

from defending U.S. citizens, U.S. interests, and our allies. This is not only my opinion; it is the carefully considered conclusion of the U.S. Department of Defense.

In its letter on June 26 to Chairman INHOFE, it states this, referring to the Udall amendment:

“The Department strongly opposes this amendment . . . At a time when Iran is engaging in escalating military provocation . . . this amendment could embolden Iran to further provocations.”

Tying the President’s hands in some undefined way in the midst of the current crisis is misguided, dangerous, and surely sends the wrong message to both Iran and to our allies.

Last week, the Iranians continued their provocative escalation in the Middle East. After weeks of buildup in which Iran attacked six commercial ships, and its proxies bombed an oil pipeline and launched a rocket into a commercial Saudi Arabian airport, Iran shot down an American drone over international waters.

The Udall amendment raises serious questions about how the military could respond to these attacks after the fact. Could we fire on the missile launcher that downed our drone? Could we sink one of their small, outboard motor vessels that attached the mines to the ships that were attacked?

Imagine for a moment that in the future, another American aircraft, perhaps one that is manned by an American pilot, were to be shot down by an Iranian rocket. It is possible that the Udall amendment would limit our military’s options to subsequently respond to such an outrage.

I don’t pretend to know whether Iran will continue its pattern of aggression, but I do know that when bad actors think they can escape consequence for malevolent acts, such acts are more likely to occur in the future.

I am glad that Senator UDALL’s revised amendment concedes the broad point that our military has the inherent right of self-defense. But in the case of a rocket hitting one of our planes, the President should not have his hands tied in responding after such an attack in an appropriate manner.

Note also that while the Udall amendment provides for the military to defend itself from attack, it does not provide for the defense of our citizens. Iran could take this as an invitation to attack Americans abroad.

Further, it would prohibit our military from defending or responding to an attack by Iran on our Iraqi partners so long as it didn’t directly hit American troops. Passing the Udall amendment would effectively give a green light to Iranian forces to carry out attacks in Iraq so long as they don’t attack U.S. forces.

If Iran were to attack Israel, one of our NATO allies, the Udall amendment would not allow the President to respond.

Finally, by carving out Iranian territory, the Udall amendment would po-

tentially prevent us from pursuing and taking out terrorists who seek refuge in Iran.

I oppose the Udall amendment not because I want to go to war with Iran or rush to respond without carefully evaluating our long-term strategy to counter Iranian aggression. I know no one who wants to go to war with Iran.

I fully concur with my many Senate colleagues who desire to reassert the constitutional role of Congress in declaring war. But to engage in this effort now, and in an undefined way, and then to attach that to Iran when Iran has just shot down an American aircraft would send a terrible message to the Ayatollahs and to the world.

I mean, think about it. Iran shoots down an American aircraft, and what does the U.S. Senate rush to do? It rushes to vote in some undefined way to restrict military consequence. That is simply unthinkable.

My amendment is not about Iran. It does not even mention Iran. My amendment is about affirming the constitutional authorities that any President must have to properly protect and defend this Nation.

As the Department of Defense maintains, the President of the United States must always have the option of responding to attacks by Iran or anyone else at a time and place of our choosing—today and in the future.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 764, as modified, to S. 1790, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

James M. Inhofe, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, Deb Fischer, Mitch McConnell, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, John Thune, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, John Boozman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 764, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, as modified, to S. 1790, an original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths

for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 87, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 186 Leg.]

YEAS—87

Alexander	Feinstein	Peters
Baldwin	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Reed
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blumenthal	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rosen
Braun	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Johnson	Shaheen
Casey	Jones	Shelby
Cassidy	Kaine	Sinema
Collins	Kennedy	Smith
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	Young

NAYS—7

Booker	Markey	Wyden
Klobuchar	Merkley	
Lee	Paul	

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Rounds	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 87, the nays are 7.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

AMENDMENT NOS. 864, 863, AND 862 WITHDRAWN

Under the previous order, amendment Nos. 864, 863, and 862 are withdrawn.

The Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 861

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 2 minutes, equally divided.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am voting in favor of the Romney amendment, No. 861, because it does nothing more than restate the longstanding principle that the Armed Forces of the United States have the ability to defend themselves and citizens of the United States from foreign attack. The

amendment does not constitute an authorization to use military force, nor is there anything in the amendment that confers any new authority on the President.

As Senator ROMNEY, the author of the amendment, stated on the floor a half-hour ago, “[t]his [amendment] is not an authorization to use military force against Iran or anyone else. . . . Under the Constitution, only Congress may declare war.”

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, I will reassert the same thing I just heard from the minority leader. I appreciate his words.

This amendment would reaffirm a basic principle. The United States has the right to defend itself and our citizens when attacked. It asserts what has always been a bedrock constitutional principle. This is not an AUMF. It is not an authorization for the use of military force.

Passing my amendment today would send a strong signal to our adversaries that we will defend ourselves if our interests, our people, our military, our allies are threatened and attacked.

My amendment is something that I believe everyone in this body can and should support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to recommit and the amendments pending thereto fall.

All postcloture time is expired.

The question is on agreeing to amendment (No. 861), offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, on behalf of the Senator from Utah, Mr. ROMNEY.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), 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 90, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 187 Leg.]

YEAS—90

Alexander	Capito	Crapo
Baldwin	Cardin	Cruz
Barrasso	Carper	Daines
Blackburn	Casey	Durbin
Blumenthal	Cassidy	Enzi
Blunt	Collins	Ernst
Boozman	Cooms	Feinstein
Braun	Cornyn	Fischer
Brown	Cortez Masto	Gardner
Burr	Cotton	Graham
Cantwell	Cramer	Grassley

Hassan	Menendez	Scott (FL)
Hawley	Merkley	Scott (SC)
Heinrich	Moran	Shaheen
Hoeben	Murkowski	Shelby
Hyde-Smith	Murphy	Sinema
Inhofe	Murray	Smith
Isakson	Paul	Stabenow
Johnson	Perdue	Sullivan
Jones	Peters	Tester
Kaine	Portman	Thune
Kennedy	Reed	Tillis
King	Risch	Toomey
Klobuchar	Roberts	Udall
Lankford	Romney	Van Hollen
Lee	Rosen	Warner
Manchin	Rubio	Whitehouse
Markey	Sasse	Wicker
McConnell	Schatz	Wyden
McSally	Schumer	Young

NAYS—4

Booker	Hirono
Duckworth	Leahy

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Rounds	Warren

The amendment (No. 861) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes on the NDAA.

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

S. 1790

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to speak on the importance of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020 legislation that authorizes \$750 billion for defense, consistent with the administration's budget request and the National Defense Strategy Commission report.

The NDAA is a critical piece of legislation. It supports our Armed Forces, our men and women in uniform, and provides for the defense of our Nation. Among its notable provisions, the bill supports a 3.1-percent pay increase for the members of our armed services, the largest in nearly a decade and very much deserved by the men and women in uniform who protect us.

It establishes a Space Force and ensures that America retains its leadership in this critical domain. It opens the way for significant investments in new weapons systems, such as hypersonic missiles and directed energy weapons along with missile defense and cyber security capabilities. It also responds to concerns about family housing across the Department of Defense.

Importantly, the bill continues to provide for the modernization of our nuclear forces. This legislation fully authorizes fiscal year 2020 spending on our nuclear deterrent, including support for all three legs of the Nation's nuclear triad. It also fully authorizes the warhead life extension programs at the Department of Energy.

I want to highlight a couple of amendments I worked on and are included in the legislation relative to modernizing our nuclear triad. One of the amendments that has been included requires that the Air Force and the National Nuclear Security Administration report to Congress on the de-

velopment of the next intercontinental ballistic missile and the W87-1, which is a modified warhead that will be placed on the new ICBM for decades to come.

It is vital that the Air Force's missile development program, known as the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent, GBSD, be synchronized with the W87-1 warhead so that a decade from now, we have a complete new weapons system that is ready for deployment. My amendment will help ensure that the deployment will happen on schedule and avoid unnecessary delays in that development.

The other amendment highlights the importance of our Nation's ICBM force and demonstrates how ICBMs enhance deterrence as a part of the triad. ICBMs provide the most prompt and most dispersed segment of our nuclear forces, and they magnify the deterrent power of our nuclear triad.

I commend my colleagues for their support of these amendments, which is a strong statement of the continuing importance of the ICBM and the need to ensure that it is modernized along with the rest of our nuclear forces in order to keep us safe.

The bill is also critically important for military activities in my home State of North Dakota. Specifically, we worked to secure a number of provisions to support the missions at the Minot Air Force Base, which is home to two of the three legs of the nuclear triad. Importantly, the NDAA authorizes funding for B-52s, including the procurement of new engines. As a member of the Senate Defense Appropriations Committee, I have worked to authorize and appropriate money for new engines which will help modernize the B-52 and extend its life for years to come.

The NDAA also advances replacement of the Vietnam-era Huey helicopters that provide security for the missile fields, and it supports the construction of a new helicopter facility at Minot to house the Huey replacement. It also makes a strong commitment to the Long-Range Stand Off, LRSO, Program that will provide a new nuclear cruise missile for the B-52, as well as continuing to advance the investments in GBSD.

The bill also supports priorities at Grand Forks Air Force Base, which is home to the Global Hawk, which provides important intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities for the Air Force. In fact, it was the Navy version of the Global Hawk which was recently shot down in the Strait of Hormuz by Iran.

The bill authorizes more than \$240 million for the Global Hawk Program and more than \$115 million for the Battlefield Airborne Communications Node that is carried on the Global Hawk Block 20 aircraft. These investments in the Global Hawk have been a priority because the Global Hawk BACN system is urgently needed to provide communications support for operations around the world.

Finally, I would like to emphasize support for items that some of my colleagues put forward that I think are critically important both for my State and for the Nation as a whole.

I am pleased to cosponsor an amendment from Senator GRAHAM that commits us over the next decade to building our capacity to produce plutonium pits. We must build up this capacity so we can extend the life of our nuclear stockpile and preserve our nuclear deterrent in the future.

I also cosponsored an amendment from Senator MURKOWSKI that requires the Defense Department to report on Russian and Chinese activities in the Arctic, which is an area of the world where we need to build up our capabilities in the coming years.

I would similarly express my support for Senator HAWLEY's amendment that requires a report from our military commanders on their ability to deter aggressive actions from Russia and China. I hope that can be included on this legislation as well.

The bill also includes an important provision from Senator KLOBUCHAR that I cosponsored to help ensure that the children of National Guard and Reserve servicemembers have access to additional support services in schools.

I cosponsored a provision from Senator BALDWIN, who joins me on the floor today, that will protect veterans' benefits if and when they have to file for bankruptcy. I am pleased to cosponsor her amendment.

All of these items demonstrate just what a large undertaking the National Defense Authorization Act really is. It includes thousands of provisions and represents a lot of work from many Members in support of our military servicemembers and their families.

I look forward to passing the legislation today and moving it to conference and getting it enacted into law for our men and women in uniform.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

FOURTH OF JULY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I am so grateful we had the opportunity to be on the floor this week and to have a discussion about our Nation's security and how we protect and preserve freedom. I have just a couple of thoughts that I wanted to bring forward as we begin to think about July 4th and Independence Day and how we commemorate that day and do honor to the heritage and the tradition of that day and of the freedoms that we enjoy.

I came across something this week that I think is just so pertinent to our discussions of this week as we focus on freedom. In 1826, a very feeble and old John Adams received a group of Quincy, MA, town leaders. They were seeking his help in planning an anniversary celebration of the Declaration of Independence. They wanted the former President to pen a toast that would be read at the event. Imagine their sur-

prise when what they got from John Adams was two words. The toast that he penned for them was simply this: "Independence forever." It is what we had fought for, what had been won, what people had desired, and their passion—*independence*.

Keeping that independence is indeed the task. I am certain they wanted something much more ambitious and eloquent, but they simply got the nugget of what centered him and what should center us.

In the Declaration, our Founding Fathers recognized that "Governments long established should not be changed for light and transient causes," but that true liberty could not thrive in the grasp of tyranny.

Today, freedom reveals itself in the lives and actions of every American, and it is our responsibility to preserve it on the battlefield and through our actions each and every single day.

With every confirmation of a district or a circuit court judge, we preserve an essential right guaranteed by the First Amendment—the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Earlier this month, I introduced a resolution supporting free speech on college campuses because it is beyond distressing to hear students and their professors argue that encouraging the open exchange of ideas amounts to an act of violence. Our Founding Fathers probably never dreamed they would hear of such a thing. This proud hostility toward diversity of thought should serve as a reminder that questions of freedom rarely remain settled.

Last week, famed economist Dr. Art Laffer, who is a beloved Tennessean, was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. The "father of supply-side economics" only became so because he was free to learn and apply the knowledge that he gained to his own groundbreaking work that led to the Laffer curve.

Looking beyond Washington, it is easy to see many more examples of freedom in action each and every day.

Every Tuesday, my friend and fellow Senator, LAMAR ALEXANDER, hosts "Tennessee Tuesday." This gives us an opportunity to meet with Tennesseans who have come to Washington. They are students, small businessmen, writers, and teachers. They have a host of talents that they share, and they have been allowed to invest in those talents.

Back home in Nashville, we enjoy the artistry of some of the world's most talented songwriters, singers, and producers. Guess what. In the United States of America, they do not have to go seek permission from any government official to write a song about a broken heart or any other act of injustice that they want to write that song about, sing that song about, or write that screenplay about.

The connections we form with each other—whether it be through art, song, or a conversation at a cash register—all run deep. The thoughts and emotions we experience when confronted

with provocative ideas are just as much a celebration of freedom as is a flag-raising ceremony or a fireworks display. This is why the very idea of censorship or a global standard of speech and association rouses immediate dissent.

We know that these collective understandings regarding a particular type of speech or behavior inevitably lead to collective insistence that the problems of the world could be resolved if only we could agree to compromise on the finer points of freedom. Those understandings assume that the intellectual comfort of the many simply must, just this once, override the ideas of the vocal minority.

As we prepare to leave Washington in anticipation of Independence Day, I would encourage my friends in Congress to challenge their own ideas of what freedom looks like. How do they exercise it and enjoy it every day? While John Adams probably never imagined a world of cable news and the comments sections, he provided us with the only context we need when confronted with the choice of preserving freedom or allowing it to slip away—his admonition: "Independence forever."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE STONEWALL UPRISING

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to mark the 50th anniversary of a critical milestone in our Nation's march toward equality—the Stonewall uprising of June 28, 1969.

The Stonewall Inn, which opened in 1967 on Christopher Street in Greenwich Village in New York City, was one of many establishments in cities across this country that served as sanctuaries for members of the LGBTQ community from persecution by police and by society at large.

In the late 1960s, every State in America, save one, criminalized same-sex relationships. Many State and local governments also had harsh laws that restricted the ability of transgender people to express their identities, and LGBTQ people were prohibited from gathering socially. As a result, LGBTQ individuals in places like Stonewall Inn, where they gathered, were targeted frequently by law enforcement, including the New York City Police Department. However, by the late 1960s, LGBTQ individuals had already begun to stand up to police harassment, including at places like Cooper Do-nuts in Los Angeles in 1959, Compton's Cafeteria in San Francisco in 1966, and the Black Cat Tavern in Los Angeles in 1967.

In the early morning hours of June 28, 1969, the NYPD raided the Stonewall Inn and arrested several people, just as it had done repeatedly over the days, weeks, and months prior. But this night was different. A few brave individuals—particularly transgender women of color, like Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera—stood up and

fought back against this injustice. That night, they sparked an uprising against the NYPD with confrontations and protests at the Stonewall Inn and the surrounding area that lasted over the course of 6 days, until July 3, 1969.

The Stonewall uprising empowered thousands of LGBTQ individuals to emerge from shadows and to come out publicly as they stood up for their community the night of June 28, 1969, and beyond, putting their lives and their safety at risk.

Along with public protests in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, Washington, DC, and elsewhere, the Stonewall uprising became a catalyst for the LGBTQ civil rights movement to secure social and political equality and inspired the formation of many advocacy organizations.

A year later, members of the LGBTQ community commemorated the first anniversary of Stonewall and reaffirmed the solidarity of the community by organizing the first Pride marches and events in New York City, San Francisco, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Now, we remember and celebrate the Stonewall uprising every year in June as Pride Month.

Three years ago, President Obama declared the Stonewall Inn and its surrounding area a national monument, becoming the first national monument to commemorate the LGBTQ civil rights movement.

Last month, New York City announced that it would dedicate a monument honoring pioneering transgender activists and key leaders in the Stonewall uprising, including Marsha P. Johnson and Sylvia Rivera. It would be the first public monument in the world honoring transgender women.

Just a few weeks ago, the NYPD Commissioner issued an official apology on behalf of the department stating: "The actions taken by the NYPD were wrong—plain and simple."

I was just a kid when the Stonewall uprising happened. I didn't hear about Stonewall on the news or even learn about it later in my history class. It wasn't until I was in college when, as a part of my own coming out process, I began to research the history of the gay rights movement and I learned more about the events at Stonewall, the people involved, and the movement that it created.

Five years after Stonewall, in 1974, Kathy Kozachenko became the first openly gay person elected to political office in the United States, winning a seat on the Ann Arbor City Council in Michigan. Three years later, in 1977, Harvey Milk was elected to the San Francisco City Council.

In 1986, I had the honor of winning election to the Dane County Board of Supervisors in Madison, WI. It was my first role in elected office, but I wasn't the first. In fact, I was the third openly gay person to serve on the Dane Coun-

ty Board. I was really fortunate to have role models who had come before me.

In 1998, I became the first openly gay person elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a nonincumbent, and, in 2012, I became the first out member of the LGBTQ community to be elected to the U.S. Senate in its history.

I remember my early years in public office when there were only about two dozen or so elected officials who were out across the country. We would meet on an annual basis to discuss how we could work together to exchange ideas about legislation that would advance equality, and we talked about how we would help to expand our numbers at the local, State, and national levels. I am proud to say that, today, there are more than 700 out LGBTQ people who are serving in elected office across the United States.

All of these public servants bring their unique life experiences to the job, and they give the LGBTQ community a seat at the table of our local, State, and Federal Governmental bodies. Perhaps just as importantly, each of these public servants is a role model for the next generation. This is important progress, but we are not there yet. We have more work to do, and we must keep fighting to move our country forward.

Members of the LGBTQ community continue to experience bias in policing and are still at significant risk of violence and discrimination. According to the annual hate crimes report, which is published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, LGBTQ individuals and, particularly, LGBTQ individuals of color continue to be the target of bias-motivated violence, but efforts to address this violence may be hindered by a continued lack of trust in law enforcement. At least 100 transgender people, primarily women of color, have been murdered in the United States since the beginning of 2015.

No LGBTQ person in the United States should have to live in fear of being the target of violence. In a majority of States in this country, LGBTQ Americans can still be fired, evicted from their homes, or denied services because of who they are or whom they love. Because there is no explicit, uniform Federal law protecting LGBTQ people from discrimination in education, employment, housing, credit, and more, too many Americans are at the mercy of an inadequate patchwork of State and local laws.

The House took a historic step forward last month when it passed the Equality Act. It is time for the Senate to do the same so that all LGBTQ Americans, no matter where they live, can finally have the freedom of full equality.

This week, I introduced a Senate resolution to honor the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising. It is the first resolution in the U.S. Senate to recognize the story of Stonewall. This reso-

lution commends the bravery, solidarity, and resiliency of the LGBTQ community in the face of violence and discrimination, both past and present. It also condemns violence and discrimination against members of the LGBTQ community and recommits to securing justice, equality, and well-being for LGBTQ people in our country. Stonewall is the story of those who came before us and let their voices be heard—of those who bravely stood up and spoke out so that others would not feel compelled to live in silence or invisibly or in secrecy.

When we look back at the Stonewall uprising and the activism that grew out of that moment, even the most basic progress seemed as if it would take a revolution to achieve—so we had one. We should be proud of the enormous progress that we have made over the last 50 years. Let us remain inspired by the courage of this story, the story of Stonewall.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

S. 1790

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, Congress has no greater responsibility than providing for a strong national defense and keeping American citizens safe.

The National Defense Authorization Act is one of the most important pieces of legislation to be considered by the U.S. Senate. It authorizes the weapons systems, programs, and resources that support the men and women who serve our country in the Armed Forces. For decades, it has been approved with strong, bipartisan support.

In my home State of Colorado, our military installations, including Fort Carson, the Air Force Academy, and Buckley, Peterson, and Schriever Air Force Bases, are on the cutting edge of readiness in protecting our national security. This legislation is foundational to their mission, their work, and our show of support for the military.

I thank Chairman INHOFE and Ranking Member REED for their bipartisan leadership on the Senate Armed Services Committee and on the floor. The tremendous responsibility of providing for national defense cannot be overstated, and they have handled the process with respect and the seriousness that it deserves. The security of the United States should always be more important than any partisan politics, and I appreciate their commitment that they have placed on national defense above all else.

I also thank my colleagues for their bipartisan work on the National Defense Authorization Act. In working with them, I was able to achieve a number of great victories in amendments for Colorado and the Nation as well.

Senator SCHATZ and I have a bipartisan amendment that will improve the public alert system and allow military communities access to clean and safe drinking water, which was another

amendment that we were able to work on.

I was able to work with Senator TOOMEY and Senator VAN HOLLEN—Senators from both sides of the aisle—to impose sanctions on the murderous North Korean regime.

We will also vote today to support a bipartisan effort that I authored that will encourage the U.S. Congress to stand with the people of Hong Kong and their democratic values while we urge Hong Kong's authorities to permanently withdraw their flawed extradition bill and support human rights in Hong Kong.

When one family member serves our country in uniform, the entire family serves. This legislation supports military families in Colorado and all over the world. It provides the largest pay increase in a decade for troops, and it continues to support military spouses. The NDAA addresses the challenges that servicemembers and their families face when they live in privatized housing, and it expands resources to address the PFAS water contamination in many of our military communities. This is an issue of life and health, and it matters greatly to the people of Colorado. I was pleased to work with my colleagues to continue addressing PFAS contamination.

Of course, in Colorado, we are proud to play a very key role in defending the United States. These installations that I talked about are critical to national security and supporting our operations in space. I am thrilled that this year's NDAA authorizes the U.S. Space Force so that the United States can remain a global leader in space and not fall behind China or any other foreign competitor.

Almost everything in today's age relies on space technology—telecommunications, GPS, transportation logistics, precision agriculture, and, of course, the U.S. military. Establishing the U.S. Space Force will better organize the military to handle space operations and will put all military members who work in the space domain under the same organizational umbrella. Colorado is home to the North American Aerospace Defense Command and the U.S. Northern Command, and it is the legacy home of the Air Force Space Command. As we establish the U.S. Space Force, Colorado is uniquely positioned to continue its support of our Nation's military operations in space and the mission set that space involves.

We cannot risk falling behind our foreign competitors in the second space age. In order to guarantee the safety and security of American citizens, we must maintain our leadership in space operations and defense. I urge my colleagues to support the National Defense Authorization Act, which supports defense operations across the globe and the brave women and men who serve in the U.S. military. I will always fight to protect and grow the presence of the U.S. military in Colo-

rado and work to ensure that these bases, which are essential to both national security and Colorado communities, remain strong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to vitiate the yeas and nays on the substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I and Senator JACK REED be given such time as we shall consume prior to the vote that will take place.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, the Senate will vote on the final passage of the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2020.

Throughout the last week and a half, we have debated the legislation here on the Senate floor in a fair process. I thank my colleagues who have supported this bill and have helped to make a better bill through the amendment process. While I would have liked to have had more open amendments—and Senator REED and I both wanted to have more amendments on the floor—we knew that there was a problem and that we could not do that.

We are pleased that we will at least be able to clear the 93 amendments that we added on yesterday as part of the bipartisan substitute amendment in the manager's package. These include the annual Intelligence Authorization Act, the Maritime Administration Authorization and Enhancement Act, and the Fentanyl Sanctions Act.

Ultimately, the job of the NDAA is to make tough choices about where we want to invest our resources. We put our resources where they matter—in taking care of our people, in implementing the national defense strategy, and in applying recommendations from the NDS Strategy Commission Report. This is something we have used as a blueprint, and it has been very successful in taking us through this process.

Everyone agrees there are things that are going to have to happen in order to rebuild our military. That is why our top line is \$750 billion. Without that, we can't achieve the goals that we all know are necessary. It also must happen as soon as possible. We can't delay on this bill.

We still have more work to be done on the NDAA. We need to conference it. The Conference Committee can sometimes take a little bit of time. We know that is going to be done for us. We know that we want to get this thing done by our deadline, which would be October 1.

In the month of July, we have to do a lot of other things. We have to do annual appropriations bills. We have to do the budget deal. So these are some of our most important responsibilities.

We have to get them done, and here is why: Things are happening right now.

Two days ago, MSG Michael B. Riley of Heilbronn, Germany, and SGT James G. Johnston of Trumansburg, NY, lost their lives in Afghanistan while engaged in combat operations. It was tragic.

Their service and sacrifice is a reminder of why this bill is so important. We have to make sure our troops have the very best of everything, and we are in the process of getting there with this bill.

Our prayers are with Master Sergeant Riley's and Sergeant Johnston's families and loved ones. We will never forget their service or their sacrifice that they made, reminding us that freedom is not free.

There is no doubt in my mind that the NDAA we are about to pass will give our troops what they need, make American families safer, and enable to us stand up for democratic values around the world.

Let me single out and thank publicly the next speaker, the ranking member, Senator REED, for being a great partner in this. We stayed together on this. We had areas where we disagreed, but we got around those, we got things done, and the end result is a very good one.

I know Senator REED is going to want to recognize, as I do, the significance of the staff we worked with and why that is so important. Of course, we want to make sure people know—you know, Senator REED and I get a lot of credit for doing a lot of stuff that other people do. We truly appreciate these people.

Let me list some of them. First of all, John Bonsell and Liz King from my staff and from Senator REED's staff. They are the ones who really got involved in this, and we feel, without them, it would have been almost impossible—along with other people.

We had John Wason, Tom Goffus, Stephanie Barna, Diem Salmon, Greg Lilly, Marta Hernandez, Jennie Wright, Adam Barker, Augusta Binns-Berkey, Al Edwards, Jackie Kerber, Sean O'Keefe, Tony Pankuch, Brad Patout, Jason Potter, J.R. Riordan, Katie Sutton, Eric Trager, Dustin Walker, Otis Winkler, Gwyneth Woolwine, Katie Magnus, Arthur Tellis, Leah Brewer, Debbie Chiarello, Gary Howard, Tyler Wilkinson, John Bryant, Patty-Jane Geller, Baher Iskander, Keri-Lyn Michalke, Jacqueline Modestett, and Soleil Sykes.

I have a few more so just relax for a minute.

I think the others are actually from the minority side, and I am sure Senator REED is going to be recognizing them.

From my personal staff, Luke Holland, Andrew Forbes, Leacy Burke, Don Archer, Kyle Stewart, and Bryan Brody.

Lastly, from the floor staff, that is Laura Dove, Robert Duncan, Chris Tuck, Tony Hanagan, Katherine Kilroy, Brian Canfield, Abigail Baker, and Megan Mercer.

All these people worked hard. They are all a part of this team, and it certainly goes far beyond just Senator REED and myself.

I yield the floor to Senator REED.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join Chairman INHOFE in support of the fiscal year 2020 Defense authorization bill. I thank the chairman for his great bipartisan leadership, thoughtful, sensible, and delivering what I think is an excellent piece of legislation.

It was based on thorough hearings, discussions, and debate on both sides of the aisle, and it came out of the committee with strong bipartisan support. I hope it enjoys that support on final passage.

As the chairman indicated, the bill provides for many different aspects that are necessary to our national defense. It provides a pay raise for the men and women of our Armed Forces who do so much for us. It includes over 30 provisions to address the privatized military housing crisis. It authorizes military construction in almost every State in this country. It provides funding and authorities for our military personnel on the frontlines and for those who are back in the United States building the ships and the tanks and advancing the technologies we need for the future fight.

This bill also contains numerous amendments from many of my colleagues, again, on both sides of the aisle, on other issues of great importance, such as the Intelligence Authorization Act, the authorization of the Maritime Administration, and provisions addressing the fentanyl crisis and the dangers of PFOS-PFAS in our water.

There are numerous provisions here that go beyond the narrow definition of the defense establishment. They are bipartisan, and they are strongly supported by both sides of the aisle.

Again, let me thank Senator INHOFE for his leadership. It made a great difference in terms of his approach to this important legislation.

Finally, I would like to thank the committee staff. Particularly, I would like to thank the majority staff and their staff director, John Bonsell. He did a superb job—they did. “Diligence,” “professionalism,” and “bipartisanship” were the watchwords of their efforts. I thank them for that.

Let me thank my staff. In particular, Jody Bennett, Carolyn Chuhta, Jon Clark, Jonathan Epstein, Jorie Feldman, Creighton Greene, Ozge Guzelsu, Gary Leeling, Kirk McConnell, Maggie McNamara, Bill Monahan, Mike Noblet, John Quirk, Arun Seraphin, Fiona Tomlin, and my staff director, Elizabeth King, who, with John Bonsell, did a superb job.

Let me thank the floor staff who have helped us over the last few days immensely.

I urge all of my colleagues to join the chairman and me in supporting this excellent legislation.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 764

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to amendment No. 764, as modified and amended.

The amendment (No. 764), as modified, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title for the third time.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the cloture motion is withdrawn.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. RISCH. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Leg.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Baldwin	Gardner	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Risch
Blackburn	Grassley	Roberts
Blumenthal	Hassan	Romney
Blunt	Hawley	Rosen
Boozman	Heinrich	Rubio
Brown	Hirono	Sasse
Burr	Hoeven	Schatz
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Johnson	Shaheen
Casey	Jones	Shelby
Cassidy	Kaine	Sinema
Collins	Kennedy	Smith
Coons	King	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Leahy	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Perdue	Young
Feinstein	Peters	

NAYS—8

Booker	Lee	Paul
Braun	Markey	Wyden
Klobuchar	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—6

Bennet	Harris	Sanders
Gillibrand	Rounds	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 8.

The 60-vote threshold having been achieved, the bill, as amended, is passed.

The bill (S. 1790), as amended, was passed.

(The bill, as modified, as amended, will be printed in a future edition of the RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the escalating tensions between the United States and Iran, my concern about the administration's current approach—a path that I am worried will lead us to war—and my support for the Udall amendment to the NDAA, which will be voted on tomorrow.

I believe that diplomatic efforts, in concert with our international partners, should be pursued immediately to avoid another unnecessary armed conflict in the Middle East.

Let me be clear. Iran is a dangerous and destabilizing force in the region. It supports terrorist proxies and meddles in the internal affairs of other states. Iran continues to pursue ballistic missile capabilities in violation of international norms and abuses the rights of its own people. Unfortunately, the administration's chosen course of action with respect to Iran has isolated the United States from the international community and made it more difficult to collectively address these issues.

The administration's actions and rhetoric related to Iran have created a credibility deficit. This is a fast-changing and dangerous situation, and it is clear that there is not a consensus within the international community with respect to Iran's plans and intentions.

Given these disconnects, it is imperative for the administration to provide Congress with current, unvarnished intelligence so that we may reach substantiated conclusions.

Taking a step back, it is important to recount the actions that have precipitated the current state of affairs. Current tensions are an entirely predictable outcome of the administration's ill-conceived approach to Iran.