are phasing out, with 546 coal plants having closed in the United States since 2010, just in this last decade. In late 2019, Murray Energy became the eighth U.S. coal company in a year to file for bankruptcy. Coal plants anywhere are virtually unfinanceable. We have even seen operating, depreciated coal plants close because just operating that coal plant costs more than financing, building, and operating renewable energy facilities. That is good news for our safety and for our well-being.

Here is our overall energy portfolio and where it has increased. Look at solar go. Ho, ho. Oh, my gosh. It is up about 1,000 percent. It is really, really rocking. The second biggest increase: wind. More are coming on as we begin to develop offshore wind.

Fossil fuels still dominate. You can see this little inlay here—the transportation sector—but Americans are starting to buy more and more electric vehicles. Some really stunning new models are coming to the market. We are, of course, not doing anywhere near enough to encourage their adoption, which means we are likely to lose out, and we are doing this because rogue fossil fuel companies like Marathon Petroleum use political mischief to poke sticks in the wheels of vehicle fuel efficiency standards.

What the fossil fuel industry likes to do is to blame China: Oh, we are not going to do anything because China has to go first. What they omit telling you is that, at the end of 2017, 40 percent of all the electric cars in the world were in China. In 2018, China manufactured nearly half of all electric vehicles worldwide. China dominates global markets for electric buses and for electric two-wheelers—scooters and so forth.

You may recall that Exxon Corporation fabulously predicted to its shareholders—a prediction they have not yet corrected—that there would be zero electric buses by 2040. China is already operating 400,000. We are going to get run away from by China if we don't smarten up and compete.

Here is more good news. The price of digging out and transporting and burning dirty fuels is high: nearly \$110 for a megawatt hour of coal-fueled power. If you look, the most expensive are nuclear power plants; the next most expensive, coal; the next most expensive, solar thermal, which generates heat; the next most expensive, natural gas; and down here, the two cheapest by far are solar photovoltaic and wind.

So we know where these markets are going, with just \$40 per megawatt hour for solar photovoltaic compared to \$110 for coal. Over the last decade, the average cost of solar dropped from \$200 per megawatt hour to less than a quarter

of that. The cost of wind power is down, and offshore wind is emerging. Battery storage now competes on price with gas-fired, peak-demand plants in many areas. Even with the massive subsidy that we all have to pay to prop up fossil fuel, renewables are starting to win on price anyway.

If the price of wind, solar, battery storage, and other renewable technologies continues to drop, we could reach 100 percent renewable energy by the middle of the century, and we will need to if we are going to stay within the 1.5 degrees Celsius safe zone. In fact, here is what you see. The power sector's emissions are declining.

There is a lot of work left to do in transportation—what you might call room for improvement there. There is a lot of room for improvement in industry and a lot of room for improvement in buildings and other. So there is work to be done here.

Of course, these other sectors don't have much of an incentive to solve their emissions problem because it is still free to pollute. We continue to violate the most basic market theory about externalities, and we let these fossil fuel polluters pollute for free. When we let them pollute for free, it takes away any incentive in these other sectors to fix that problem—and, of course, that is goal 1 for the fossil-fuel industry. With a \$650 billion-per-year subsidy, they are throwing everything they have politically at trying to protect that phony, non-market-based, unfair subsidy. And even with it, they are still losing.

We could be doing better in all these sectors if we put a proper market-based price on carbon. So far they have won, if you can call not preparing for a looming calamity to be winning.

Here is a quick summary of the lessons of the 2010s.

One, the science is clear—we have blown by 400 parts per million. We are now in uncharted territory for the human species.

Two, climate change is a massive threat to our economy, particularly with the danger of crashes coming soon in coastal property values and carbon assets.

I just read the letter from BlackRock to CEOs and investors. BlackRock is one of the biggest investment companies in the world. They have warned of what they called capital reallocation. That means things are going to shift—happening as markets anticipate climate hazard—things like facing the danger of coastal property value crashes or carbon asset value crashes. Those crashes create capital reallocation.

I love the way economists talk. All the agony behind that, and they call it capital reallocation. Wrecking the world economy, they call systemic risk.

Three, Americans are getting that climate change is a big problem. It is a big change. It is a big change particularly with young Republicans, who totally get it.

Here is my challenge to my Republican colleagues in the Senate: Sit down with your own young staffers. Sit down with the young staffers in your own office and hear them out about climate change. You will see that there is a big generational divide.

Four, coal is on the ropes. Experts predict huge stranded assets in gas and oil. Solar and other renewables are booming as they outcompete fossil fuel on costs alone. That is a genie even the crooked fossil fuel machine can't put back in the bottle.

Of course, the fossil fuel industry is still up to no good, with its vast array of phony front groups so it does not look like it is them. They have names like the George C. Marshall Institute, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, the Heartland Institute—a bunch of phony front groups filled with stables of paid liars emitting slimy rivers of dark money, polluting our politics as badly as their emissions pollute our planet. That hasn't stopped, and they should be held accountable.

The 2020s are going to be tough, for sure. Australia is seeing the opening episode.

I have an analogy that I will use as I close. I have spent time running rivers. I like running rivers. I like running rivers in inflatables. I like running rivers in kayaks. I have run rivers from the placid Rappahannock in Virginia to the mighty Colorado through our massive Grand Canyon and lots in between. One of the things about running a river that has big rapids is that the first thing you do is you look at the map and you learn where the big rapids are so you can stop, get safely to shore, and figure out whether you can navigate the rapids or whether you need to portage around them.

Well, we had a map for where the rapids are on this. The scientists showed us. They told us. They warned us. But we ignored them. But not paying attention to what you are told on the science map is not your last chance. Going down the river, when you get closer, you can actually start to hear the falls, the rapids roaring up ahead of you.

The wildfires, the flooding, the rising seas, the species relocating around the planet—if that is not a roaring for us to hear now from the planet about the dangers ahead, shame on us. It is enough for us to know that we are actually getting close to big trouble, and we still do nothing.

Then there is a point on the river where it is your last chance. You have no choice as to whether you are going to miss the rapids or the falls ahead. You have ignored all the warnings. You have ignored the map. You haven't listened to the roar, and now you are close. Now you will have to paddle very hard to avoid the roaring rapids ahead. Nature's forces are pulling you inexorably toward the cataract. You will have to paddle for your life to avoid it.

That is where I believe we are right now. I believe that as human kind, as a



country, we have to paddle for our lives right now to avoid being sucked over the climate falls and into dangers that we don't want to see and that we don't want our children to have to see.

Let's wake up here. Let's shake off the shackles of this crooked fossil fuel industry, and let's get paddling for our lives.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### TRIBUTE TO DR. SAMIR GUINDI

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the community in Harlan County, KY, will gather next month in honor of a devoted caregiver and friend as he prepares to begin a well-deserved retirement. Today, I would like to join them in paying tribute to Dr. Samir Guindi for the 45 years of devotion he has given to Southeastern Kentucky.

Dr. Guindi—Sam to his friends—and his wife, Laila, are originally from Egypt. They arrived in Harlan in 1975, where Sam spent much of his career as the only ear, nose, and throat surgical specialist in the area. As a result, his services were constantly in demand, and he dedicated himself wholeheartedly to the vital work. Conservative estimates by his colleagues show Sam conducted more than 200,000 patient visits during his impressive career. He performed approximately 30,000 procedures. Many of the patients Sam treated were children at high risk of ear damage and deafness.

On top of his busy professional schedule, Sam partnered with the well-regarded Appalachian Regional Healthcare System to provide charitable care for families in need. He was based in Harlan, but Sam's work extended into nearby Bell, Letcher, and Perry Counties as well. He spent countless hours on the road to see scores of patients in a single day, often without any compensation. In a region that has long faced a scarcity of medical professionals, Sam's tireless generosity and kindness made a remarkable impact on families in Southeastern Kentucky.

Sam's life has been a wonderful example of selflessness. Both of his sons, Alfi and Sherif, are successful attorneys, and Sherif followed his father into the service of his community by working as a public defender and an assistant Commonwealth's attorney. It is my privilege to join the Guindi family, the Harlan community, and all of Sam's patients in thanking him for his decades of providing vital medical care in Appalachia. I wish Sam the very best as he enjoys a relaxing retirement. I urge my Senate colleagues to join me in commending this outstanding Kentuckian.

#### TRIBUTE TO TOMMY LOVING

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, it is a pleasure to join the residents of Warren County, as well as law enforcement professionals throughout Kentucky, in congratulating my friend Tommy Loving as he marks 50 years of distinguished service in law enforcement next month. With a dedication to service, Tommy has been instrumental in the protection of Kentucky's families and communities. He continues to answer the call of duty each and every day, and our Commonwealth is safer as a result.

Tommy's career in law enforcement began at age 21 when he joined the Kentucky State Police, KSP, as a dispatcher. He would wear the gray uniform for more than two decades, serving as a trooper and then sergeant at posts across the Commonwealth.

In response to the ongoing struggle against illegal drugs, local leaders established the Bowling Green-Warren County Drug Task Force in 1997. They asked Tommy to put his experience to work protecting families from the spike of substance abuse as the organization's inaugural director. For the last 23 years, Tommy has done just that.

The task force is a collaborative team from the local police department, the county sheriff, Western Kentucky University's police force, the KSP, professionals from the Kentucky Governor's and Attorney General's Offices, and Federal law enforcement. These officers, bolstered by chemists, prosecutors, and support staff, lead the fight against the spread of dangerous substances in Warren County. As Kentucky continues to endure the devastating consequences of the opioid epidemic and a resurgence of methamphetamine use, the task force's expertise is vital now more than ever.

Because of his decade-long record leading this highly specialized team, Tommy was asked to take on an additional responsibility as the executive director of the Kentucky Narcotic Officers' Association, KNOA. With a mission to assist law enforcement personnel throughout the State with training and support as they combat illicit drug abuse, KNOA has increased the wellbeing of communities throughout the Commonwealth.

In recognition of his success in both local and State law enforcement, Tommy was selected to be the regional director for the National Narcotics Officers' Association Coalition in 2010. Now, he coordinates with officers and policymakers across six States and our Nation's Capital to share best practices and enhance public safety. Other States are looking to Kentucky for leadership, and Tommy's experience is benefiting families and communities around the country.

Thankfully, last year Kentucky saw the largest decrease in drug overdose fatalities in a decade. It was a long-awaited glimmer of hope in our fight against addiction. The service of law

enforcement officers, like Tommy, is a critical part of our comprehensive response to the addiction epidemic, and I hope he and his colleagues are proud of their contributions to this good news. In 2018, the KNOA Board unanimously voted to bestow on Tommy their Lifetime Distinguished Service Award for his decades of work protecting families and communities from substance abuse.

It is a distinct pleasure for me to join the chorus praising Tommy for his half-century in law enforcement. We may never be able to repay the selfless sacrifices of the brave men and women who protect our communities, but we can and should show our gratitude. Tommy's leadership and service are a great asset to Kentucky, and I know I speak for many when I say thank you. As he celebrates this milestone, I hope my Senate colleagues join me in sharing our congratulations with Tommy Loving and thanking him for his faithful service to Kentucky families.

#### REMEMBERING CHRISTOPHER ALLEN

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to speak about a dedicated husband, father, son, public servant, and Marylander, Chris Allen.

Sadly, Chris passed away last week. He was 58 years old. He leaves behind a wife Lynda-Marie, and two daughters, Sophie and Lucie.

Chris spent years in the office of my friend Senator ROBERTS, relentlessly advocating on behalf of his constituents. More recently, he worked for Senator GRASSLEY on the Republican staff of the Senate Finance Committee, where he pushed for pragmatic policy solutions to improve the life of retirees and the pension system.

Those of us who were lucky enough to know Chris know he lifted the spirits of those around him through his wry sense of humor and infectious positivity. At work, he was experienced, passionate, and knowledgeable about his work, always searching for good policy with bipartisan support.

For those lucky enough to work with Chris, he made lifelong friends and allies. He will not soon be forgotten.

The world is a little less upbeat without Chris here. I hope you will join me in praying for his family and friends.

#### TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL SARAH D. ECCLESTON

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I rise today to recognize LTC Sarah D. Eccleston for her exemplary dedication to duty and service to the U.S. Army and to the United States of America.

Over the past year, she has served as the congressional analyst and congressional liaison in the Office of the Army Surgeon General.

LTC Sarah Eccleston was born and raised in Dillon, MT, and began her Army service in 2001 as a cadet in the Reserve Officer Training Corps, ROTC.

In 2004, she was commissioned as a distinguished military graduate from the University of Utah ROTC Program and received her bachelors of science degree in nursing from Westminster College, Salt Lake City, UT.

On her initial assignment as a lieutenant, she served as a staff nurse on a 32-bed multidisciplinary medical-surgical unit at the Carl R. Darnall Army Medical Center at Fort Hood, TX. She then attended the Critical Care Nurse Course at Brooke Army Medical Center, BAMC, in Fort Sam Houston, TX, where she began working as a clinical staff nurse in the surgical trauma intensive care unit at BAMC.

In 2009, she deployed with the 10th Combat Support Hospital out of Fort Carson, CO, to Baghdad, Iraq, where she worked as a critical care nurse. Shortly thereafter, she began working as the 2nd Brigade ROTC nurse counselor at Fort Dix, NJ. She completed her time with ROTC in May of 2012 and was selected for long-term health education and training through Widener University, where she received a master's in nursing. After graduating as a critical care clinical nurse specialist, Lieutenant Colonel Eccleston was assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center in Fort Lewis, WA, where she oversaw policy and quality of practice in three intensive care units.

Prior to her current assignment, in the summer of 2018, Lieutenant Colonel Eccleston was selected to serve as the executive nurse fellow to the Chief and Deputy Chief of the Army Nurse Corps.

After graduating as a critical care clinical nurse specialist, Lieutenant Colonel Eccleston was assigned to Madigan Army Medical Center at Joint Base Fort Lewis-McChord, WA, where she oversaw policy and quality of practice in three intensive care units.

Montanans and all Americans owe LTC Sarah Eccleston the deepest gratitude for her decade of active service to this Nation. I wish Sarah and her family all the best as they continue their journey of service.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO NORMA KAEHLER

• Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I am pleased to recognize Mrs. Norma Kaehler on the occasion of her retirement. Norma has been a hero of the aviation community for more than two decades. Most recently, she served as the managing director for government and corporate affairs at American Airlines Group.

Not many may remember this, but Norma got her start on Capitol Hill working for Senator Mack Mattingly of Georgia, and she never forgot that taking care of constituents is our No. 1 priority around here. She has always worked on behalf of the employees of American Airlines on Capitol Hill, tens of thousands of airline pilots, mechanics and maintenance personnel, flight

attendants, gate agents, and everyone in the back office—all responsible for ensuring planes depart and land on time—have benefited from her advocacy on their behalf. I can personally attest to this during her tireless advocacy of legislation I sponsored that protected the retirement benefits of American Airline employees after the 2013 merger.

In the course of her career, Norma Kaehler has worked for multiple airlines: Trans World Airlines, American Airlines, and American Airlines Group; and she played a major role in every FAA reauthorization bill enacted by Congress. Through it all, Norma remained an unflappable, passionate advocate for aviation. I know I join her family and American Airlines in thanking Norma for her years of service and contributions to the aviation community.

Congratulations on your retirement. We will miss you around here.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JULIUS P. KNAPP

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise today to commend Julius “Julie” P. Knapp for his service to our Nation during the past 45 years. Mr. Knapp retires this month from his position as the FCC’s Chief of the Office of Engineering and Technology, OET, where he helped usher in the modern age of communications and was instrumental in making spectrum available to fuel our Nation’s economic growth in this area. If you are accessing a mobile device right now, using Wi-Fi, or buying the latest wireless gadget, you are likely benefiting from Julie Knapp’s work.

Mr. Knapp is well known and respected here in Congress for his technically precise and straightforward testimony at countless hearings. Mr. Knapp is a world-recognized expert in communications and is widely viewed as a leader on technical policy issues because of his expertise, his pragmatic and fair approach, and his ability to “translate” complex engineering issues to policymakers on all sides of an issue. He has briefed generations of congressional staffers on the intricacies of spectrum management and provided significant and substantial input on spectrum legislation. Many Members of this body have discussed communications industry developments with Julie, including low power FM, wireless and satellite issues, 4G LTE, Wi-Fi, and 5G, among others.

When the public looks at Julie Knapp’s career, we can see a parallel to the timeline of America’s communications industry’s growth. He graduated from high school in New Hyde, NY, in 1969, and he received his engineering degree from the City College of New York in 1974. Less than a month later, he went right to work for the American people. He rose through the ranks at the FCC, beginning as a 22-year-old certifying radio frequency devices and growing into a seasoned professional in the increasingly important equipment

authorization branch. He became Chief of the FCC laboratory, Chief of the Policy and Rules Division for OET, and finally Chief of OET, where he has served with extraordinary distinction since 2006.

Mr. Knapp’s outstanding work has brought him numerous awards and accolades within the government and in the engineering community. In 2012, he received one of the highest honors for a civil servant, the Presidential Distinguished Rank Award. He also has received the FCC’s Gold and Silver Awards and the Eugene C. Bowler Award for exceptional professionalism and dedication to public service.

Mr. Knapp has served the United States through multiple administrations, never asking for more than the opportunity to make a difference—and along the way, making a lasting, positive impact. He epitomizes the concept of civil service. We all owe Julie Knapp a debt of gratitude and our sincerest thanks for dedicating his life to building America’s communications systems and making these services universally available to all of us and for doing so with grace and humility.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### REMEMBERING PAUL “PETE” DYE, JR.

• Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, today I honor the life of Paul “Pete” Dye, Jr., who was a legend in the sport of golf and the most iconic golf course architect in the modern era. Just one of five architects to be inducted into the World Golf Hall of Fame, his death on January 9, 2020, marks an end to an illustrious career of dedication and contribution to the sport.

Born on December 29, 1925, in Urbana, OH, Dye was first introduced to golf by his father, who built Urbana Country Club, a nine-hole course on their family’s land in Champaign County. As a high schooler, Dye won the State championship and went on to medal in the State amateur golf championship.

While many know Dye as an iconic course designer, he was also deeply committed to our great Nation. In 1944 at the age of 18, Dye enlisted in the U.S. Army during World War II.

Dye leaves behind an extraordinary legacy, including the world-renowned “Island Green,” the 17th hole at TPC Sawgrass in my home State of Florida, where Dye lived for many years. Florida was a special place for Dye, and it was also where he met his wife, Alice Holliday O’Neal, while he was enrolled at Rollins College. They went on to have two sons, P.B. and Perry, who to this day have continued their father’s work, honoring him by designing courses under the Dye Designs banner.

With immense gratitude for his work and service, I am honored to pay tribute to Pete’s life.●

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 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 bill, without amendment:

S. 457. An act to require that \$1 coins issued during 2019 honor President George H.W. Bush and to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue bullion coins during 2019 in honor of Barbara Bush.

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

H.R. 2398. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4302. An act to authorize public housing agencies to share certain data regarding homeless individuals and families for the provision of housing and services, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4335. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue rules that prohibit officers and directors of certain companies from trading securities in anticipation of a current report, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4458. An act to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue reports on cybersecurity with respect to the functions of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4841. An act to require the prudential banking regulators to provide annual testimony to Congress on their supervision and regulation activities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5315. An act to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to establish a Financial Agent Mentor-Protégé Program with the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of title 38, United States Code.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY) announced that on today, January 14, 2020, he has signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 583. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to provide for enhanced penalties for pirate radio, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2476. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to provide funding to secure nonprofit facilities from terrorist attacks, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 2398. An act to amend the United States Housing Act of 1937 and title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for the HUD-VASH program, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit annual reports to the Committees on Veterans' Af-

fairs of the Senate and House of Representatives regarding homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4302. An act to authorize public housing agencies to share certain data regarding homeless individuals and families for the provision of housing and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4335. An act to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue rules that prohibit officers and directors of certain companies from trading securities in anticipation of a current report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4458. An act to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to issue reports on cybersecurity with respect to the functions of the Federal Reserve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 4841. An act to require the prudential banking regulators to provide annual testimony to Congress on their supervision and regulation activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 5315. An act to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to establish a Financial Agent Mentor-Protégé Program within the Department of the Treasury, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution approving the request of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for a waiver under section 1703E(f) of title 38, United States Code; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3193. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-3713. A communication from the Deputy Chief Management Officer, Office of the Chief Management Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to Section 921 (b) (3) of the John McCain Fiscal Year 2019 National Defense Authorization Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3714. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 8, 2020; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3715. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Acquisition, Logistics and Technology), transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the Department's Chemical Demilitarization Program (CDP); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-3716. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations and Procedures Under the Plant Variety Protection Act" ((RIN0581-AD86) (Docket No. AMS-ST-19-0004)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3717. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Apricots Grown in Designated Counties in Washington; Increased Assessment Rate" (Docket No. AMS-DC-19-0048) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3718. A communication from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Beef Promotion and Research Rules and Regulations" (Docket No. AMS-LP-19-0054) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3719. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Capital Simplification for Qualifying Community Banking Organizations; Technical Correction" (RIN1557-AE59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3720. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the remaining obstacles to the efficient and timely circulation of \$1 coins; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3721. A communication from the Departmental Privacy Officer, Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act Regulations; Exemptions for the Investigations Case Management System" (RIN1014-AA41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-3722. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Surface Deformation" ((NUREG-0800, Chapter 2) (SRP 2.5.3)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3723. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; California; Northern Sierra Air Quality Management District; Reasonably Available Control Technology" (FRL No. 10003-96-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3724. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Georgia; Non-attainment New Source Review" (FRL No. 10004-19-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3725. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Statement Rule Certification for the 2015 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 10004-21-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3726. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Missouri; Sampling Methods for Air Pollution Sources" (FRL No. 10004-15-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3727. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; New Mexico; City of Albuquerque-Bernalillo County; New Source Review (NSR) Preconstruction Permitting Program" (FRL No. 10003-44-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3728. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Washington; Update to the Adoption by Reference, Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council" (FRL No. 10003-85-Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3729. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Montana; State Implementation Plan Revisions for Open Burning" (FRL No. 10003-37-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3730. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; New Mexico and Albuquerque-Bernalillo County, New Mexico; Control of Emissions From Existing Other Solid Waste Incineration Units" (FRL No. 10003-60-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3731. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "California; Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 10003-98-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3732. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extreme Area Submission Requirements, Coachella Valley Nonattainment Area; California Ozone" (FRL No. 10003-97-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3733. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fenhexamid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 10002-21-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committees on Environment and Public Works; and Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-3734. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Surface Coating of Metal Cans and Surface Coating of Metal Coil Residual Risk and Technology Review" (FRL No. 10003-81-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3735. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Renewable Fuel Standard Program; Standards for 2020, Biomass-Based Diesel Volumes for 2021, and Other Changes" (FRL No. 10003-79-OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-3736. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure 2020-5" (Rev. Proc. 2020-5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3737. A communication from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties for Inflation" ((RIN1801-AA20) (34 CFR Parts 36 and 668)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 9, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3738. A communication from the Senior Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3739. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Device Submissions: Amending Premarket Regulations That Require Multiple Copies and Specify Paper Copies To Be Required in Electronic Format" (RIN0910-AH48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 14, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3740. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation Requiring an Approved New Drug Application for Drugs Sterilized by Irradiation" (RIN0910-AH47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 13, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3741. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2017 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-3742. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of the Class E Airspace; Redding, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0625)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3743. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of the Class E Airspace; Coudersport, PA; and Revocation of Class E Airspace; Galeton, PA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0757)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3744. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0603)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3745. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0983)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3746. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-9072)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3747. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0703)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3748. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0256)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3749. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.; Canadair Limited) Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0710)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3750. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Services B.V. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0709)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3751. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0993)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3752. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2019-0499)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on January 10, 2020; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## 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 Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 3183. A bill to improve the Safe Routes to School Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 3184. A bill to require an annual report of Federal employees and retirees with delinquent tax debt; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3185. A bill to prohibit the payment of bonuses to contractors for unsatisfactory performance; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 3186. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to modify the definition of Appalachian region; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

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

S. 3187. A bill to permit the Scipio A. Jones Post Office in Little Rock, Arkansas, to accept and display a portrait of Scipio A. Jones, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3188. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to establish demonstration and pilot projects to facilitate education and training programs in the field of advanced manufacturing; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3189. A bill to use proceeds from spectrum auctions to support supply chain innovation and multilateral security; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3190. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3191. A bill to increase the capacity of research and development programs of the Federal Government that focus on industries of the future, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 3192. A bill to establish an aerospace fellowship program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 3193. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes; read the first time.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. Res. 469. A resolution supporting the people of Iran as they engage in legitimate protests, and condemning the Iranian regime for its murderous response; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 169

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons.

S. 259

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 259, a bill to impose criminal sanctions on certain persons involved in international doping fraud conspiracies, to provide restitution for victims of such conspiracies, and to require sharing of information with the United States Anti-Doping Agency to assist its fight against doping, and for other purposes.

S. 277

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 277, a bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Fred Korematsu, in recognition of his dedication to justice and equality.

S. 342

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 342, a bill to reauthorize title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve and encourage innovation in international education, and for other purposes.

S. 348

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 348, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 400

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 400, a bill to gather information about the illicit production of illicit fentanyl in foreign countries and to withhold bilateral assistance from countries that do not have emergency scheduling procedures for new illicit drugs, cannot prosecute criminals for the manufacture or distribution of controlled substance analogues, or do not require the registration of tableting machine and encapsulating machines.

S. 578

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 578, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five-month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 701

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 701, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program, and for other purposes.

S. 892

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland



(Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 892, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the women in the United States who joined the workforce during World War II, providing the aircraft, vehicles, weaponry, ammunition, and other materials to win the war, that were referred to as "Rosie the Riveter", in recognition of their contributions to the United States and the inspiration they have provided to ensuing generations.

S. 947

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 947, a bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to improve compensation for workers involved in uranium mining, and for other purposes.

S. 1053

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1053, a bill to establish a universal personal savings program, and for other purposes.

S. 1074

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1074, a bill to reinstate Federal Pell Grant eligibility for individuals incarcerated in Federal and State penal institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 1374

At the request of Ms. MCSALLY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1374, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 2233

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2233, a bill to nullify the effect of the recent executive order that requires Federal agencies to share citizenship data.

S. 2379

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2379, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to clarify the authority of State Medicaid fraud and abuse control units to investigate and prosecute cases of Medicaid patient abuse and neglect in any setting, and for other purposes.

S. 2570

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Massa-

chusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2570, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Greg LeMond in recognition of his service to the United States as an athlete, activist, role model, and community leader.

S. 2679

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2679, a bill to facilitate the automatic acquisition of citizenship for lawful permanent resident children of military and Federal Government personnel residing abroad, and for other purposes.

S. 2803

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2803, a bill to provide Federal housing assistance on behalf of youths who are aging out of foster care, and for other purposes.

S. 2815

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2815, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the National Purple Heart Honor Mission.

S. 2941

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2941, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a consumer recycling education and outreach grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2948

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2948, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program for work therapy using service dog training.

S. 2980

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2980, a bill to require the promulgation of certain standards for perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2989

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2989, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify the mailing requirement relating to social security account statements.

S. 2991

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2991, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct an independent review of the deaths of certain veterans by suicide, and for other purposes.

S. 3133

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3133, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited conditional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs, and for other purposes.

S. 3153

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3153, a bill to prohibit the sharing of United States intelligence with countries that permit the operation of Huawei fifth generation telecommunications technology within their borders.

S.J. RES. 63

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 63, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S.J. RES. 68

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 68, a joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress.

S. RES. 466

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 466, a resolution honoring the members of the Armed Forces and the intelligence community of the United States who carried out the mission that killed Qasem Soleimani, and for other purposes.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3190. A bill to authorize dedicated domestic terrorism offices within the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation to analyze and monitor domestic terrorist activity and require the Federal Government to take steps to prevent domestic terrorism; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3190

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2020”.

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Recent reports have demonstrated that White supremacists and other far-right-wing extremists are the most significant domestic terrorism threat facing the United States, including—

(A) a February 22, 2019, New York Times op-ed, by a Trump Administration United States Department of Justice official, who wrote that “white supremacy and far-right extremism are among the greatest domestic-security threats facing the United States. Regrettably, over the past 25 years, law enforcement, at both the Federal and State levels, has been slow to respond. . . . Killings committed by individuals and groups associated with far-right extremist groups have risen significantly.”;

(B) an April 2017 Government Accountability Office report on the significant, lethal threat posed by domestic violent extremists, which—

(i) explained that “[s]ince September 12, 2001, the number of fatalities caused by domestic violent extremists has ranged from 1 to 49 in a given year.”; and

(ii) noted that “[F]atalities resulting from attacks by far right wing violent extremists have exceeded those caused by radical Islamist violent extremists in 10 of the 15 years, and were the same in 3 of the years since September 12, 2001. Of the 85 violent extremist incidents that resulted in death since September 12, 2001, far right wing violent extremist groups were responsible for 62 (73 percent) while radical Islamist violent extremists were responsible for 23 (27 percent).”; and

(C) an unclassified May 2017 joint intelligence bulletin from the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security, which found that “white supremacist extremism poses [a] persistent threat of lethal violence,” and that White supremacists “were responsible for 49 homicides in 26 attacks from 2000 to 2016 . . . more than any other domestic extremist movement”.

(2) Recent domestic terrorist attacks include—

(A) the August 5, 2012, mass shooting at a Sikh gurdwara in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, in which a White supremacist shot and killed 6 members of the gurdwara;

(B) the April 13, 2014, mass shooting at a Jewish community center and a Jewish assisted living facility in Overland Park, Kansas, in which a neo-Nazi shot and killed 3 civilians, including a 14-year-old teenager;

(C) the June 8, 2014, ambush in Las Vegas, Nevada, in which 2 supporters of the far-right-wing “patriot” movement shot and killed 2 police officers and a civilian;

(D) the June 17, 2015, mass shooting at the Emanuel AME Church in Charleston, South Carolina, in which a White supremacist shot and killed 9 members of the church;

(E) the November 27, 2015, mass shooting at a Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs, Colorado, in which an anti-abortion extremist shot and killed a police officer and 2 civilians;

(F) the March 20, 2017, murder of an African-American man in New York City, allegedly committed by a White supremacist who

reportedly traveled to New York “for the purpose of killing black men”;

(G) the May 26, 2017, attack in Portland, Oregon, in which a White supremacist allegedly murdered 2 men and injured a third after the men defended 2 young women whom the individual had targeted with anti-Muslim hate speech;

(H) the August 12, 2017, attacks in Charlottesville, Virginia, in which—

(i) a White supremacist killed one and injured nineteen after driving his car through a crowd of individuals protesting a neo-Nazi rally, and of which former Attorney General Jeff Sessions said, “It does meet the definition of domestic terrorism in our statute.”; and

(ii) a group of 6 men linked to militia or White supremacist groups assaulted an African-American man who had been protesting the neo-Nazi rally in a downtown parking garage;

(I) the July 2018 murder of an African-American woman from Kansas City, Missouri, allegedly committed by a White supremacist who reportedly bragged about being a member of the Ku Klux Klan;

(J) the October 24, 2018, shooting in Jeffersonton, Kentucky, in which a White man allegedly murdered 2 African Americans at a grocery store after first attempting to enter a church with a predominantly African-American congregation during a service;

(K) the October 27, 2018, mass shooting at the Tree of Life Synagogue in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in which a White nationalist allegedly shot and killed 11 members of the congregation;

(L) the April 27, 2019, shooting at the Chabad of Poway synagogue in California, in which a man yelling anti-Semitic slurs allegedly killed a member of the congregation and wounded 3 others;

(M) the August 3, 2019, mass shooting at a Walmart in El Paso, Texas, in which a White supremacist with anti-immigrant views killed 22 people and injured 26 others;

(N) the December 10, 2019, shooting at a Kohler supermarket in Jersey City, New Jersey, in which 2 men with anti-Semitic views killed 3 people in the store and a law enforcement officer in an earlier encounter; and

(O) the December 28, 2019, machete attack at a Hanukkah celebration in Monsey, New York, in which a man who had expressed anti-Semitic views stabbed 5 individuals.

(3) In November 2019, the Federal Bureau of Investigation released its annual hate crime incident report, which found that in 2018, violent hate crimes reached a 16-year high. Though the overall number of hate crimes decreased slightly after three consecutive years of increases, the report found a 4-percent increase in aggravated assaults, a 15-percent increase in simple assaults, and a 13-percent increase in intimidation. There was also a nearly 6-percent increase in hate crimes directed at LGBTQ individuals and a 14-percent increase in hate crimes directed at Hispanic and Latino individuals. Nearly 60 percent of the religion-based hate crimes reported targeted American Jews and Jewish institutions. The previous year’s report found that in 2017, hate crimes increased by approximately 17 percent, including a 23-percent increase in religion-based hate crimes, an 18-percent increase in race-based crimes, and a 5-percent increase in crimes directed against LGBTQ individuals. The report analyzing 2016 data found that hate crimes increased by almost 5 percent that year, including a 19-percent rise in hate crimes against American Muslims. Similarly, the report analyzing 2015 data found that hate crimes increased by 6 percent that year. Much of the 2015 increase came from a 66-percent rise in attacks on American Muslims and a 9-percent rise in attacks on American

Jews. In all 4 reports, race-based crimes were most numerous, and those crimes most often targeted African Americans.

(4) On March 15, 2019, a White nationalist was arrested and charged with murder after allegedly killing 50 Muslim worshippers and injuring more than 40 in a massacre at the Al Noor Mosque and Linwood Mosque in Christchurch, New Zealand. The alleged shooter posted a hate-filled, xenophobic manifesto that detailed his White nationalist ideology before the massacre. Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern labeled the massacre a terrorist attack.

(5) In January 2017, a right-wing extremist who had expressed anti-Muslim views was charged with murder for allegedly killing 6 people and injuring 19 in a shooting rampage at a mosque in Quebec City, Canada. It was the first-ever mass shooting at a mosque in North America, and Prime Minister Trudeau labeled it a terrorist attack.

(6) On February 15, 2019, Federal authorities arrested U.S. Coast Guard Lieutenant Christopher Paul Hasson, who was allegedly planning to kill a number of prominent journalists, professors, judges, and “leftists in general”. In court filings, prosecutors described Lieutenant Hasson as a “domestic terrorist” who in an email “identified himself as a White Nationalist for over 30 years and advocated for ‘focused violence’ in order to establish a white homeland.”.

#### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Director” means the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(2) the term “domestic terrorism” has the meaning given the term in section 2331 of title 18, United States Code, except that it does not include acts perpetrated by individuals associated with or inspired by—

(A) a foreign person or organization designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189);

(B) an individual or organization designated under Executive Order 13224 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note); or

(C) a state sponsor of terrorism as determined by the Secretary of State under section 6(j) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. 4605), section 40 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780), or section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

(3) the term “Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee” means the committee within the Department of Justice tasked with assessing and sharing information about ongoing domestic terrorism threats;

(4) the term “hate crime incident” means an act described in section 241, 245, 247, or 249 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 901 of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3631);

(5) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(6) the term “uniformed services” has the meaning given the term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

#### SEC. 4. OFFICES TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF OFFICES TO MONITOR, ANALYZE, INVESTIGATE, AND PROSECUTE DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) DOMESTIC TERRORISM UNIT.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Unit in the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of Homeland Security, which shall be responsible for monitoring and analyzing domestic terrorism activity.

(2) DOMESTIC TERRORISM OFFICE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Office in the Counterterrorism Section of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice—



(A) which shall be responsible for investigating and prosecuting incidents of domestic terrorism; and

(B) which shall be headed by the Domestic Terrorism Counsel.

(3) DOMESTIC TERRORISM SECTION OF THE FBI.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Section within the Counterterrorism Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which shall be responsible for investigating domestic terrorism activity.

(4) STAFFING.—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each ensure that each office authorized under this section in their respective agencies shall—

(A) have adequate number of employees to perform the required duties;

(B) have not less than 1 employee dedicated to ensuring compliance with civil rights and civil liberties laws and regulations; and

(C) require that all employees undergo annual anti-bias training.

(5) SUNSET.—The offices authorized under this subsection shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) JOINT REPORT ON DOMESTIC TERRORISM.—

(1) BIENNIAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and each 180 days thereafter for the 10-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Attorney General, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit a joint report authored by the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) an assessment of the domestic terrorism threat posed by White supremacists and neo-Nazis, including White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies and the uniformed services; and

(B)(i) in the first report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that have occurred in the United States since April 19, 1995, including any White-supremacist-related incidents or attempted incidents; and

(ii) in each subsequent report, an analysis of incidents or attempted incidents of domestic terrorism that occurred in the United States during the preceding 180-day period, including any White-supremacist-related incidents or attempted incidents; and

(C) a quantitative analysis of domestic terrorism for the preceding 180-day period, including—

(i) the number of—

(I) domestic terrorism related assessments initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of assessments from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism;

(II) domestic terrorism-related preliminary investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of preliminary investigations from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and how many preliminary investigations resulted from assessments;

(III) domestic terrorism-related full investigations initiated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, including the number of full investigations from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and how many full investigations resulted from preliminary investigations and assessments;

(IV) domestic terrorism-related incidents, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, the number of deaths and injuries resulting from each incident, and a detailed explanation of each incident;

(V) Federal domestic terrorism-related arrests, including the number of arrests from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each arrest;

(VI) Federal domestic terrorism-related indictments, including the number of indictments from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each indictment;

(VII) Federal domestic terrorism-related prosecutions, including the number of incidents from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each prosecution;

(VIII) Federal domestic terrorism-related convictions, including the number of convictions from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism, and a detailed explanation of each conviction; and

(IX) Federal domestic terrorism-related weapons recoveries, including the number of each type of weapon and the number of weapons from each classification and subcategory, with a specific classification or subcategory for those related to White supremacism; and

(ii) an explanation of each individual case that progressed through more than 1 of the stages described under clause (i), including the specific classification or subcategory for each case.

(3) HATE CRIMES.—In compiling a joint report under this subsection, the domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall, in consultation with the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice and the Civil Rights Unit of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, review each hate crime incident reported during the preceding 180-day period to determine whether the incident also constitutes a domestic terrorism-related incident.

(4) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of the report, posted on the public websites of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(c) DOMESTIC TERRORISM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.—There is authorized a Domestic Terrorism Executive Committee, which shall—

(1) meet on a regular basis, and not less regularly than 4 times each year, to coordinate with United States Attorneys and other key public safety officials across the country to promote information sharing and ensure

an effective, responsive, and organized joint effort to combat domestic terrorism; and

(2) be co-chaired by—

(A) the Domestic Terrorism Counsel authorized under subsection (a)(2)(B);

(B) a United States Attorney or Assistant United States Attorney;

(C) a member of the National Security Division of the Department of Justice; and

(D) a member of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(d) FOCUS ON GREATEST THREATS.—The domestic terrorism offices authorized under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) shall focus their limited resources on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the number of domestic terrorism-related incidents from each category and subclassification in the joint report for the preceding 180-day period required under subsection (b).

## SEC. 5. TRAINING TO COMBAT DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) REQUIRED TRAINING AND RESOURCES.—The Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall review the anti-terrorism training and resource programs of their respective agencies that are provided to Federal, State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies, including the State and Local Anti-Terrorism Program that is funded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance of the Department of Justice, and ensure that such programs include training and resources to assist State, local, and Tribal law enforcement agencies in understanding, detecting, deterring, and investigating acts of domestic terrorism and White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of law enforcement and corrections agencies. The domestic-terrorism training shall focus on the most significant domestic terrorism threats, as determined by the quantitative analysis in the joint report required under section 4(b).

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Any individual who provides domestic terrorism training required under this section shall have—

(1) expertise in domestic terrorism; and

(2) relevant academic, law enforcement, or other community-based experience in matters related to domestic terrorism.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and twice each year thereafter, the Secretary, the Attorney General, and the Director shall each submit a biannual report to the committees of Congress described in section 4(b)(1) on the domestic terrorism training implemented by their respective agencies under this section, which shall include copies of all training materials used and the names and qualifications of the individuals who provide the training.

(2) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) unclassified, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of each report, posted on the public website of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

## SEC. 6. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense shall establish an interagency task force to analyze and combat White supremacist and neo-Nazi infiltration of the uniformed services and Federal law enforcement agencies

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the interagency task force is established

under subsection (a), the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense shall submit a joint report on the findings of the task force, and the response of the Attorney General, the Director, the Secretary, and the Secretary of Defense to such findings, to—

(A) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(C) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives.

(2) CLASSIFICATION AND PUBLIC RELEASE.—The report submitted under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) submitted in unclassified form, to the greatest extent possible, with a classified annex only if necessary; and

(B) in the case of the unclassified portion of the report, posted on the public website of the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

#### SEC. 7. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE SUPPORT FOR HATE CRIME INCIDENTS WITH A NEXUS TO DOMESTIC TERRORISM.

(a) COMMUNITY RELATIONS SERVICE.—The Community Relations Service of the Department of Justice, authorized under section 1001(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000g), shall offer the support of the Service to communities where the Department of Justice has brought charges in a hate crime incident that has a nexus to domestic terrorism.

(b) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—Section 249 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—The Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall assign a special agent or hate crimes liaison to each field office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate hate crimes incidents with a nexus to domestic terrorism (as such term is defined in section 3 of the Domestic Terrorism Prevention Act of 2020).”

#### SEC. 8. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Justice, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Homeland Security, and the Department of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 469—SUPPORTING THE PEOPLE OF IRAN AS THEY ENGAGE IN LEGITIMATE PROTESTS, AND CONDEMNING THE IRANIAN REGIME FOR ITS MURDEROUS RESPONSE

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MCSALLY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 469

Whereas Iran began experiencing severe political unrest following the increase of fuel prices in November 2019;

Whereas reports state that the November 2019 protests were the deadliest period of political unrest since the Islamic Revolution occurred in 1979, resulting in the deaths of hundreds of Iranian citizens;

Whereas, spurred by the shooting down of a Ukrainian airliner by the Iranian military and the Government of Iran's subsequent denial, thousands of Iranian protesters, undeterred by water cannons, tear gas, and the reported use of live ammunition, continue their legitimate protest against a corrupt regime, hoping that their efforts will result in a brighter future for all Iranians, not just the elite;

Whereas, on January 10, 2020, during a press briefing at the White House concerning new tough sanctions on Iran, Secretary Pompeo stated, “These sanctions targets include the Secretary of the Supreme National Council and the Commander of the Basij Forces; that's the regime's brute squad, which has, in the last few months, killed approximately 1,500 Iranians who were simply demanding freedom.”;

Whereas, on January 11, 2020, Iran's only Olympic medalist, Kimia Alizadeh, announced her defection from Iran, stating that she was “one of the millions of oppressed women in Iran” and that she had defected due to “hypocrisy, lies, injustice, and flattery” of the Iranian regime;

Whereas, on January 11, 2020, Secretary Pompeo tweeted, “The voice of the Iranian people is clear. They are fed up with the regime's lies, corruption, ineptitude, and brutality of the IRGC under @khamenei\_ir's kleptocracy. We stand with the Iranian people who deserve a better future”;

Whereas, on January 12, 2020, in a tweet directed towards Iranian leaders, President Trump stated, “Thousands have already been killed or imprisoned by you, and the World is watching. More importantly, the USA is watching”;

Whereas the United States Government supports the rights of all people to peaceably assemble and allow for substantive discourse, and it is deeply troubling that a government would ignore the concerns of its citizens as the Government of Iran has continually done; and

Whereas, now more than ever, it is imperative that all nations support the people of Iran as they protest a government that for far too long has ignored the needs of its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) stands with the people of Iran, hopeful for change, as they protest their corrupt and oppressive government;

(2) condemns the lethal crackdown by the Iranian regime on the peaceful protestors;

(3) calls on all peaceful and law abiding nations to support the legitimate protests by the Iranian people; and

(4) demands that the Iranian leadership be held accountable for their murderous actions against their own citizens who want nothing less than to be represented by a fair and just government.

### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1279. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1280. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1281. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, supra; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SA 1282. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. ROMNEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2547, to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China.

### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1279. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

In section 1, insert after paragraph (4) the following:

(5) On January 2, 2020, United States personnel killed terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani during the course of a targeted strike against terrorists engaged in planning attacks against United States persons and personnel.

SA 1280. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

In section 1, insert after paragraph (4) the following:

(5) Members of the United States Armed Forces and intelligence community, and all those involved in the planning of the January 2, 2020, strike, including President Trump, should be commended for their efforts in a successful mission.

SA 1281. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution S.J. Res. 63, to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities against the Islamic Republic of Iran that have not been authorized by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations; as follows:

On page 5, line 18, insert “or to restrict missions related to force protection of United States aircraft, ships, or personnel” after “attack”.

SA 1282. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. ROMNEY) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2547, to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China; as follows:

In section 2, strike paragraph (5) and insert the following:

(5) A critical objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military of the People's Republic of China on a

path toward transparency and nonaggression.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 2 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 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 14, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed roundtable.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3193

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3193) to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl-related substances as schedule I controlled substances, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask unanimous consent for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of Rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WARSAW UPRISING

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 339, S. Res. 375.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 375) recognizing the 75th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations without amendment, and with an amendment to the preamble as follows:

Whereas, October 2, 2019, marks the 75th anniversary of the tragic conclusion to the War-

saw Uprising, a landmark event during World War II, in which brave citizens of Poland revolted against the German Nazi occupation of the city of Warsaw in the face of daunting and seemingly insurmountable odds;

Whereas the Warsaw Uprising, which was part of a nationwide resistance against the German Nazi occupation of Poland and lasted for 63 days, was started by the Polish Home Army, the underground resistance effort that included many young and brave individuals;

Whereas the Warsaw Uprising occurred just over a year after the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising in April 1943, which was the single largest act of Jewish resistance against forces of Nazi Germany;

Whereas, after the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising, the remaining Jewish Poles from Warsaw were sent to the Treblinka extermination camp, the Majdanek labor camp, or other forced-labor camps;

Whereas, beginning August 1, 1944, the Polish Home Army fought against the German Nazi occupation of Warsaw, using mostly homemade weapons and far outnumbered by the overwhelming German Nazi force, at a cost of approximately 200,000 citizens of Poland killed, wounded, or missing;

Whereas Adolf Hitler ordered the annihilation of the city of Warsaw and the extermination of its citizens as punishment for the uprising, decimating 80 percent of Warsaw with no regard for the lives of the citizens of Warsaw or for the rich heritage of historic architecture in Warsaw;

Whereas a Soviet-led army halted its march toward the city of Berlin at the banks of the Vistula River on the specific orders of Stalin to allow the German Nazis to decimate the Poles;

Whereas, throughout the Warsaw Uprising, many people fled the city of Warsaw, remained in hiding, or were wounded or killed, and the surviving population of Warsaw, which once totaled more than 1,300,000 people, was then sent to prisoner of war camps and endured harsh conditions;

Whereas, after World War II, thousands of Polish refugees fled from Poland due to persecution and came to the United States for safety, security, and new opportunities;

Whereas the deep, rich history and traditions of immigrants from Poland who settled in the United States, particularly in the States of Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, and Wisconsin, have undeniably shaped the social fabric and foundation of the United States;

Whereas, in the 20th century, Cleveland, Ohio; Buffalo, New York; Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Detroit, Michigan; and Chicago, Illinois; served as the major epicenters for immigrants and workers from Poland whose remarkable contributions to industry led to the incorporation of new towns and the subsequent growth of those towns;

Whereas the heroic actions of the Polish underground resistance during World War II and the brave citizenry of Poland provide a valuable lesson in perseverance and patriotism;

Whereas the legacy of the Warsaw Uprising serves as one of the most poignant reminders of the human cost of the Allied war effort during World War II to defeat Adolf Hitler and the German Nazis; and

Whereas the bravery demonstrated by the citizens of Poland during the Warsaw Uprising continues to inspire people throughout the world who are subjected to tyranny and oppression and who join the fight for freedom, democracy, and the pursuit of liberty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 75th anniversary of the Warsaw Uprising;

(2) commends the bravery, heroism, and patriotism of the individuals who fought as part of the Polish Home Army in order to liberate Poland from German Nazi occupation; and

(3) honors the memory of the soldiers and civilians whose lives were lost during the fighting, and the individuals who suffered in concentration camps and death camps during World War II and the Holocaust.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to; the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 375) was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

#### RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF SUSTAINED UNITED STATES LEADERSHIP TO ACCELERATING GLOBAL PROGRESS AGAINST MATERNAL AND CHILD MALNUTRITION AND SUPPORTING THE COMMITMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO GLOBAL NUTRITION THROUGH THE MULTI-SECTORAL NUTRITION STRATEGY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 379, S. Res. 260.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 260) recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership to accelerating global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to global nutrition through the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy.

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

Whereas of all children under 5 worldwide—  
(1) 149,000,000, or 21.9 percent, are stunted or chronically undernourished;  
(2) an estimated 7.3 percent, or nearly 49,000,000, experience life-threatening acute malnutrition (also known as “wasting”); and  
(3) more than 40,000,000 are overweight;

Whereas, in countries highly affected by undernutrition, stunting affects 1 in every 3 children;

Whereas malnutrition directly or indirectly causes 45 percent of all deaths of children under 5 years of age, a total of 2,600,000 deaths annually;

Whereas undernourished adolescent girls often suffer impaired cognitive ability and productivity, and the future children of those girls are at increased risk for low birth weight and death;

Whereas iron deficiency anemia, associated with undernutrition, contributes to 1 in 5 maternal deaths, or 20 percent of maternal mortality;

Whereas poor maternal nutrition contributes to poor fetal development and low birth weight,

and an estimated 60 to 80 percent of neonatal deaths occur in low-birth-weight babies;

Whereas a large body of evidence supports the benefits of improved breastfeeding practices on the short-term and long-term health and development of children and their mothers;

Whereas a growing body of evidence indicates that reducing maternal and child malnutrition, especially in the critical 1,000-day period between the beginning of pregnancy and the second birthday of the child, is imperative to—

(1) ending preventable child and maternal deaths;

(2) improving IQ, and physical, brain and cognitive development; and

(3) strengthening the immune systems of children;

Whereas combatting malnutrition is an economic issue, as well as a global health issue, that is central to reducing poverty and putting communities on a path toward greater self-reliance and economic growth;

Whereas research indicates that—

(1) adults who were well nourished as children earn up to 46 percent more than adults who were malnourished as children;

(2) countries with a very high burden of early malnutrition have lower economic growth rates resulting from lost income and productivity; and

(3) the cost of child malnutrition is substantial, with estimated losses in Gross Domestic Product of 3 to 16 percent and potential impacts to the global economy as high as \$3,500,000,000 per year;

Whereas leading economists and Nobel Laureates have identified improving child nutrition as the most cost-effective way to improve global health outcomes and enhance development;

Whereas the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) recognizes that it is in the national interest of the United States to help developing countries reduce malnutrition by addressing the direct and underlying causes of malnutrition;

Whereas the linkage between humanitarian assistance and development programming under the USAID Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy helps build resilience to shocks and stresses in vulnerable communities, promotes greater self-reliance, and is essential to reducing long-term reliance upon other forms of United States foreign assistance;

Whereas, in addition to providing bilateral support, the United States plays a leading role in supporting the goals of Scaling Up Nutrition, a global movement of 60 countries to prioritize nutrition through effective policy and dedicated national resources, particularly during the 1,000-day window of opportunity between the beginning of pregnancy and the second birthday of the child; and

Whereas, despite the significant progress in reducing undernutrition since 1990, global progress has been too slow—

(1) to ensure that undernutrition no longer inhibits a child's ability to attain a full and prosperous future; and

(2) for the global community to reach the global nutrition targets set for 2025; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,  
That the Senate—

(1) recognizes that—

(A) malnutrition is a universal issue that no country can afford to overlook;

(B) food security and good nutrition in early childhood saves lives and lays the foundation for healthy physical and cognitive growth and development; and

(C) the potential life-long health and economic benefits of early childhood nutrition influence the future of individual children and families, as well as entire communities and countries;

(2) acknowledges that effective programs to reduce malnutrition are not only lifesaving, but

also critical to the success of United States foreign assistance programs to improve global health, end preventable child and maternal death, achieve an AIDS-free generation, reach starving children during an emergency, strengthen food security, and accelerate inclusive economic growth;

(3) affirms that it is in the national interest of the United States to help developing countries build their own capacity to reduce malnutrition, address the direct and indirect causes of malnutrition, and meet the nutritional needs of women and children;

(4) recognizes the effectiveness of the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy of USAID, the U.S. Government Global Nutrition Coordination Plan, and the U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy to address the direct and indirect causes of malnutrition and reach, by 2025, the global nutrition targets agreed to at the World Health Assembly in 2012;

(5) supports the goals and principles of the Scaling Up Nutrition movement to end global malnutrition through—

(A) greater collaboration between governments, civil society, international organizations, donors, the private sector, and researchers on multi-sectoral approaches;

(B) cost-effective and inclusive approaches; and

(C) improved transparency and accountability for results;

(6) recognizes the significant progress made in the fight against global malnutrition,

(7) recommends accelerating improvements to the systems affecting the health and nutritional status of women and children through innovative, scaled-up approaches;

(8) applauds the efforts of USAID to integrate effective nutrition programming across relevant development sectors; and

(9) calls for additional transformative efforts across relevant sectors at USAID to accelerate progress toward ending maternal and child malnutrition, including through—

(A) country development cooperation strategies that align with national nutrition plans; and

(B) improved and clear methods to track nutrition funding and outcomes across all global nutrition programs of the United States Government, especially those relating to—

(i) global health;

(ii) food security;

(iii) agricultural development;

(iv) basic education;

(v) food assistance; and

(vi) water, sanitation, and hygiene (also known as “WASH”).

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment to the resolution be agreed to; that the resolution, as amended, be agreed to; that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to; that the pre-amble, as amended, be agreed to; that the committee-reported title amendment be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 260), as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The committee-reported title amendment was agreed to as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “A resolution recognizing the importance of sustained United States leadership to accelerating global progress against maternal and child malnutrition and supporting the commitment of the United States Agency for International Development to reducing global malnutrition through the Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy.”.

## INDO-PACIFIC COOPERATION ACT OF 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 363, S. 2547.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2547) to state the policy of the United States with respect to the expansion of cooperation with allies and partners in the Indo-Pacific region and Europe regarding the People's Republic of China.

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

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Indo-Pacific Cooperation Act of 2019”.

### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress supports the finding on the People's Republic of China articulated in the 2018 National Defense Strategy and the 2017 National Security Strategy.

(2) The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409) established the policy of the United States “to develop and commit to a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region” so as to advance United States national security, economic, human rights, and other regional interests, and for such purposes, Congress has authorized appropriate funding.

(3) The People's Republic of China is leveraging military modernization, influence operations, and predatory economics to coerce neighboring countries to reorder the Indo-Pacific region to the advantage of the People's Republic of China.

(4) As the People's Republic of China continues its economic and military ascendance, asserting power through a whole of government long-term strategy, the People's Republic of China will continue to pursue a military modernization program that seeks Indo-Pacific regional hegemony in the near-term and displacement of the United States to achieve global preeminence in the future.

(5) The most far-reaching objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military relationship between the United States and the People's Republic of China on a path toward transparency and nonaggression.

(6) The People's Republic of China uses economic inducements and penalties, influence operations, and implied military threats to persuade other countries to heed the political and security agenda of the People's Republic of China.

(7) United States allies and partners are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China.

### SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to expand military, diplomatic, and economic alliances and partnerships in the Indo-

*Pacific region and with Europe and like-minded countries around the globe that are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China;*

*(2) to develop, in collaboration with such allies and partners, a unified approach to addressing and deterring significant diplomatic, economic, and military challenges posed by the People's Republic of China; and*

*(3) to promote, in partnership with like-minded countries around the globe, the values of democracy and human rights.*

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Romney amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; that the committee-reported substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 1282) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: To modify a finding relating to the defense strategy of the United States)

In section 2, strike paragraph (5) and insert the following:

(5) A critical objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military of the People's Republic of China on a path toward transparency and nonaggression.

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

The bill (S. 2547), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2547

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Indo-Pacific Cooperation Act of 2019".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Congress supports the finding on the People's Republic of China articulated in the 2018 National Defense Strategy and the 2017 National Security Strategy.

(2) The Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409) established the policy of the United States "to develop and commit to a long-term strategic vision and a comprehensive, multifaceted, and principled United States policy for the Indo-Pacific region" so as to advance United States national security, economic, human rights, and other regional interests, and for such purposes, Congress has authorized appropriate funding.

(3) The People's Republic of China is leveraging military modernization, influence operations, and predatory economics to coerce neighboring countries to reorder the Indo-Pacific region to the advantage of the People's Republic of China.

(4) As the People's Republic of China continues its economic and military ascendance, asserting power through a whole of government long-term strategy, the People's Republic of China will continue to pursue a military modernization program that seeks Indo-Pacific regional hegemony in the near-term and displacement of the United States to achieve global preeminence in the future.

(5) A critical objective of the defense strategy of the United States is to set the military of the People's Republic of China on a path toward transparency and nonaggression.

(6) The People's Republic of China uses economic inducements and penalties, influence operations, and implied military threats to persuade other countries to heed the political and security agenda of the People's Republic of China.

(7) United States allies and partners are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China.

#### SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to expand military, diplomatic, and economic alliances and partnerships in the Indo-Pacific region and with Europe and like-minded countries around the globe that are critical to effective competition with the People's Republic of China;

(2) to develop, in collaboration with such allies and partners, a unified approach to ad-

ressing and deterring significant diplomatic, economic, and military challenges posed by the People's Republic of China; and

(3) to promote, in partnership with like-minded countries around the globe, the values of democracy and human rights.

#### ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2020

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, January 15; 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 that the Senate then proceed to 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.

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:50 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, January 15, 2020, at 10 a.m.

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 14, 2020:

#### DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

PETER GAYNOR, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.