

family who comes across the border the opportunity to keep its family together instead of going through this painful separation from any kind of prosecution that would happen regardless of that prosecution occurring. Give families the opportunity to stay together, make a decision on what they are going to do together, and get this done. That is something the administration can do.

Short of that, I absolutely believe Kirstjen Nielsen, who is our Secretary of Homeland Security, is exactly correct when she says this is Congress's fault. Congress has had the opportunity for a couple of decades now to fix this, and Congress, for a couple of decades, has said that it is not a problem, it is not a problem, it is not a problem.

I and several other Senators and quite a few House Members have continued to weigh this issue and say it is a problem no matter how it is used. Whether it has been used with heavy prosecution or light prosecution in previous administrations, it has always been a problem. Congress has had the ability to fix it, but Congress has been unwilling to do it. It is time for Congress to step up and do the job it is supposed to do—take the votes it is supposed to take.

I am very aware these issues are difficult and technical and emotional, but these are real lives that are mixed into this—individuals who were created in the image of God. They have value and worth. Families are affected by this. Congress needs to step up, take the votes, and actually do the task that needs to be done. The administration is right in that this is Congress's problem and that it is Congress's responsibility to fix it. We shouldn't leave the administration hanging out there.

I also say to the administration: You have other options and other tools, in the meantime, to keep families together. Use them. For the sake of all of those kids and all of those families, use them. In the meantime, in the middle of this intolerable position, let's step up, and let's take the votes.

We all know we need border security. In this body, border security was an overwhelming bipartisan-supported measure in 2006, when the Secure Fence Act was passed. We believe there needs to be border security. Let's vote for it. Let's get it done. Let's not just talk about doing it someday. Let's actually do it. Let's add more immigration judges. Our backlog of a year and a half before one can get to an immigration court is absurd. Catch and release is absurd. No one would do that or should do that. We have ways to fix that.

I have stated over and over in this body that I think it is absurd we have individuals who are in this country, due to no fault of their own, and have grown up in this country whom we have just ignored and pretended have not been there. Those people who are in DACA or who are DACA-eligible deserve an answer. This Congress should

vote on it rather than just keep them in limbo.

Publically, I believe they should have a shot at naturalization. The reasonable thing is to give us 10 years to get the border security done. At the same time, those individuals in DACA will have a 10-year path headed toward their naturalization. That should not be unreasonable. In the meantime, give those individuals the opportunity to travel and work and go to school and be full participants in our society.

I think the diversity lottery is absurd. Other than salvation in Christ, I think one of the greatest gifts you can possibly have on this Earth is American citizenship. We just put it out there and say: You don't have to have any qualifications. If you want to come, come. I think we should actually extend it to people who are going to engage in the economy and be productive parts of our society, who have gifts and abilities that will help us as a culture. Let's make that the extension. Let's keep the diversity lottery. I am grateful to have people here who are from all over the world. Let's just make sure they are bringing the skills we need. I don't think it is that unreasonable.

There are things we can do that we agree on and that we should move on rather than just say: Someday, let's do. Someday is today. Someday is right now. It is time for Congress to step up and take the lead and stop blaming everybody else. It is time for us to do our job and vote on this for a result.

I yield the floor.

TRIBUTE TO CHUCK MRAZ

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today I would like to take a moment to congratulate the "Voice of the Eagles," Chuck Mraz, who is retiring from his position as the news director at Morehead State Public Radio. Serving communities in eastern Kentucky, southern Ohio, and western West Virginia for more than 30 years, Chuck's reporting has been a staple for countless listeners. As he prepares to sign off, I would like to take a brief look back at his remarkable career.

I have had the privilege of joining Chuck's program many times over the years. While I have enjoyed our conversations about important issues to Kentucky, we found a shared passion that has nothing to do with my role in the Senate: our love of sports.

At the outset of his career, Chuck wanted to be a sportscaster. According to him, sports have "always been a part of my life ever since I realized that I could pick up a bat and hit a ball." He joined MSPR in 1986 as the station's sports director and special events director. Even when he took on a new challenge in 2005 as the news director, Chuck kept his part time role as the play-by-play voice of the MSU football and men's basketball teams.

Throughout his time on the air at MSPR, Chuck has called more than 1,000 Eagles athletic events. According

to the school, that is more than any other announcer in the athletic department's history. He has been a constant presence for coaches, players, and fans and has been an integral part of the Eagles' community. He still says the highlight of his career was MSU's 2011 Men's NCAA basketball tournament win at the buzzer over my alma mater, the University of Louisville Cardinals.

For his impressive career, Chuck has won local, State, and regional acclaim from his peers. Among his many accolades are more than 40 Kentucky Associated Press awards, the Eastern Kentucky Leadership Conference Award for Media and Technology, and the Ohio Valley Conference Media Award.

Even more important to Chuck than his honors are the relationships he built with the next generation of broadcasters. He recognized many inspirational teachers and advisers in his own life, and as a result, Chuck has mentored hundreds of students while at MSU. Many of them have begun their own notable careers around the State. As they continue to prosper in their work, Chuck's impact on the broadcasting community will continue to be felt for years to come.

Looking back on his long and successful career, Chuck said, "I've always believed that hard work can overcome a lack of ability in some areas." His drive has led to many late nights, many 3:30 a.m. alarms, and a lot of time away from his family, but it is that commitment that has also brought Chuck great success in his profession and in the Morehead community.

In retirement, Chuck looks forward to spending more time with his family, especially his wife, Joni, and his daughters, Megan and Elizabeth. Just because he is leaving his role as news director, however, doesn't mean that MSPR listeners won't hear Chuck on the radio. Even in retirement, he plans to call Eagles football and basketball games. At the end of this month, the community will gather to celebrate Chuck's career and to thank him for his contributions to the school, its students, and to the Eagles. I would like to add my voice to the MSU community in wishing him a restful and happy retirement.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, BBEDCA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary spending and allows for various adjustments to those limits. In addition, sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 allow the Chairman of the Budget Committee to establish and make revisions to allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments.

The Senate is considering S. Amdt. 2910, a "minibus" spending measure

covering programs within the jurisdiction of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Energy and Water, Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and the Legislative Branch. This legislation includes funding for military construction designated as overseas contingency operations funding pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of BBEDCA. These provisions provide \$921 million in budget authority for fiscal year 2019. The inclusion of the overseas contingency operations designations with these provisions makes this

spending eligible for an adjustment under the Congressional Budget Act.

Accordingly, I am increasing the fiscal year 2019 budgetary aggregate by \$921 million in budget authority. Further, I am revising the budget authority allocations to the Committee on Appropriations by increasing revised security budget authority by \$921 million in fiscal year 2019.

I ask unanimous consent that this notice and the accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVISION TO BUDGETARY AGGREGATES
(Pursuant to Sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

\$s in millions	2019
Current Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,547,094
Outlays	3,508,052
Adjustments:	
Budget Authority	921
Outlays	0
Revised Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	3,548,015
Outlays	3,508,052

REVISION TO SPENDING ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019
(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

\$s in millions	2019
Current Allocation:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	647,000
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	597,000
General Purpose Outlays	1,314,141
Adjustments:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	921
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0
General Purpose Outlays	0
Revised Allocation:	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	647,921
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	597,000
General Purpose Outlays	1,314,141
	Regular OCO Program Integrity Disaster Relief Emergency Total
Memorandum: Detail of Adjustments Made Above	
Revised Security Discretionary Budget Authority	0 921 0 0 0 921
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority	0 0 0 0 0 0
General Purpose Outlays	0 0 0 0 0 0

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my vote in opposition to the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act.

First, I would like to thank Chairman MCCAIN and Ranking Member REED for including the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act in this defense authorization bill.

I worked with Senator CORNYN to develop this important piece of legislation to update the role of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, CFIUS.

Our bill would expand CFIUS's authority to review foreign investments in the United States and potentially block those that pose a risk to our national security. I hope our bill is retained by the conferees and included in the final defense authorization bill so that it can become law.

The defense bill we are considering today also authorizes funding for a number of programs critical to California's defense industry. That includes funding for three ships: two oilers and an additional expeditionary support base ship. All three are vital to the shipbuilding industry in southern California.

The bill also continues production of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter and F-18 Super Hornet aircraft, which, when coupled with the B-21 Raider, will help maintain California's edge in aerospace.

However, I am deeply disappointed that the defense authorization bill also includes two nuclear weapons-related provisions that I strongly oppose.

The first is the inclusion of \$65 million to develop a new low-yield submarine-launched ballistic missile. I vehemently oppose the development of any new nuclear weapons, and I oppose the funding included in this bill for that purpose.

I remember when the United States dropped nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It is seared into my memory.

My greatest hope is that humanity will never see the use of nuclear weapons again. My deepest fear, however, is that so-called low-yield nuclear weapons make such a repetition more—not less—likely.

The Trump administration has argued that it needs new nuclear weapons to respond in kind to a potential Russian first-use of a low-yield weapon. That line of argument makes clear that the Trump administration is contemplating actually using nuclear weapons to fight "limited" nuclear wars. We are kidding ourselves if we think there is such a thing as a "limited" nuclear war.

We should listen to the wise words of Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis, who said in February: "I don't think there is any such thing as a 'tactical nuclear weapon.' Any nuclear weapon used any time is a strategic game-changer." That is particularly true with the low-yield weapon included in this bill. We already have 1,550 strategic nuclear weapons. We have hundreds more low-yield weapons.

We are building new nuclear ballistic missile submarines, new long-range bombers, new intercontinental ballistic missiles, new nuclear cruise missiles,

and new fighter aircraft capable of delivering advanced gravity bombs. We are also making investments to extend the life of our existing warheads.

We have a safe, secure, and reliable nuclear deterrent. We do not need to build new nuclear weapons, particularly for President Trump.

While I oppose this new low-yield weapon, I appreciate that it has been the subject of considerable congressional debate and requires an explicit congressional authorization to develop. However, that explicit congressional authorization to develop new nuclear weapons will no longer be required if this defense bill becomes law.

That is because, during the Senate Armed Services Committee's markup of the bill, Senator COTTON offered an amendment to eliminate all existing restrictions on the development of new, low-yield weapons.

His amendment, which passed on a party line vote, would allow the Secretary of Energy to develop new weapons simply by requesting funding to do so. Removing these restrictions is an abdication of our constitutional and moral responsibility to oversee spending on the world's most dangerous weapons. I cannot support this change to Congress's authority, and therefore I am compelled to vote against the defense authorization bill because of it.

As this bill moves forward, I urge the conference committee to reject the Cotton amendment and retain longstanding restrictions on the development of new low-yield nuclear weapons.