



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 31, 2018

No. 129

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Sovereign Lord of the Universe, we pray today for our lawmakers. Use them for Your glory, providing them with wisdom to live with integrity through their labors. Enable them to live, trusting in the unfolding of Your providence. Lord, inspire our Senators to glorify You, doing justly, loving mercy, and walking humbly on the path You have chosen. Keep them in the circle of Your unfolding providence. May they find delight in doing Your will as You remove from their lives the barriers of fear, hatred, and strife. Help them to seek more fully to resemble the Prince of Peace.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2018.

To the Senate:

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

appoint the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I want to take a few moments to discuss the brave men and women who serve in U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

I had the privilege of visiting the ICE office in my hometown of Louisville this past Friday and of meeting with these agents in person.

This is a Federal agency that was created following the attacks of September 11, 2001. It is responsible for several key aspects of our homeland security: enforcing our immigration laws, combating terrorism, and preventing people and goods from moving illegally throughout our country. Its record on these vital missions is staggering. In fiscal year 2017, ICE recorded more than 105,000 arrests of aliens with known criminal convictions on their records—nearly 4,600 convictions for robbery, more than 3,700 for sexual assault, and more than 1,500 for homicide.

We are talking about the men and women in law enforcement who con-

front all of this in order to keep all of us safe. This is hardly a controversial mission; it is essential. We are lucky these agents are willing to serve. The Nation is better off for it. So I wanted to pay these agents a visit in Louisville and thank them firsthand for their work.

Recently, they have fallen into the crosshairs of some extremely vocal, far-left special interest groups, groups that explicitly say—now get this; this is what they say—that our Nation would be better off with no borders and no immigration laws of any kind. That is what these people advocate. They are slandering ICE agents. They are calling the agency “an unaccountable strike force executing a campaign of ethnic cleansing” and even “a genuine threat to democracy.” That is what they are calling ICE agents. According to these leftwing groups, the threat to democracy is not the violent criminals who are illegally present in our country but, rather, the brave law enforcement officers who volunteer to take them on.

Well, fringe political movements are nothing new. You can find a few Americans who will argue almost any side of any issue. What is new—what does get my attention—is when prominent, leading Democratic politicians, including a number of our colleagues right here in the Senate, adopt some of these extremist views wholesale and let the far-left talking points form the basis of their own policy positions.

The junior Senator from New York said recently that if Democrats regain the House and Senate, the first thing they should do is “get rid of ICE.”

The senior Senator from Massachusetts pointed to “replacing ICE” as the first priority of a top-to-bottom rebuild of America’s immigration system.

The mayor of New York City calls the agency “no longer acceptable.”

A Member of the U.S. House of Representatives likened it to—get this—“the Gestapo of the United States.”

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5463

The gestapo of the United States? I am really not sure where to begin in responding to this foaming hysteria.

It is one thing for a few protesters and Socialist hecklers who want open borders and the elimination of all immigration laws to adopt a slogan as silly and ill-considered as “abolish ICE,” but it is something else entirely when U.S. Senators are so eager to please these leftwing extremists that they join that chorus—join in denigrating the men and women of U.S. law enforcement. This is the moment we are in—that of leading Democrats’ taking cues from the open-borders Socialist crowd and proposing to eliminate the very agency that enforces Federal immigration laws within the interior of our country. Talk about a political stunt.

The American people want nothing to do with these dangerous antics. My neighbors and constituents in Kentucky certainly don’t. So my fellow Republicans and I will continue to proudly stand with ICE, stand with the rule of law, and stand with all of the American families who would rather have fewer drugs and less crime in the communities in which they are raising their children.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on another matter, we learned last week that second-quarter real GDP growth exceeded 4 percent. That is the best quarterly growth rate in 4 years and one of the strongest reports since the great recession.

Earlier this month, we learned that new claims for unemployment insurance recently reached the lowest level since—listen to this—1969 and that the number of continuing claims, week to week, is lower than it has been at any point since 1973. Let me say that another way. Notwithstanding almost half a century of population growth, fewer Americans are applying for new unemployment benefits today than has ever been the case since just a few months after Apollo 11 landed on the Moon. The last time this few number of Americans continued to receive unemployment week to week was when Richard Nixon was President. No wonder analysts are heaping praise on this economy. The Wall Street Journal noted last week that recent reports indicate “underlying strength that could tee up one of the best years in the current expansion.”

Back in March, my home State of Kentucky joined a list of 14 States that have reached the lowest unemployment rates in recorded history since this united Republican government has been in office. Never before on record has Kentucky’s unemployment rate dropped as low as 4 percent.

Already in 2018, an estimated 14,000 Kentuckians have found jobs at businesses of all shapes and sizes.

Glier’s Meats, in Covington, announced that the company was plan-

ning to add new positions and invest in new equipment to meet growing demand. In the words of the company’s president, “We had a number of projects that were seen as something we could consider doing down the road, but because of tax reform, it’s possible to reinvest in the plant and in new equipment now.”

In Ashland, Braidy Industries expects to support 1,000 construction jobs as it constructs a new state-of-the-art manufacturing facility and then 600 permanent jobs. It broke ground in June.

Not a single one of our colleagues across the aisle voted in support of this historic tax reform that is helping to make these developments possible. For them, these data are telling an inconvenient truth, and the inconvenient truth is this: The rest of America is not hiding from these numbers. Americans are benefiting from these numbers. We are celebrating them and all of the life-changing job opportunities, wage growth, and small business expansions they represent.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate has a duty and a responsibility to methodically review a Supreme Court nominee’s record. That is why, in past years, the Senate has sent bipartisan letters—bipartisan—to the National Archives and Presidential libraries requesting the necessary information on a nominee. Democrats and Republicans agreed that however we would ultimately vote, transparency and openness were principles we all shared.

It appears that bipartisan tradition has been tossed aside. It was fine for our Republican friends when they were in the minority and President Obama nominated candidates to the Supreme Court. But the double standard is glaring, enormous, and detrimental to America.

Now the Republican majority has cast aside Democratic wishes for openness and transparency and has made a partisan request for only a small subset of Judge Kavanaugh’s records. It is such a break from precedent that we have to wonder: What are the Republicans hiding about Judge Kavanaugh’s

record? What are they so afraid of that they tie themselves in knots—into a pretzel—to contradict everything they stood for when they were in the minority?

Today, every Democrat on the Judiciary Committee has joined Ranking Member FEINSTEIN in making a formal request of the National Archives to provide the exact same universe of documents provided during the confirmation of Justice Kagan. When I say the same request, I mean the exact same request.

The Judiciary Committee has updated the letter to refer to Judge Kavanaugh, but in every other way it is identical to the request that Democrats and Republicans made for Justice Kagan that Republicans insisted on when she was nominated by President Obama.

By the way, it was Senate Republicans who insisted on this standard during previous confirmations. Democrats, even though our nominee might be exposed, agreed because we believed in openness, and we are not hypocritical in saying that it is only good when we are in charge, not when you are in charge. We believe it works both ways.

Ranking Member FEINSTEIN has made it clear that we don’t need or want every single scrap of paper from Judge Kavanaugh’s time as Staff Secretary, but to review none—none—of the nominee’s records for most of his senior role in the White House is an act of what might be called willful opacity. That is why we are not following very sensible, bipartisan precedent now.

Judge Kavanaugh himself has said that his time as Staff Secretary was especially useful to him as a judge and that his time in the White House made him a better interpreter of statutes. I hope that the National Archives will understand the dilemma we are in and the unusual circumstance we are in, and, ultimately, I hope my Republican colleagues will understand and that both the Archives, either on its own or with Republican acquiescence, will make the right decision in the interests of transparency, consistency, and fairness. To do otherwise is to forsake the Senate’s constitutional duty to provide advice and consent on this surpassingly important nomination.

REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another subject, taxes, President Trump and congressional Republicans promised working America the Moon and the stars with their tax bill. President Trump said that it would create “a middle-class miracle” and that everyone would get a \$4,000 raise. Remember that? President Trump promised the American people that these tax cuts for the wealthy would trickle down—or torrent down—and everyone would get a \$4,000 raise. If we asked Americans from one end of the country to the other to tell us by raising their

hands how many of them got a \$4,000 raise, maybe the top 1 percent would—maybe the top 2 percent—but not most Americans.

Wages are virtually stagnant. The promises the President made have not materialized. And when we measure wages against costs of everyday living—in other words, buying power, how much of a raise you get versus how much things cost—the Bureau of Labor Statistics found that year over year, hourly earnings have dropped by 1 percent. In other words, the American consumer—the average middle-class person, even with this tax cut—has less buying power today than they had last year. President Trump and Republicans promised a \$4,000 raise, but average hourly earnings' buying power—the ability to live a decent life—for far too many Americans has gone down. Talk about a sleight of hand. Talk about an exaggerated—if not dishonest—promise. There it is.

While average working Americans continue to struggle to keep their heads above water, corporations and the wealthy are having a bonanza thanks to the Republican tax bill. As the President himself tweeted this morning, the tax bill made the Koch brothers and almost every multimillionaire richer at a time when they are doing great. We don't begrudge that people are wealthy and doing well, but the middle class needed this tax break far more than the rich, even though the rich had political power over our Republican friends—and when the wealthiest lobbyists and big, powerful corporations say jump, our Republican friends say how high, ignoring the middle class. So in the Trump economy, big, wealthy corporations are cashing in, the top 1 percent are doing great, and American workers are falling behind.

Listen to this. Already this year, corporations have dedicated over \$600 billion—now approaching \$700 billion—to corporate share buybacks and debt repurchasing programs, goosing their stock price but doing little to help workers. That is a record pace. These buybacks help the CEOs and wealthy shareholders but do nothing for the middle class.

There is also a new, troubling pattern being brought to light of corporate executives selling off stocks shortly after the stock price has been inflated. So they do the buyback, then they sell the stock and cash in. Here is the pattern: The Republican tax bill gave American corporations a mammoth tax cut; American corporations use some of those newfound profits to buy back and inflate the value of their own stock; executives of those companies then turn around and sell the stock at a higher price to pad their pockets.

SEC Commissioner Robert Jackson studied nearly 400 examples of stock buybacks since the beginning of 2017 and found that after half of them—half—at least one executive sold shares

within the next month. That is American taxpayer money, President Trump. That is the money you are taking from the American people and giving to the wealthiest of the American people. The Republican tax bill is robbing the American Treasury to pad the pockets of wealthy executives and the richest Americans.

Now, if that wasn't bad enough, listen to what they want to do now. It was reported in yesterday's newspaper, the administration is considering doing an end-run around Congress to give another \$100 billion tax cut mainly to the wealthy by cutting taxes on capital gains. The economy is already running hot on the artificial sweetener of tax cuts and deficit spending. Another \$100 billion in tax cuts for the rich isn't just more gasoline on the fire; it is an incendiary device.

At a time when the deficit is out of control, at a time when wages are flat, at a time when the wealthiest are doing better than ever, to give the top 1 percent another big advantage is outrageous. It shows the Republicans' true colors: tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy, empty promises for everyone else.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on North Korea, last night, we received news that North Korea has been continuing work at a missile facility north of its capital. Previous satellite images have shown work ongoing at two other missile sites in the country.

Clearly, North Korea is not suspending, let alone winding down, its nuclear missile programs. Yet, shortly after President Trump met with Chairman Kim in Singapore, President Trump said North Korea was "no longer a nuclear threat" to the United States. The juxtaposition of President Trump's rhetoric and the facts on the ground are jarring. It would be funny if it wasn't so sad.

President Trump explains out of nowhere that the nuclear threat is over, and North Korea is building more missiles that reportedly can reach all of the United States instead of just the West Coast. North Korea's nuclear program remains a grave threat to the region and the United States. President Trump can't wish it away. He can't place fantasy next to reality. North Korea will not give up its nuclear program simply because President Trump wants them to. Now, we are all rooting for diplomacy to succeed, but if President Trump is going to make progress toward the complete, verifiable, and irreversible denuclearization of North Korea, he needs to grapple with the reality of the situation, not be in a dream world where he thinks his rhetoric is reality, when it doesn't match the dangerous reality on the ground.

3D GUNS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, on 3D guns, in a short time, just

a minute or two from now, I will be joining several of my colleagues to talk about an issue we have been worried about for quite a while—ghost guns. Over the past several years, 3D printing technology has advanced to the point where anyone with an internet connection is now able to print guns at home.

A court order has barred companies from posting plans to print guns, but a few weeks ago, inexplicably, the Trump administration settled with gun activists to allow them to post detailed instructions, plans, files, and 3D drawings of weapons on the internet, and this starts tomorrow. So, starting tomorrow, all you need is a little money—a couple hundred bucks—and you can download a print from the internet to make a gun at home. No background check, no criminal history check, no certification that the person isn't adjudicated mentally ill or has the intent to harm. Even terrorists could avail themselves of this technology to print an unlimited amount of home weapons. According to the New York Post, more than 1,000 people have downloaded plans to make AR-style, 3D-printed guns, and the ban hasn't even been lifted yet.

The idea of these print-on-command ghost guns is as scary as they sound. We should be doing everything in our power to make sure this doesn't happen. These guns can go through metal detectors, stadiums, and airports: No metal; they are made of plastic only.

Out of the blue this morning, President Trump tweeted he was looking into the matter, months after his own administration caused the problem by settling with gun activists and allowing it to happen. From 2010 to 2017, you couldn't do this. There was an international agreement. The Trump administration, because gun activists were pushing, said go ahead and do it.

Now, a day before this happens, President Trump is saying he will look into the matter—although he said he would consult the NRA. Hardly the great advocates of gun safety in America. I wish President Trump had looked into this matter months ago—or even last week—and urged the Justice Department and the State Department not to reach the settlement in the first place. It is another example—of so many—of the President showing up on the scene a day late and a dollar short to address a problem his own administration has created. The President's tweet this morning gets to the basic incompetence of this administration: The left hand doesn't know what the right hand is doing, and it has real important consequences for the safety of the American people.

I look forward to joining my colleagues to talk more about this issue and what Congress can do about it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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 and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

PRESIDENTIAL TAX TRANSPARENCY LEGISLATION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, the Senate is approaching the end of the debate on a significant piece of spending legislation that includes funding for the Internal Revenue Service. That is why I have come to the floor this morning to discuss one of my amendments to this legislation, which is based on a bill that I have authored, entitled the Presidential Tax Transparency Act.

It is long past time for the President's tax returns to be released to the American people. This President has, in effect, thrown in the trash can a bipartisan, 40-year, pro-transparency tradition in his having refused to release his tax returns in the course of the 2016 election. This had been a tradition accepted by all liberals and conservatives across the political spectrum that had dated back to the post-Watergate era. The President has ended it for reasons as flimsy as you can get—a made-up story about the President's claim that you can't release your returns in the course of an audit.

Yet now it is not just a matter of the President's destroying a four-decades', good-government campaign tradition. Week after week, month after month, there are more questions that swirl about with respect to financial ties that might skew the President's decision-making about new foreign deals. The Trump Organization continues to strike that violate the promises the President made to the American people—about foreign cash coming into his properties here in the United States; about the astronomical amount of cash taxpayers spend to fund the President's many visits to Trump-branded properties, essentially forcing the American people to finance Trump resort ad campaigns.

The episode that left more jaws on the floor than perhaps any other came

a few weeks ago. That is when the President traveled through Europe for what should have been routine meetings with our longstanding allies. Instead, the President attacked our closest allies and put on a performance, while standing next to Vladimir Putin, that few will soon forget. With a hostile dictator at his side, the President said that the United States was "foolish," and he threw our intelligence officials under the bus and refused once again to accept the conclusion that Russia interfered with our 2016 election. The cleanup he tried to do a few days later, in my view, was laughable at best.

Following that meeting in Helsinki, people across the Nation were left to wonder: Does Vladimir Putin have something on the President? Does the President simply prefer dictators and strongmen to democratically elected leaders, or does Putin have information or financial influence that he is exploiting?

There was also the mystery of why this administration, which seems to stumble from decision to decision, sprang into action to save ZTE—a company that is a Chinese serial sanctions violator and a tech company that the experts will tell you is a threat to our national security. In an open hearing of the Intelligence Committee and in response to my question, Mr. Evanina—the new point person for the whole question of counterintelligence and counterterrorism—said that he still regarded ZTE as an espionage threat.

For all of the President's tough talk about enforcing sanctions on countries that pose a threat to Americans, letting ZTE off the hook after it violated sanctions against Iran and North Korea is just baffling. It certainly shows signs of weakness. The timing also raised eyebrows, as the ZTE deal came right after the Trump family secured valuable trademarks, and a Trump project in Indonesia got a \$500 million loan from a Chinese state-owned company.

These looming questions are yet another reason the American people should not be asked to wait any longer for a chance to see what every other President has offered in the last four decades—his tax returns. The American people deserve to see those returns and see if some of the "almost impossible to explain" Presidential judgments over the last few weeks have been due to what may be in those returns.

So let's be clear. The financial ties between the President, The Trump Organization, and Russia could be well hidden deep within the Trump web of business entities. Releasing the tax returns, at least, is a start with respect to accountability and transparency in the long-held tradition Presidents have followed.

Unfortunately, for the interests of the American people, debate on the legislation before us has now been cut off. That means that my amendment, which would call for the disclosure of

these tax returns and transparency and accountability, just as we have seen decade after decade, will not get a vote, but I intend to keep calling up this legislation for a full debate. I simply believe this issue is too important to ignore.

There is a reason we have had this tradition for four decades. This is the lowest ethical bar for a President. It is not a high one. It is the lowest ethical bar, and it is not being followed. Members on both sides ought to be interested in protecting good-government, pro-transparency traditions that stretch back decades.

What a lot of people have wondered is, why is legislation necessary here? I had held off for months in 2016 even talking about requiring this by legislation. I had just hoped that then-Candidate Trump would have done voluntarily what everybody else had done for four decades. When it was clear he wouldn't, I had said I didn't know of any other path to get the transparency and accountability the American people deserve other than through legislation like this.

Nobody in Congress ought to be in favor of keeping the American people in the dark about what is motivating the President's decision, and certainly all of us ought to be concerned about protecting against corruption. Helping Russia undermine NATO and letting sanctions violators—repeat sanctions violators—off the hook puts American interests in danger.

The public has a right to know the truth of what is behind those decisions. Certainly, a part of being able to make those judgments is having the chance—the opportunity—as we have seen for four decades, to see the President's tax returns.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NEW HOPE ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last week the House passed an important piece of legislation, the reauthorization of the Perkins Act. It was sent to the President's desk for his signature and, once that happens today, it will become the law of the land.

I want to take just a moment to talk about part of it because it has huge implications for my State and the United States. It is called the New HOPE Act, and it builds on other steps we have taken recently to strengthen our Nation's economy. Specifically, it deals with this phenomenon of occupational licensing.

State licensing mandates require men and women to pay fees, complete training programs, and pass exams before they can enter certain jobs and

professions, but many of these licensing requirements are simply protectionism. They do nothing to protect consumers or ensure the public safety. They simply protect the incumbents' interests and erect large barriers to entry. They make it more difficult for new folks to learn and practice new trades and preserve exclusive access to those who have the means and the time necessary to jump through all the procedural and financial hoops.

Existing licensing rules perpetuate the status quo and stifle new talent. Oftentimes, they are totally unnecessary, as you may have gathered from my comments, and certainly burdensome. When that happens, they need to be eliminated.

Last year in Austin, I had a chance to meet with people in the cosmetology, heating and ventilation, and other industries, and we talked about how licensing requirements impact their industries, as well as job creation, upward mobility, and public safety.

Around that same time, the Institute for Justice ranked Texas licensure requirements as the 17th most burdensome in the country. That is not a statistic I am proud of. So, naturally, we spoke about ways we can reduce the burden on job seekers.

That is where the bill I sponsored comes in, the New HOPE Act, which is part of this Perkins reauthorization bill. It provides additional authority to State Governors receiving funds for career and technical education. It gives them discretion to consolidate or eliminate licenses or certifications that provide limited consumer protection or pose an unnecessary and sometimes insurmountable barrier to entry for aspiring men and women seeking to enter certain professions. If you want to be a hairdresser or an eyebrow threader or a roofer or a mortician, we should support you 100 percent. We shouldn't condone the erection of barriers to your entering this profession once you have satisfied the necessary and important qualifications and training. There are certain training steps that are a good idea, and I am not suggesting otherwise, but you shouldn't have to wait for years and waste thousands of dollars in order to get there. That is what this bill is all about.

I am grateful to my Democratic cosponsor, the junior Senator from Michigan, as well as the bill's champions over in the House, Representative WALBERG and Representative CUELLAR. We couldn't have gotten this done without them. I look forward to the President's signature. I know that once it becomes law, it will work to further enhance the positive economic climate that we have seen under this administration, with the jaw-dropping announcement of last Friday that the economy is burning so hot that the gross domestic product has gone up by 4.1 percent in the last quarter alone.

There are many steps to turning this economy around. One of the biggest, of

course, was the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which we passed last year and which has had transformative effects. So I am optimistic that legislation like the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will continue to allow getting out of the way of the people who are creating opportunity and growing the economy and wages and take-home pay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the confirmation process for Judge Kavanaugh continues and, predictably, so does the Democrat hysteria. It is the same old playbook: Any Supreme Court nominee from a Republican President is guaranteed to destroy the Constitution, abolish our rights, and endanger the lives of the American people. I am not exaggerating for effect. Those are actual accusations from Democrats and liberal interest groups.

In the lead-up to Justice Gorsuch's confirmation, the head of one liberal organization stated that there was "substantial evidence" that if Gorsuch's "egregious views were to become law, Americans' lives . . . would be put at risk in untold ways." A year into Justice Gorsuch's tenure on the Supreme Court, Americans seem to be doing OK.

But that didn't stop the former Democratic Governor of Virginia from tweeting that "the nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh will threaten the lives of millions of Americans for decades to come."

Then, of course, there is that other favorite Democrat accusation—that the Constitution will be put in jeopardy if we confirm a Republican President's Supreme Court nominee. In the lead-up to Judge Kavanaugh's nomination, the junior Senator from California said: "We're looking at a destruction of the Constitution of the United States."

I have to say that I find this accusation particularly hilarious because if there is one thing that we can count on Judge Kavanaugh to do, it is to defend the Constitution. In fact, his respect for the Constitution and the rule of law is perhaps the distinguishing feature of his jurisprudence.

In a speech last year, Judge Kavanaugh said:

As I see it, the Constitution is primarily a document of majestic specificity, and those specific words have meaning. Absent constitutional amendment, those words continue to bind us as judges, legislators, and executive officials.

Later on in the same speech, Judge Kavanaugh noted:

Because it is so hard, and because it is not easy even to pass federal legislation, pressure is often put on the courts and the Supreme Court in particular to update the Constitution to reflect the times. In the views of some, the Constitution is a living document, and the Court must ensure that the Constitution adapts to meet the changing times.

For those of us who believe that the judges are confined to interpreting and applying the

Constitution and laws as they are written and not as we might wish they were written, we too believe in a Constitution that lives and endures and in statutes that live and endure. But we believe that changes to the Constitution and laws are to be made by the people through the amendment process and, where appropriate, through the legislative process—not by the courts snatching that constitutional or legislative authority for themselves.

In short, if there is one thing the American people can count on, it is that Judge Kavanaugh will uphold the Constitution, even when he doesn't like the result. He will not attempt to legislate from the bench or to make the Constitution say what he wants it to say. Anyone who comes before Judge Kavanaugh can be certain that he will rule based on the facts of the case, the law, and the Constitution, and nothing else—not his personal feelings, not his political opinions, not his beliefs about what the law should be, but just the plain text of the law and the Constitution. That is the kind of judge that all of us, including the Democrats, should want on the Supreme Court—the kind of judge who, in the words of Judge Kavanaugh, will decide "cases based on settled principles without regard to policy preferences or political allegiances or which party is on which side in a particular case."

The truth of the matter is that Democrats are not worried that Judge Kavanaugh will not uphold the Constitution. Let's be clear about that. They know very well that he will. What they are worried about is that he will not deliver their preferred outcomes and that his judicial opinions will conflict with the Democrats' political opinions. Democrats aren't looking for a qualified Supreme Court Justice. They are looking for a political rubberstamp.

For Democrats, the only good Supreme Court Justice is a Supreme Court Justice who will use his or her power to advance the political agenda of the Democratic Party. Just look at the Democrat Senator who announced his opposition to the President's Supreme Court nomination before the President had actually nominated anyone. That is right. The Democrat Senator announced plans to oppose the nominee before a nominee even existed.

Well, that is all the evidence we need that Democrats' opposition to Judge Kavanaugh is based not on any actual problems with Judge Kavanaugh but on Democrats' ideological opposition to any nominee they are not sure will be a rubberstamp for the Democrat agenda.

The confirmation process will continue, and I am sure the hysteria from Democrats will continue as well, but the Senate will move forward with the business of confirming another outstanding judge of the Supreme Court.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Before I close, Mr. President, I would like to say just a couple of words about the economic numbers released last week. On Friday, the Commerce Department announced that the economy

grew at a rate of 4.1 percent in the second quarter of 2018, and I have to say that this is tremendous news.

Getting our economy going again has been a huge priority for Republicans since President Trump's election. We have eliminated burdensome regulations that were acting as a drag on economic growth. In December of last year, we passed a comprehensive tax reform bill that put more money in Americans' pockets and fixed some of the problems in the Tax Code that were keeping businesses from growing and creating jobs. Now we are seeing the results: robust economic growth, low unemployment, near-record optimism among small businesses, soaring business investment, and more.

What does all of this mean? It means more jobs and better wages for hard-working Americans. It means more opportunities, and it means more economic security and a better life for American families.

I am proud of the economic progress we have made over the past year and a half, and I am going to keep working with my colleagues in Congress to advance policies that will expand economic opportunities for Americans even further so that we can continue to create those good-paying jobs and those better wages for American workers and for American families.

I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

THE AMERICAN LEGION 100TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATIVE COIN ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session and resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 1182, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 1182, an act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

Pending:

McConnell motion to concur in the amendments of the House to the bill.

McConnell motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the bill, with McConnell amendment No. 3628 (to the House amendment to the bill), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 3629 (to amendment No. 3628), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to refer the message of the House on the bill to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 3630, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 3631 (to the instructions) amendment No. 3630), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 3632 (to amendment No. 3631), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAUL). Under the previous order, the cloture motion, the motion to refer, and the motion to concur with amendment are withdrawn.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

The question occurs on agreeing to the motion to concur in the House amendments to the Senate bill.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Leg.]

YEAS—86

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

NAYS—12

Barrasso	Johnson	Risch
Cotton	Lankford	Sasse
Enzi	Lee	Shelby
Inhofe	Paul	Toomey

NOT VOTING—2

Flake McCain

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:55 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session and consideration of the Grant nomination.

All time has expired.

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—2

Flake McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 5 minutes of debate equally divided prior to the cloture vote on the Shelby amendment No. 3399.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to urge my colleagues to invoke cloture on the substitute amendment before us.

In debating this measure over the past week, we voted on several amendments. We hope to include dozens more in a managers' package that we are working with the Democrats on that continues to evolve. We sought to achieve a fair process on this package. The bill managers have gone to great lengths to accommodate Members' interests within the framework that has allowed us to make so much progress thus far in the appropriations process.

I want to thank my colleagues. I especially thank Senator LEAHY for working together with us in a bipartisan way. We hope this will continue to be a constructive process because all of us benefit. In this light, I urge my colleagues to vote yes so we can continue to move forward on this package and build upon the momentum we have generated thus far.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I applaud what the senior Senator from Alabama said. We worked very closely together on the weekend, yesterday, and today, and we are continuing to work on a managers' package. I also want to be able to bring up my elections security grants amendment, especially as we know that Russia and others continue to try to interfere with our elections.

I believe the Senate has to act as a coequal branch of government in defending against a threat to our democracy. The threat is very real. Our intelligence community unanimously agrees that Russia interfered in the 2016 elections. There is an imminent threat to our 2018 elections. Just last week, we learned that a Russian hacker targeted the office of a sitting Senator. We can't ignore such a threat against this Chamber or our government.

My amendment, if I bring it up, will provide \$250 million for State election security grants to protect our elections. It improves election cyber security, replaces outdated election data equipment, and undertakes other anti-cyber efforts.

In fiscal year 2018, Congress came together—Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate—and appropriated \$380 million for state election security grants. It was the first new funding for election security in years. In just a few short months since then, all the States and territories—55 in all—requested funding, and 100 percent has been committed to the states and 90 percent disbursed.

Last week, 21 State attorneys general signed a letter pleading with Congress to provide more funding to address this crisis, writing: "More funding is essential to adequately equip states with the financial resources we need to safeguard our democracy and protect the data of voting members in our states."

Securing our elections and safeguarding our democracy should not be a partisan issue. The House Republicans blocked Democrats from even

having a vote on the House floor. I am still hopeful the Senate will not make that same mistake.

Let us heed the warnings of our intelligence agencies. Of the lights blinking red. Of the appeals from the attorneys general, the secretaries of state, and the state and local election officials who are sounding the alarm. This duty has fallen to us, and we must not later be found to have been asleep at the switch, with so much at stake.

I join with Senator SHELBY on this next vote, but I do want Senators to be on notice that I will be bringing this up at some point.

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

The assistant 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 Senate amendment No. 3399, to H.R. 6147, an act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Hoeven, Bob Corker, James Lankford, Lindsey Graham, Mike Crapo, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe, Roy Blunt, Jerry Moran.

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. 3399, offered by the Senator from Alabama, Mr. SHELBY, to H.R. 6147, an act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Leg.]

YEAS—94

Alexander	Casey	Enzi
Baldwin	Cassidy	Ernst
Barrasso	Collins	Feinstein
Bennet	Coons	Fischer
Blumenthal	Corker	Gardner
Blunt	Cornyn	Graham
Booker	Cortez Masto	Grassley
Boozman	Cotton	Harris
Brown	Crapo	Hassan
Burr	Cruz	Hatch
Cantwell	Daines	Heinrich
Capito	Donnelly	Heitkamp
Cardin	Duckworth	Heller
Carper	Durbin	Hirono

Hoeven	Moran	Shaheen
Hyde-Smith	Murkowski	Shelby
Inhofe	Murphy	Smith
Isakson	Murray	Stabenow
Johnson	Nelson	Sullivan
Jones	Perdue	Tester
Kaine	Peters	Thune
Kennedy	Portman	Tillis
King	Reed	Udall
Klobuchar	Risch	Van Hollen
Lankford	Roberts	Warner
Leahy	Rounds	Warren
Manchin	Rubio	Whitehouse
Markey	Sanders	Wicker
McCaskill	Sasse	Wyden
McConnell	Schatz	Young
Menendez	Schumer	
Merkley	Scott	

NAYS—4

Gillibrand	Paul
Lee	Toomey

NOT VOTING—2

Flake	McCain
-------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 4.

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

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, FINANCIAL SERVICES, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the clerk will report the bill.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby amendment No. 3399, in the nature of a substitute.

Murkowski amendment No. 3400 (to Amendment No. 3399), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3304

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, to accommodate the Senator from Utah, I will not make my remarks first, but just by way of introduction to say that tonight at midnight American national security is going to be irreversibly weakened by the actions of President Trump and his administration. That is because at midnight the administration will allow the online publication of blueprints to manufacture 3D plastic guns, and this is one example.

So to accommodate the Senator from Utah, instead of making my remarks now, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3304 submitted earlier today; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I first saw this legislation literally moments ago; therefore, I haven't had adequate time to review it, but I will say this: Any legislation that comes from this body that begins with the following words will attract my attention and should attract the attention of anyone who is concerned about our First Amendment and other constitutional rights. It begins with the words: "It shall be unlawful for any person to intentionally publish. . . ." That ought to be concerning to us—to each and every one of us—Democrats and Republicans alike.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Senator is basing that on First Amendment rights. There are many limits on our First Amendment rights of speech. You cannot say "fire" in a crowded theater. Why in the world would you assert First Amendment rights to publish instructions to manufacture a plastic gun that someone can take through a metal detector, into a crowded theater, and start shooting in that theater—instead of shouting "fire," which is clearly an understood limitation upon our First Amendment rights of speech.

It is inexplicable that the administration is allowing this to go into effect at midnight tonight. It is dangerous. In fact, the President this morning tweeted that allowing these blueprints to go online—the President tweeted: "It doesn't seem to make sense."

I would say amen to that, Mr. President, but it is your administration that has allowed this to happen because after years of winning this issue in courts at every stage of litigation, the administration has surrendered to the crazed demands of a self-described anarchist who is going to put this on the internet. He wants to sow chaos—he said so—in our country and across the world by making these blueprints widely available.

We can make this impossible if, No. 1, the President will do it. He can stop it before midnight, and the clock is ticking. We are only talking less than 9 hours from now because 3D-printed guns, made of plastic or resin, can't be detected by metal detectors. Because they are plastic, there is not a serial number on the metal so they are untraceable, and anyone can get their hands on them, even people who are legally barred from having a gun, such as felons or domestic abusers. So after midnight, people can walk onto airplanes with a deadly weapon because they are not caught in the metal detector, and people would not know about it.

People can walk into schools. My State is the most recent for a school shooting. As a result of Parkland, people are outraged. They want to harden schools, but now are we going to render

the metal detectors useless as they try to harden the schools because somebody can get through a metal detector with this or with an AK-47 or an AR-15 that can be manufactured by these 3D printers?

Somebody could come into this building, somebody could be up in that Gallery right now, and if they have a plastic gun, including bullets that are plastic bullets, we wouldn't know about it.

So whether you are talking about schools or this Chamber or whether we are talking about airports, any public space that we try to protect is going to be useless because these 3D-printed firearms are a direct threat to our national security, and we are going to let these go up on the internet tonight at midnight.

I think some of our allies like the Israelis should be concerned about this because this is not limited to the United States. These can be printed anywhere in the world. Therefore, it can give national security apparatuses a great headache because they can't detect them.

So as I stated in the unanimous consent request, I and other Senators have introduced the legislation today to block the online publication of blueprints.

Now, as it turns out, since we can't do it here, and if the President can't do it in 8 hours 45 minutes, it is going online, and it is going to take us a long time—I mean, what Senator or Representative can object to this? So even if we can get the legislation passed, it is going to take a while because the legislative process is slow.

We have also introduced a separate bill to require every gun to have a serial number and to have a main component made of metal so it can be detected by a metal detector.

Obviously, this is all common sense. This is not a partisan issue. Everybody should be concerned about the threat posed by these deadly plastic guns.

I had intended to give these remarks before asking for unanimous consent. As an accommodation to the Senator from Utah, who had to run to an appointment, I went ahead and asked that unanimous consent. But I want my fellow Senators, who have been so great and so articulate on this issue, to be heard. I ask for them to also speak—the Senator from Utah's objection was about First Amendment rights—about why those objections don't apply here.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague and friend from Florida for his leadership on this profoundly important and imminently threatening issue of safety, as well my colleague from New Jersey for his very important leadership and also Senator MARKEY from Massachusetts. We have joined together in this cause to prevent a new wave of lethal gun violence in our streets and communities resulting

from these plastic, undetectable, and untraceable, weapons. We are talking about assault rifles, pistols, and shotguns—all of them homemade. They are ghost guns. They are the new frontier and new face of gun violence in this country.

Our colleague from Utah raised a First Amendment objection. The fact is that the courts are dealing with that objection. It is the basis of a challenge brought by a group who so far has failed in the courts to stop this public health regulation.

No right is absolute. The First Amendment is not absolute. The idea of crying fire in a movie house is one example that is given time and again. Likewise, in the course of our history, we have found that the First Amendment has to yield to public safety when there is an imminent and urgent threat. Clearly, there is here.

I have supported companion legislation that would, in fact, stop the actual making of these kinds of weapons. It involves none of the First Amendment difficulties the Senator from Utah has raised, and I will be pursuing it perhaps through the same kind of unanimous consent effort in the days to come.

Today, the Senator from Florida is absolutely right to seek this body's unanimous consent in the face of this threat that is self-inflicted by the Trump administration. It has caved to the rightwing fringe group and the NRA, which are challenging this public safety regulation, and it has, in effect, snatched defeat from the jaws of victory because the litigation was on a path to prevailing against those objections. This litigation should have been permitted to run its course. It was on a path to success. But now the administration has created this emergency, beginning at midnight tonight. On August 1, plans, designs, blueprints can be published without limit on the internet, making possible the mass homemade manufacture of these ghost guns. They are a scourge, a potential source of death and injury on our streets.

Any idea that plastic is less durable or strong as a source of material for these guns is completely outmoded because we make planes from plastic. Plastic in some forms is as durable and strong as metal.

The threat here is real and urgent, and I join my colleague from Florida in asking that there be unanimous consent. I hope we will pursue this legislative effort together and that we will have bipartisan support. I stress that we must have bipartisan support. Senators who fail to step up, speak out, and act in the face of this emergency should be held accountable.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to our colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on the floor, and I salute both Senator NELSON and Senator BLUMENTHAL, who represent

States whose citizens have felt the scourge of gun violence—in Newtown, in Parkland, and in the Pulse nightclub. I don't know how many more Parklands we need, but I certainly know that my colleague from Utah, who only read a part about what alarms him—that it shall not be possible to publish what? To publish the information to create a gun—a gun that is undetectable and untraceable.

Why are we spending billions to secure ourselves as we go through the airports of our country? We saw it after September 11. Now we are going to undermine all of those billions and all of that security by allowing anyone here or in the world to get access to the IP address. You download it, and all of a sudden, you can create a three-dimensional plastic gun that is as deadly as any other gun.

What draws us to the floor to ask the unusual effort of unanimous consent to ultimately bring this legislation to the floor is the failure of the administration to not allow this to happen in the first place. We won't need legislation if the President turns back the decisions of his Secretary of State and others in his administration and says: Wait. This is not in our national security interests. It is not in the national interests of the United States to allow our citizens to be exposed to an undetectable, untraceable gun that is as deadly as any other. It is not in the national interests and security interests of the United States to have our soldiers halfway around the world face terrorists who have access to a new design that will be cheaper for them and at the end of the day will allow them to attack our soldiers.

It is unconscionable. But since the administration, if anything, has acted the opposite way, we come to the floor. If the government has any specific role that rises above all others, it is to protect its citizens. That is what we are trying to do here. It should be a bipartisan request.

What is so difficult about the legislation? Nothing much. One of the two pieces of legislation simply says that you cannot permit an IP address to be published on the internet because, globally, anybody can get that, download it, and create a gun. That is the simple part of it. The other one is that any gun has to be traceable and identifiable and therefore has to have a number on it.

Even when our colleagues who are the most ardent advocates of the Second Amendment say they want to keep guns out of the hands of criminals—well, how do you keep a gun out of the hands of criminals when it isn't detectable and isn't traceable? It is pretty amazing. I have been in the Congress 26 years between the House and the Senate, and it is one of the most amazing moments for me.

Look, this country has a gun violence problem. It has a mass-shooting problem. But a do-it-yourself, downloadable gun will supercharge this

crisis, leading to more senseless tragedies. It is already too easy for criminals, extremists, and terrorists to get their hands on a gun. Now we are going to add a new concern: terrorists packing the plans for new, plastic, printable firearms. I don't care if a gun is made out of metal or plastic—if it can fire a bullet and take someone's life, then it should be regulated.

It is beyond irresponsible for the Trump administration to roll over and allow a self-described anarchist to post directions for do-it-yourself guns on a website available to anyone with an internet connection. That is what we are saying. Already, according to some news reports, the blueprints for an AR-15—the weapon used in the massacre at Parkland—were downloaded more than 2,500 times. That is 2,500 unknown individuals in an unregulated space.

As the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I was appalled to find out that the State Department carried this out without notifying Congress. Last Wednesday, Secretary of State Mike Pompeo was before our committee, and he looked us in the eye and said that he was unaware of the issue and that he would look into it. That was on Wednesday. On Friday, the State Department had suspended arms export regulations specifically to allow these 3D gun blueprints to be posted on the internet—so much for looking into it.

This is a case that was proceeding through the courts where the government had won at every round. In this morning's tweet, the President made it pretty clear that instead of listening to the concerns of the American people when he has a gun question—which I would submit is not even a gun question; it is a national security question—he listens to the NRA.

The NRA may be concerned in this particular case. Why? Because plastic guns don't get built by the gun manufacturers and dealers that they represent and that fund their causes.

The posting of a 3D gun shows just how dangerous the Trump administration's regulatory effort to loosen export controls on firearms—including assault-style rifles and even sniper rifles—actually is to the safety of Americans at home, abroad, and innocent civilians across the globe.

All you have to do is go to this company's website to see it for yourself. They are proclaiming that “the era of the downloadable gun” is here. That is what they say on the website. “The era of the downloadable gun” is here. Well, we should make sure that era doesn't happen.

These are two simple but powerful commonsense pieces of legislation that can protect us. I call upon the President to stop it dead in its tracks so we don't have to wait for the legislation, but if not, we call upon this institution to protect the American people.

I hope my colleagues will consider coming back later in the day and making another unanimous consent request

so that we can actually protect the American people against the ability of anyone—anyone—with a 3D printer to create a gun that can kill a human being and ultimately defy all of our security procedures at airports and elsewhere. And it lets any terrorist in the world who wishes us harm to manufacture it in quantity. That is pretty outrageous. That is what we are talking about. I hope the administration will see the light and change their course.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida, Mr. NELSON, for introducing this legislation and also my other colleagues who have been on the Senate floor today.

This is emergency legislation, which is why there was a request for unanimous consent to move forward today. It is very disturbing that consent was not provided because we know that as a result of the Trump administration's actions, starting tomorrow, people all over the country—in fact, all over the world—are going to be able to download on their computers instructions and a whole manual on how to manufacture plastic guns with 3D printing.

This is something that has been before previous administrations. The Obama administration fought hard against this ability for people to be able to send those instructions to make 3D guns at the speed of light around the world. In fact, this administration early on opposed allowing this to happen.

Somehow, when this whole lawsuit was resolved the other day, the folks who want to send these instructions around the world were allowed to do so. In fact, Alan Gottlieb, who is with the Second Amendment Foundation that was part of this case, said:

We asked for the Moon and we figured the government would reject it, but they didn't want to go to trial. The government fought us all the way and then all of the sudden folded their tent.

Secretary Pompeo and the Trump administration folded their tent. As a consequence, Americans will be placed at much higher risk starting tomorrow. We have already seen over 1,000 people sign up to begin to receive the instructions to make AR-15s using 3D printing.

Why is this going to pose a big danger? No. 1, it is a total end-run around criminal background checks for the purchase of a handgun or any kind of weapon. We should be closing the loopholes in the existing background check system, closing things like the gun show loophole. Instead, this allows for a total runaround. If you can just download instructions and use a 3D printer to make a gun at home, you obviously aren't going to go through any kind of criminal background check.

No. 2, we have spent a lot of time and effort giving the ATF the authority to track guns used in crimes. I would have

thought all of us want to make sure we can track people down who are using guns to commit crimes and catch them. If you print a gun at home using a 3D printer, there is no traceable number, there is no serial number. We are not going to be able to easily track down the people who are using these guns to commit crimes.

No. 3, with plastic 3D printing, the technology we have at airports to detect metal will become ineffective.

Folks around the world, if you are a terrorist wanting to do harm, now you are going to get instructions over the internet. You are going to be able to download it as easy as you can download an iTunes. With a 3D printer in your basement or around the corner in some space, you are going to be able to manufacture guns; No. 1, evading metal detectors at airports, putting the entire flying public at risk; No. 2, it is a public end-run around the criminal background check system, which is already flawed; and, No. 3, it will not allow us to trace guns used in crimes.

I thought there was a consensus in this body that we should get after people who use guns to commit crimes, whether crimes in the United States or crimes around the world. Yet what this body is doing by not allowing a vote today on the Nelson bill is saying it is OK for people to be using this technology in their basements to make guns that can evade all these systems and commit crimes and make it impossible to trace who did it.

This is a really bad day for the U.S. Senate. This is a moment where people should be acting in emergency fashion to stop this danger and risk to the American public. Instead, people are folding up their tent and allowing this to happen, starting tomorrow. It is a shameful moment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

ANIMAL DRUG AND ANIMAL GENERIC DRUG USER FEE AMENDMENTS OF 2018

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, in February, the HELP Committee passed a bill to reauthorize the animal drug and animal generic drug user fee programs at FDA. That bill was the result of months of bipartisan work. During markup, we worked together to put aside differences and adopted an amendment from Senator MURPHY increasing innovation in animal drug trial designs to advance more medicines for our pets and livestock—similar to the work we did for humans in the 21st Century Cures Act—and an amendment from Senator PAUL to clarify the regulatory process for animal feed additives.

We worked together because this bill has to pass by August 1 to avoid disruption to the hard-working employees at FDA who ensure our pets and food-producing animals have safe and effective drugs.

Last month, the House Energy and Commerce Committee took our bipartisan bill that we worked on together and added a controversial amendment that expands the conditional approval pathway for animal drugs. Currently, the FDA can conditionally approve an animal drug for a minor species or for an uncommon disease in a major species. This narrow category of drugs can be approved, for a limited time, and sold to customers while the company collects data to determine whether the drug actually works. This pathway was supposed to spur innovation, but only four drugs have ever been conditionally approved in the pathway's 14-year history, and only one of those four was actually effective and gained full approval.

That is not a very good track record. Nonetheless, the House bill expands that pathway to any difficult-to-develop animal drug that can address an unmet need and doesn't even define what qualifies as difficult.

I have been very concerned that the undefined scope of this pathway sets a terrible precedent and, more importantly, doesn't uphold the gold standard of FDA approval that our public relies on. However, today Dr. Gottlieb has made public assurances to both me and our chairman that he intends to implement this provision with additional caution and restrictions, according to congressional intent.

FDA has committed to promulgating regulations to define what it means for a study to be "difficult." Importantly, FDA has publicly agreed that conditional approval is not an appropriate pathway for any human medical products or antibiotics.

Antibiotic resistance is a large and growing global public health problem, and the rampant overuse of medically important antibiotics in our food supply compounds that problem. I am very pleased this bill requires FDA to report on its work to bring all medically important antibiotics under veterinary supervision, but there is more to do.

I thank Senators WARREN, FEINSTEIN, GILLIBRAND, and BLUMENTHAL for their leadership on reducing the non-judicious use of antibiotics in animals. On Friday, Senator WARREN sent a letter to FDA asking for additional actions and commitments to bring all medically important antibiotics under veterinary supervision and reevaluate duration limits for antibiotic abuse.

I thank Mr. Gottlieb for his quick response to Senator WARREN and his clear commitment to work with us on these issues, including greater transparency into the progress of removing unlimited durations of antibiotic use. I sincerely hope we can avoid these situations in the future, where deals struck between FDA and the industry, with little transparency, are then somehow demanded of Congress.

Senator ALEXANDER and I included language in this year's agricultural appropriations bill that makes clear Congress does not find this appropriate,

and I hope the FDA and its regulated industries take that language seriously in future user fee negotiations.

I support moving this bill forward today, but I do plan to conduct careful oversight into the implementation of this law and hold FDA accountable for any deviations from the commitments made to me today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed to Senator ALEXANDER and myself from Scott Gottlieb and Steve Solomon be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. FOOD & DRUG ADMINISTRATION,
July 31, 2018.

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER, *Chairman*,
Hon. PATTY MURRAY, *Ranking Member*,
Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ALEXANDER AND SENATOR MURRAY: We are writing to share with you the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA or the Agency) current views on how it would implement the proposed expanded conditional approval pathway in H.R. 5554, the "Animal Drug and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018." The Agency's staff were directed to review the possibility of expanding the conditional approval pathway by the previous reauthorization of the Animal Drug User Fee Act (ADUFA) and Animal Generic Drug User Fee Act (AGDUFA) programs in 2013, and we are prepared to implement the expansion of the pathway as outlined in H.R. 5554, if enacted, with appropriate regulatory caution and restrictions.

FDA currently has conditional approval authority for animal drugs intended to treat a minor species or for diseases or conditions in major species that would constitute a minor use, which was granted by the addition of section 571 to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) in 2004 by the Minor Use and Minor Species Animal Health Act (MUMS Act). To receive conditional approval, an animal drug sponsor must meet the same safety and manufacturing standards as a new animal drug for which full approval is sought under section 512. The main advantage of the conditional approval pathway for sponsors is that they can make their drug available after demonstrating a reasonable expectation of effectiveness. The pathway requires an annual review of the conditional approval to determine if the sponsor is making sufficient progress toward meeting the effectiveness standard for full approval.

FDA believes conditional approval offers a unique pathway to address specific challenges of certain aspects of veterinary medicine that human medicine does not face. Therefore, FDA does not believe this pathway would be suitable for human medical products. For example, variability in response to therapies among animals means that one product is not likely to meet the needs of all animals. Even within a single species (e.g., canine), it is well-documented that there can be significant variability among animal breeds in how drugs are metabolized (e.g., ivermectin is toxic for collies, but safe for other breeds). Despite the need, incentivizing new product development continues to be a challenge for the industry given the limited market for veterinary drugs. Based on experience, we believe this pathway would be used uncommonly, as a sponsor must make a substantial investment of time and resources to obtain the conditional approval. In addition, the sponsor

must be confident that they will ultimately be successful in meeting the substantial evidence of effectiveness standard required for full approval under section 512(b). FDA's review of its active pending animal drug products in various phases of development indicates that 16 products might qualify for the new pathway. FDA's best current estimate is that 12 to 20 animal drugs might seek conditional approval during the 10-year authorization period provided in H.R. 5554.

FDA has acted to withdraw conditional approval when sufficient progress towards meeting the effectiveness standard for full approval has not been met. For example, FDA withdrew the conditional approval of the drug Paccal Vet-CAI in 2017, after it was conditionally approved in 2014, for this reason. Since the MUMS Act was enacted in 2004, only four drugs have received conditional approval, and FDA has only granted a full new animal drug approval to one of these drugs. We want to assure you that FDA will make certain there are appropriately defined parameters for this expansion of the conditional approval pathway, which will be developed through a public process.

The proposed expansion of the pathway in H.R. 5554 would allow certain animal drugs that are not intended to treat minor species or minor uses in major species to qualify for conditional approval, but only if they meet two key requirements. The first proposed requirement is that the drug must be "intended to treat a serious or life-threatening disease or condition or addresses an unmet animal or human health need." FDA considers serious or life-threatening diseases or conditions to be those that, if untreated, are likely to lead to an animal's death, such as congestive heart disease and lymphoma. FDA intends to define "unmet need" similarly to how the term is defined in FDA's Expedited Programs guidance for human medical products. FDA intends to provide more details to clearly define this first requirement in the guidance or regulation it would be required to issue.

The second key requirement for eligibility would be that "a demonstration of effectiveness would require a complex or particularly difficult study or studies." FDA believes use of the conditional approval pathway should and will be limited to situations in which effectiveness is in fact particularly difficult or complex to demonstrate, and would only be granted after demonstrating a reasonable expectation of effectiveness. FDA intends to consider whether the clinical end-points of the disease or condition are particularly difficult to evaluate. FDA also intends to consider factors such as the need of a sponsor to use complex adaptive or other novel investigation designs, real world evidence, and the difficulty of enrolling trials. To clarify the limited scope of new animal drug applications for which this pathway would be available, FDA intends to issue regulation to describe the elements it would consider in determining whether an effectiveness study would be difficult or complex to complete.

The proposed conditional approval expansion requires FDA to issue guidance or regulation by September 30, 2019, to clarify these criteria; FDA expects to finalize these documents before accepting applications for the expanded conditional approval pathway. We can assure you that FDA believes this expanded pathway should be used only in very limited cases, since its goal is to bring new veterinary therapies to market for which there have not been sufficient incentives to do so through the traditional new animal drug approval pathway. FDA does not believe the age conditional approval pathway should be available to new animal drugs that easily could use the traditional new animal drug approval pathway. If H.R. 5554 is en-

acted, we will keep your staff closely updated on our efforts to clarify in guidance and regulation the statutory restrictions on use of the expanded conditional approval pathway.

H.R. 5554 also contains language that will provide Congress the opportunity to reconsider conditional approval. The proposed pathway will sunset after 10 years, to coincide with the reauthorization of the user fee programs in 2028. In addition, the language requires a Government Accountability Office study to be completed prior to this date so that Congress, the Agency, and stakeholders can evaluate the expanded conditional approval pathway prior to its sunset. The sunset provision would create an incentive for the Agency and stakeholders to demonstrate that this pathway's implementation is appropriately implemented and judiciously utilized. Finally, H.R. 5554 further restricts this pathway by prohibiting any drug that contains an active antimicrobial ingredient from utilizing the expanded pathway.

In closing, we want to remind you that if H.R. 5554 is not reauthorized before August 1, 2018, we must initiate the process of adjusting animal drug review activities and the personnel engaged in those activities, including identifying and notifying 115 full time equivalent federal employee positions of a reduction in force no later than 60 days prior to their expected release. This could not only result in 115 full time employees being terminated, but would disrupt work and morale—not only for hundreds of other employees at the Agency's Center for Veterinary Medicine, but for their colleagues in other Agency centers as well.

We hope that we have been able to alleviate any concerns you have with the temporary, limited expansion of the Agency's existing conditional approval pathway for animal drugs in H.R. 5554, and that you will support timely passage of this bill to avoid any reductions in force and disruptions at the Agency. Again, you have our personal commitment to keep your staff informed as we implement this provision, if it is enacted.

Sincerely,

SCOTT GOTTLIEB, M.D.,
*Commissioner of Food
and Drugs.*

STEVE SOLOMON, D.V.M.,
M.P.H.,
*Director, Center for
Veterinary Medicine.*

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, in a moment, I will specifically address the comments the Senator from Washington made. First, I would like to acknowledge that she and other Members of the Senate worked with us to make sure this legislation could become law by August 1, and I thank her for that.

Sometimes the House accepts a Senate bill, as it did with the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act that the President signed today, and sometimes the Senate accepts a House bill, as I will move that we do today. One reason we are able to do that is because our committees work closely with the House to try to take as many of their good ideas as we can so we can pass each other's bill, if that became necessary. The second reason that happens is because Senator MURRAY characteristically works with me to solve problems like she is doing today, and I am grateful to her for doing that. We don't agree on everything, but we agree on a lot.

I noticed in our committee hearing the other day that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, of which I am chairman and she is the ranking Democrat, has approved 50 bills this Congress. Eighteen of them have been signed by the President. Some more will be signed by the President.

We are working hard on opioids legislation, which is of great interest to almost every Member of this body. Our committee has unanimously reported that to the floor, and we are working with other committees. We have been working with the House on that. We are working on getting generic drugs to market more easily, something that has needed to be done for 20 years. We have reported that out to the Senate. Pandemic legislation—dealing with epidemics and being prepared for them—is ready for the Senate to act on.

This is characteristic of the work Senator MURRAY and her staff do. As she mentioned, this bill is the last of the so-called user fee agreements. We passed four last August that dealt with about \$9 billion in industry user fees to fund the Food and Drug Administration. This is another bill to do that. These bills are complicated and difficult and involve lots of discussions. In the end, they often pass by agreement, as this one will today, I believe, but that is because of the amount of work our staff and Senator MURRAY's staff and the House of Representatives have done. I thank them for that.

The FDA user fee bills provide about half the funding the Food and Drug Administration uses every year to keep the drugs we buy at our pharmacies and get at the doctor's office safe. We take it for granted, but it is the gold standard, and we work very hard to try to make sure we don't infringe on that gold standard of safety and efficacy.

The House of Representatives has passed, by unanimous consent, the bill we referred to, the Animal Drug and Generic Animal Drug User Fee Amendments, which reauthorizes user fee programs that allow the animal drug industry and the Food and Drug Administration to continue to expedite the review of safe and effective treatments for animals. These updated agreements have been carefully worked out between the Food and Drug Administration and the animal drug industry, with input from farmers and ranchers, food and feed producers, veterinarians, and other stakeholders.

If Congress doesn't do its job, as the Senator from Washington said, to reauthorize these critical programs before August 1, the Food and Drug Administration will be forced to send layoff notices to 115 employees. By our action today, we will be able to avoid that.

The review of over 2,000 animal drug applications and investigational submissions currently pending before the Food and Drug Administration will be significantly delayed if we don't act, and we intend to act. This means it

will take longer for new animal drugs and treatments to be available to farmers, ranchers, veterinarians, and families, but, fortunately, because of the cooperation today, that will not happen.

The Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, our committee, approved the Senate version of this bill on February 28 of this year by a bipartisan vote of 22 to 1. The bill passed the House in almost identical form that was approved by the HELP Committee in February, but the House bill, as Senator MURRAY said, expands conditional approval to encourage innovation and competition.

Conditional approval allows a drug to go to market once it meets the Food and Drug Administration safety standards, and then the drug company has up to 5 years to prove the drug is effective. Based on bipartisan feedback about conditional approval, the House of Representatives agreed to make three changes in its bill: No. 1, a 10-year sunset for conditional approval; No. 2, clarify the conditional approval does not require an additional fee to be paid to the Food and Drug Administration; and, No. 3, a Government Accountability Office report on conditional approval.

Senator MURRAY and I agree that we need to clarify what it means for a drug to be “difficult to study.” I have talked to Dr. Scott Gottlieb, the Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration about these concerns, and he agrees. Dr. Gottlieb has agreed to quickly issue guidance and develop regulations that provide clarity on what “difficult to study” means and that do not change the gold standard of the Food and Drug Administration’s drug approval process.

Also, conditional approval is not available for antimicrobial drugs. The language in the bill is clear, and Dr. Gottlieb understands that conditional approval is not available for antimicrobial drugs.

Congress will also conduct oversight to make sure conditional approval is achieving the goal of helping more pets and keeping our food supply safe. This bipartisan legislation will help keep animals healthy, prevent disease outbreaks, and protect our food supply.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 5554.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5554) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to reauthorize user fee programs relating to new animal drugs and generic new animal drugs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

Without objection, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate will proceed to the measure.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 5554) was passed.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, FINANCIAL SERVICES, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

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

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

IMMIGRATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, from the earliest moments in the Presidential campaign, Donald Trump made it clear that immigration was an important issue to his election. You will recall statements that he made about the construction of the wall on the southern border of the United States. He called it the big, glorious, gorgeous 2,000-mile wall, and he promised us that the Mexicans would pay for it. Over and over he promised us they would pay for it. That wasn’t the only reference made to immigration during the course of the campaign, so it came as no surprise, when President Trump was elected, that immigration became a major issue in his administration.

It is ironic, in a way, that this Nation of immigrants called America would have such struggles these days with the issue of immigration. Many of us can trace our origins to recent immigrants. In my own case, my mother was an immigrant to this country, and here her son turned out to have a full-time government job as a U.S. Senator.

My story is my family’s story, but it is also America’s story of how the sons and daughters of immigrants came here and tried to—and in many ways did—make a difference in the country we live in. Despite that fact, despite the Statue of Liberty and all of our heritage from immigrants coming to America, there has always been a political voice and a political force that has resisted more immigration.

There were people who have said: We have enough. They are going to take our jobs. They don’t practice our religions. They don’t speak our language. Their food smells funny. We don’t like the way they dress.

Over the course of decades, if not centuries, that was always part of the American political life, but it was a minority position. With the Trump administration, immigration issues have been front and center. We have seen that many times.

Years ago, I introduced the Dream Act. The Dream Act said that if you were brought to this country, undocumented as a baby, as a child, you should have a chance to earn your way to legal status to become part of America’s future. I have tried to pass that bill, and I have been successful in the Senate a few times. We have been successful in the House, but it has never made it through both Chambers to become the law of the land.

President Obama created a program called DACA, based on the Dream Act, which allowed those who qualified to have 2-year temporary, renewable status, protected from deportation, with the legal right to work.

Last year, President Trump abolished the program, and 790,000 young people who were protected—who had registered with the government, who had paid a filing fee, who had gone through a criminal background check and were going to school and working—were told their protection would go away.

Were it not for a court decision to protect them, many of them would be deported today. But that court decision can change any day, any week, any month.

We tried in February on the floor of the Senate to come up with a bipartisan approach to solving this problem, but we fell short. When a bipartisan group of Senators came up with a proposal, which I supported and which received over 50 votes, at the end of the day, the Trump administration opposed it, so it went down, and we did not answer the need for the passage of legislation.

There is a new issue before us, one most Americans are well aware of; that is, the President’s announcement of what is known as the zero tolerance policy. It started at the beginning of April, and it was a policy by our government to literally arrest and charge every person who came to this border without legal status.

You could come to the United States without legal status and apply to become a person protected with asylum or a refugee. Just coming to the border itself is not a crime if you come for that purpose.

But this new zero tolerance policy said that they would charge every person who came to the border as a criminal. Well, one thing led to another because once a person has been charged as a criminal—even as a misdemeanor criminal—in most circumstances, their children, minors in their custody, are removed from them. That is exactly what happened. In 2,700 cases, our government, under the President’s zero tolerance policy, forcibly removed children from their parents.

We had a hearing on it today, and it is the reason I have come to the floor. We asked the heads of the agencies who created this policy some basic questions. We asked them if they had created a means of determining what would happen to the children, where the parents would be, and how they would be reunited. The sad answer, the real answer, is no.

So when a Federal judge in Southern California stepped in and said that the zero tolerance policy must end, and now there must be a reunification of these families—parents with their children—it turned out that this Government of the United States of America did not have the records to reunite parents and children.

They literally turned thousands of people loose, trying to match up these kids with their parents—kids who had been separated by our government at the border. You think to yourself, as one of my colleagues said: When you take your child into Chuck E. Cheese, they sometimes give them little plastic bracelets so that they don't get lost and we know who that little child belongs to.

Our Federal Government didn't do that, and, as a consequence, thousands—thousands—of children were turned loose into a system, and when the court order was applied we couldn't comply; we couldn't reunify them.

Where are we today? Today, out of the 2,700 or more children who were separated from their parents, we have reunified about 2,000 of them, roughly, but for 711, we are still short of bringing the reunification together; the parents are not reunited with their children. For 94 of these children, we do not have information. We don't know where their parents are. Think about that.

In the United States of America, with our vast wealth and talent and resources and computers, we removed children from their families and tossed them into the bureaucratic sea. I am not sure how this story is going to end, but it is a pretty sad situation.

One of my colleagues, Senator BLUMENTHAL from Connecticut, asked the assembled representatives of the Trump administration the following question: Do you believe that the zero tolerance policy was a success? Not one of them did. Do you believe that the United States should engage in further family separation? Not one of them did.

So we know it was a mistake, and we know there are still victims out there—kids who have not been reunited. The obvious question is: What can we do about it? Well, we can use every resource at our disposal to make sure that we bring these children back in contact with their parents.

I went to one of the shelters in Chicago about 5 weeks ago to meet with 10 of these kids. Their ages ranged from about 5 years of age to 14, and the youngest ones were from Central America and Mexico. They came into

the room. I remember two little girls holding hands, walking into the room, cutest little things, and they looked like twins because their hair was fixed the same way. It turns out that they were not twins; they were not even sisters. One of the little girls said: "No, amigas"—friends.

I watched them. They held on to one another through the entire meeting, and as they left the room, they held hands together. They were clinging to the only connectivity—the only anchors—in their lives: other children who were going through the same experience. They had been forcibly separated from their parents.

I brought some cards with me, made by kids of my staff in Chicago—just cards with stickers on them, construction paper with little messages, some in Spanish, some in English. I let the kids choose from these cards if they wanted them. Every single one of them took one and hung on to it like it was a Christmas gift.

What is it like for these children to be separated at that early age? I am not an expert. I have been a dad and a grandfather, if that gives me any claim to expertise. But when you turn to the experts, the pediatric physicians, they say that it is institutional child abuse to forcibly remove children from their parents and set them off in a strange setting, this institutional setting, for weeks and for months, and that is exactly what we did.

The President finally realized that he was wrong and reversed the policy, but the kids are still there. The kids have not been united, and we have not solved the problems that face this country.

There are a lot of things that divide Democrats and Republicans in this town. I hope there are several things we can all agree on.

No. 1, the United States needs border security. We can't have open borders for everyone who wants to come to this country. It wouldn't work, it wouldn't be safe, and I am not advocating that. I doubt that many people are.

Secondly, we need to make sure that dangerous people who want to come into this country are stopped, and anyone who is here, undocumented and dangerous, should be removed. I think we all agree on that.

The third thing we need—clearly need—is comprehensive immigration reform. Our immigration system is desperately broken. It doesn't serve our needs in so many different ways.

I was part of an effort 5 years ago when eight Senators—four Democrats and four Republicans joined together. JOHN MCCAIN, CHUCK SCHUMER, LINDSEY GRAHAM, MICHAEL BENNET, BOB MENENDEZ, JEFF FLAKE, MARCO RUBIO, and I spent about 6 months writing a comprehensive immigration reform bill. We all had to give a little. That is what happens when you are in a political situation.

We brought the bill to the floor of the Senate, and it passed with 64 votes.

That is a pretty healthy margin in a Chamber that is often bitterly divided.

We had comprehensive immigration reform. So what happened to it? It crossed the Rotunda into the House of Representatives and disappeared. They never held a hearing, and they never called a bill. They ignored it completely. They left the mess that we now have in place.

Well, we need to return to this issue, and we need to do it quickly. We need to make sure that we have another comprehensive immigration reform bill that starts addressing the basic issues we addressed in our last effort. That, to me, is the only way to put us on the right track to do the right thing.

In the meantime, there are too many victims, and too darn many of them are children. We can do better as a nation. The United States is a caring and compassionate nation. We have proved it over and over again throughout our history. We need to do it again.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. President, I want to discuss the conference report that is coming over for the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act.

I want to thank Senator JOHN MCCAIN, who has been absent from the Chamber for months, but we think of him every day and remember fondly his amazing ability to shepherd this bill through the Senate and through conference committee; JACK REED, the Democrat serving on that same defense authorization committee; JIM INHOFE of Oklahoma, who has stepped in to fill in for JOHN MCCAIN in his absence; Congressman THORNBERRY, Congressman SMITH, and all of those who worked on this conference agreement.

Since I am the ranking Democrat or vice chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I know how hard it is to take a bill of this complexity and size and work out a political compromise. But that was achieved with the National Defense Authorization Act, and it was done with many extraordinary efforts when it came to defense and foreign policy.

No compromise is perfect, but I am troubled and disappointed by several particular provisions in the bill, and I wanted to speak to them on the floor before the bill comes up for consideration later this week.

This last January, Secretary of Defense Mattis, whom I respect greatly and voted for, argued in his national defense strategy that we were seeing "the reemergence of long-term, strategic competition," especially against Russia and China. I don't think anyone disputes that, and yet two high-profile provisions in this Defense authorization bill weaken the pressure that we should be exerting against these two nations.

Russia has illegally seized territory in Ukraine and Georgia. It has protected the murderous Syrian regime. It has murdered its critics with chemical attacks on foreign soil. It has attempted to undermine democratic elections across the Western world, from

France to our own United States. For that reason, Congress put in place tough sanctions against Russia last year. They passed with overwhelming votes in the House and the Senate. I voted for them as did most of the Members from both sides of the aisle.

Many of those sanctions required the President to impose the sanctions. It was mandatory that he do this. It gave Congress the right to review those sanctions if the President decided to waive and not apply them. Why? It is sad to say that this congressional review was included because no one trusted President Trump to stand up to Vladimir Putin. He believes the word of Vladimir Putin over that of our intelligence community professionals. Unfortunately, our President has shown on almost a daily basis, that he simply doesn't have it in him to stand up for American interests if Vladimir Putin disagrees.

Yet the conference report before us provides the administration with an even bigger national security waiver on these sanctions, a larger escape clause so that the President could avoid applying sanctions to Russia, and it removes Congress's ability to review that decision. I am sure the Secretary of Defense will use his powers in this bill wisely to allow the United States to help key allies wean themselves off of Russian military equipment. The problem is that this is not the only way the administration can use this broad waiver. It makes congressional review more, not less, important, and yet the conference report, I think, goes in thing wrong direction.

We need to be firm with Russia. They need to understand there is a price to pay for what they are doing to their neighbors, as well as to the rest of the world and especially to the electoral process of the United States. It was only last week that we received the latest notification that one of my fellow colleagues in this Chamber has had her office hacked by the Russians during the course of her reelection campaign. This is not the end of Russian intrigue, and we have to address this Russian threat with our eyes wide open. I wish the Defense authorization bill were more explicit in that regard.

This conference agreement also waters down sanctions against China. Last year, a large Chinese telecommunications company was caught redhanded evading U.S. sanctions on North Korea and Iran.

Earlier this year, the Department of Defense also stopped selling its phones to the military because it "may pose an unacceptable risk to personnel, information, and mission." These phones from China "may pose an unacceptable risk to personnel, information, and mission." Our Department of Defense has warned us that this Chinese equipment can be dangerous if used by our military establishment in the United States.

We responded forcefully to these repeated violations of the law and na-

tional security risk, passing a provision to prohibit this company from doing any business in the United States, but, again, just as with the Russia provision, this was watered down from prohibiting it from doing business with the U.S. Government. What it means is that the Chinese telecommunications company, which we fear is going to make us weaker in terms of national security, is prohibited for business with our government but is able to sell its products in the general commerce of America. That cannot make our country any safer.

The agreement also contains a comprehensive overhaul of the way we protect our economy from national security threats. So perhaps next time, if the Chinese violate it or any other country does, we can catch them before damage is done. We could have made this provision much stronger.

Another reason why I am disappointed by this conference committee report is the irresponsible removal of provisions related to Myanmar, formerly known as Burma. The House bill contained five provisions restricting security engagement with Burma, imposing sanctions on Burmese officials responsible for human rights abuses, and requiring the State Department to make a determination on whether the atrocities committed against the Rohingya people, a minority, constituted ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity, or genocide.

These provisions were included in the House version of the National Defense Authorization Act with overwhelming bipartisan support. Similar language passed out of our Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a stand-alone bill with bipartisan support. It looked like these provisions were destined to be in the final work product.

We are all aware of the horrific persecution of the Rohingya people by the Burmese military, stemming from decades of deep-seated misconceptions and hatred that have led to violence, most recently last August, when a small group of militants attacked a security outpost.

The Burmese military brutally responded in a scorched-earth campaign against the Rohingya people, killing thousands, including children, violating their women, forcibly starving their people, and burning down their villages. More than 700,000 Rohingya people fled Burma to nearby Bangladesh, as they had been overwhelmed by the Burmese military and their forces.

In neighboring Bangladesh, they were forced into squalid refugee camps, which I visited. I know the Bangladeshis and others are doing their best to help them, but these are horrible living conditions for anyone.

In Burma the government authorities continue to deny that any of this took place. They burned and overtook former Rohingya villages. They ignored calls for safe and voluntary repatriation and accountability.

I am particularly disappointed in Aung San Suu Kyi. Her silence on these problems is hard to explain. Many of us admired her for a long period of time and the courage she showed against the Burmese military, but when it comes to this moral humanitarian choice, her silence is distressing. Just this month, an extensive and devastating report released by the group Fortify Rights found that the Burmese authorities had actually made the preparations for attacks against the Rohingya people before the August 25 militant attack, which they blamed for their actions. Groups such as Fortify Rights, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and countless others have even documented the Burmese military officials and units responsible for the crimes against the Rohingya, led by General Min Aung Hlaing.

Despite this, our President has been slow to sanction military officials. The Trump administration has been sitting on a potential list for months and so far has sanctioned one person only. Here in the Senate, one of our Senate leaders, dismayed, continues to block movement of any bipartisan sanction effort aimed for those responsible for this atrocity.

I am sorry to say that what looked like an easy bipartisan provision to condemn this behavior by the Burmese military is a casualty of this conference committee, and it is another reason that I am troubled by the work product. Finally, I want to note that this conference agreement provides zero paid increases for defense civilian personnel. That is just unacceptable. The President did not request an increase in his budget proposal even though Secretary Mattis has called their contributions essential to our military operations for everything from acquisition to policy expertise.

Congress should exercise its independent judgment to provide this civilian pay increase. After all, we cannot expect to continue to recruit and retain the best civilian workers in our military without appropriate pay.

I am glad that the Appropriations Committee was providing modest increases for all Federal and civilian employees, but every committee in every branch of government must take responsibility for this in the future. I understand that one cannot demand perfection in the legislative process, and there are many provisions in this conference report that I appreciate and the work that was put into it.

The conferees rejected unrelated poison pill environmental provisions from the House and retained a very strong Senate statement in support of NATO. These are two of the hundreds of good provisions contained in this bill and conference report. But as I stated at the outset, I believe the agreement also makes improper changes in the key areas that I have outlined, and for those reasons I will be voting against cloture on the conference agreement.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CODES ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about the importance of teaching computer science and coding in our education system. Throughout the United States and especially in my home State of Washington, our internet economy is booming. Nationwide, it represents 7 percent of our GDP and makes up 13 percent of Washington's economy. In Washington, more than 13,000 internet companies provide more than a quarter of a million jobs.

We want to keep this American success story going, but to do that, we need to make sure these startups have the workforce of tomorrow that they need. That is why it is so important for children throughout the United States to be able to learn to code in school.

Every student in America should be taught the tools they need to enter our 21st-century economy. I laugh and say all the time that I took typing and Latin as my prerequisite requirements in college. I am not saying that typing and Latin didn't help me today, but I question whether we are teaching the same skills today that we need for the 21st-century economy.

Every student in the United States should have the opportunity to learn about the internet, algorithms, and applications. In Washington, we are making progress in this area because 31 percent of our high schools offer coding classes, but more still needs to be done.

According to a great organization, code.org, 90 percent of parents in the United States want their children to study or understand computer science; however, only 40 percent of their children are taught anything about computer programming. Computer jobs are the No. 1 source of new jobs in the country. Currently, there are more than 500,000 computer job openings in the United States.

This is a skills gap we have to close if we want to continue to develop these new products and services. That is why I worked with my colleague from Louisiana, Senator CASSIDY, to introduce the High School CODES Act earlier this year. Our legislation creates a new Federal grant program to help high schools throughout the country establish or expand coding education programs for their students.

Ninety percent of parents want their children to study computer science, so we should be providing them more opportunities. Children in cities, suburbs and rural communities all should have access to these computer science programs.

As I mentioned, in my State, the demand for computer science and coding programs is clear. Right now, Washington has more than 16,000 good-paying job openings in computer science. Still, only 31 percent of our State schools offered computer science courses for the high school level between 2016 and 2017. What is standing in our way? Well, in many cases, it is the cost of developing a computer science curriculum and getting a program up and running in the high school. That is exactly the problem our legislation tries to solve by giving local communities the resources they need to develop and implement good computer science curriculums that make the most sense for those communities.

As I said, not everybody will necessarily go into computer science. I took typing and Latin, which gave me a fundamental understanding of both of those things. What is wrong with everybody having a fundamental understanding of the language of the 21st-century computer programming?

I was excited, with Senator CASSIDY, when we were able to include language in the reauthorization of the Perkins vocational and technical educational bill, which the President signed today, to move us closer to that goal. The language in the bill that was signed by the President would allow the use of Federal funds to support efforts to expand, develop, or implement programs to increase opportunities for students to take rigorous courses in coding and computer science and support statewide efforts to create access to and implementation of coding and computer science. This is a great example of what we can do when working together in a bipartisan manner.

It is the first important step to make sure that every student understands some level of what our economy is going to be built on in the future. We will have plenty of work to do. As I said, not everyone will go into computer science, but having a basic understanding of how just about everything in your home and your workplace is going to work, and even your car and other applications that you have, will be a good bridge to this economy.

We are going to continue to work together and find ways that computer science and coding can be taught in our classrooms. At the Federal level, we don't have a lot of control over that curriculum at the local level, but we can incentivize, as we are doing today, schools across the United States, with a little Federal support, to make sure that coding and computer science are key parts of a high school education.

I want to thank my colleague Senator CASSIDY for working on this important issue with me and helping to get it included in this Perkins legislation. I thank all my colleagues for voting for it and the President for signing it. The economy of the future can leave people behind but not if we help prepare them for the future, and part of preparing them for the future is just a

basic understanding of how programming and computer science work.

I hope many schools across the United States will take up this opportunity. I hope it will lead to many new applications, new job creations, and greater awareness of what STEM education is all about. Having people trained in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and math is key to our country's future. I am so glad the President is signing this legislation today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. 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 LIEUTENANT GENERAL MICHAEL H. SHIELDS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as we are working through the remaining issues as they relate to the various appropriations bills before us, I wanted to take just a few moments this afternoon to speak about a friend of mine, a friend of Alaska's, a gentleman, and a leader, Alaska's LTG Michael H. Shields, who is retiring from the U.S. Army after 35 years of service. I thank Mike on behalf of my Senate colleagues and the people of Alaska for his outstanding service as he retires from Active Duty.

Mike received his commission through the Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps at Norwich University in 1983. Like so many of Alaska's best and finest citizens, we kind of adopted him. He came to Alaska to serve. He came to love our State, and we just loved him right back.

I first came to know Mike as Colonel Shields when he was commanding the 172nd Stryker Brigade Combat Team—known as the Arctic Wolves—at Fort Wainwright, AK, just outside of Fairbanks. He led the brigade during the height of Operation Iraqi Freedom. It was a very difficult command, probably one of the more difficult commands any colonel could imagine.

The Arctic Wolves had executed their planned 2005 to 2006 deployment in northern Iraq. They had done an exceptional job, and they were ready to come home. They had been there for a full deployment. The plans were laid. The families had all been told. This very successful, yearlong deployment was coming to an end during the early summer of 2006. Again, there was a great deal of excitement about the end of that deployment. The problem, though, was that it was not coming to an end. The unit had performed very well in northern Iraq, and the Pentagon basically said: We need more help. We need you to help out in the vicinity around Baghdad.

As it is with the military, the Pentagon didn't exactly ask the soldiers if

they wanted to extend their deployment; they told the soldiers that the deployment was going to be extended. That is not unusual. This is the military. You go where you are told to go and when you are told to go. Unfortunately, this message was delivered in a messy and very chaotic way. It was very sudden, and it was without warning to their families. Some of the elements of the 172nd had already returned to Fort Wainwright, and ultimately they had to redeploy. They had to go back to Iraq. Other elements were actually in the air on the way home when their planes were turned around.

I was in Fairbanks, at Fort Wainwright, at the time, and I can recall going through the gates, and there were areas where there were chain link fences. Kids had taken papier-mache and stuffed it in the chain link to spell out the words "Welcome Home Daddy" and hearts. The messages of love and excitement about their dad or their husband coming home were everywhere. But when the plug is pulled and they are told they are not going to be coming home, it is extraordinarily disappointing not only for those who have been deployed for this yearlong period but also for those families who are literally waiting, who knew exactly what they were going to be wearing when their dad stepped off that airplane, to be told "He is not coming home now, and we don't know when he is coming home." It was very difficult when these families were told to wait. The families were angry. They were upset. They were very angry. They felt they had been misled and with good cause.

Fortunately, the Army and the Fairbanks community just kind of stepped up to wrap their arms around the families during this now-extended deployment, and things calmed down. These are military families. They are tough. They have gone through these separations, and as hard as that had been, they had kind of set their heads right and said: No. We are going to get through this. That may have been the easy part.

Mike, on the other hand, our colonel, had to deal with these problems from a distance. Baghdad is 5,620 miles and 11 time zones away from Fairbanks. So not only did Mike have to manage the challenges of the battlefield in Iraq but also the challenges of maintaining troop morale and focus across all of this time and distance.

Part of the problem—and making matters worse—was that nobody really knew how long this extension would be. When you think about all that goes on in a tense situation like that, only the most outstanding of leaders can really pull something like this off, and Mike proved himself to be the best of the best. He reminded his troops, they needed to stick together in order to survive.

He said: "The strength of the pack is the wolf, and the strength of the wolf is the pack." That is the motto of the Arctic Wolves.

Then-Colonel Shields went on to say:

It means no wolf pack is stronger than its individual hunter, and no hunter is more important than the pack. Individually, we accomplish little. As a team, we accomplish much.

The troops endured what turned out to be a 4-month extension on top of their initial deployment. The unit returned home by Christmas. The American Forces Press Service reported on December 15 of 2006 that the Arctic Wolves earned distinction in Iraq as they took on what then-Army Secretary Francis Harvey called "the toughest challenge of any unit in Iraq." Again, there are many reasons to be very proud of all they have done under the command of Colonel Shields.

Mike moved on to other challenges. He was twice promoted following that deployment. He then went back to Alaska. I was thrilled when Mike returned as a major general to command U.S. Army Alaska, which was headquartered at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson in Anchorage. He returned to Alaska in 2013 to command U.S. Army Alaska. He branded U.S. Army Alaska as the Army's experts in high-altitude, cold-weather ground operations.

One of our really great—I mean truly great—training assets is the Northern Warfare Training Center in Black Rapids, AK. Mike ensured that his troops were trained at Black Rapids for missions that would demand their unique skill sets. He then opened Black Rapids to the allied troops who required those skills. He was really an effective evangelist for the Army's cold-weather mission—a mission of increasing importance as the Arctic has become more strategic.

He has told me numerous times of some of the challenges of training some of these young soldiers how to ski in extremely cold conditions with very interesting Army-issued skis and equipment. One of these days, he will challenge me to a race, but I don't know. In knowing the skills of General Shields, I think I am going to pass on that.

Prior to departing Alaska for his next assignment in 2015, Mike was required to host visiting Army officials who were studying a major downsizing that potentially involved the consolidation of brigades. Both the 172nd, which was then rebranded the 1st of the 25th, and the Airborne Brigade at Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson were potentially on the chopping block.

Big Army was looking at a variety of scenarios across its enterprise, and that brought evaluation teams to both Anchorage and Fairbanks. He showed the evaluation teams our remarkable training assets. Even more importantly, he prepared the teams for what they would hear at the community meetings. What they heard was that Alaska was a very special place for our military families and that Alaska communities went above and beyond what was expected in their support of mili-

tary communities. Whatever else one may say about Alaska's military value, it is a great place for military families.

The evaluation teams left with favorable impressions of what Alaska had to offer. The Stryker Brigade survived this process. Yes, we fought to retain our Airborne Brigade at JBER, but Mike laid very solid groundwork for our ultimate success, and we are very grateful to him for his support of the Alaska mission.

Throughout, Mike distinguished himself through exceptionally meritorious service and achievement in a multitude of assignments of increasing responsibility, culminating as the Director of the Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization, and he has proven to be an exceptional and inspiring leader there.

His selfless service, dedication to duty, and unyielding devotion to soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coalition partners are in keeping with the finest traditions of military service.

The distinctive accomplishments of Lieutenant General Shields bring great credit upon himself, the U.S. Army, and the Department of Defense. It is with great pride that I reflect upon his outstanding career before the U.S. Senate today.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, over the last several days, the minority leader has again continued his unprecedented partisan interference with the business of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In addition to these partisan interventions being unwelcomed, many of the minority leader's assertions are just plain false, and other assertions omit significant context. So, as I have done several times in recent days, I am here to correct the record.

Let me start by reiterating that the confirmation process for Judge Kavanaugh will be the most transparent in history. That is from the availability of all the documents that are out there for our colleagues to study about this nominee. Senators already have access to the most important part of Judge Kavanaugh's record—his more than 300 opinions written during his 12 years on the DC Circuit, in addition to the hundreds more opinions he joined, and the more than 6,000 pages that were submitted in connection with his Senate Judiciary questionnaire.

Moreover, the Senate will receive more pages of executive branch documents than the Senate will have received for any Supreme Court nominee ever—I anticipate up to 1 million pages of documents from Judge Kavanaugh's time in the White House Counsel's Office and his service in the Office of the Independent Counsel, along with records related to his 2006 confirmation to be a judge on the DC Circuit. The production could be larger than those of the last five Supreme Court nominees combined. Hence, one understands

why I am saying this will be the most transparent confirmation process of any Federal Supreme Court Justice.

The other side is pretending like the most expansive and transparent confirmation process in history is not good enough. Despite this expansive and transparent confirmation process and that Senators already have Judge Kavanaugh's entire judicial record in front of them already, Democratic leaders continue to make unreasonable demands for more and more documents. In fact, they demand access to every email and every other document ever written or received by every staffer who ever worked in the Bush White House. They want these records in order to fish for documents that merely mention Brett Kavanaugh's name. In other words, they, essentially, want access to every document that ever went through the Bush White House.

Now, this is really beyond unreasonable, and it is not a very serious proposal. During Judge Kagan's confirmation, then-Chairman LEAHY was adamant that documents merely mentioning Justice Kagan's name shouldn't be produced. This is just one example of Democratic leaders' not following the Kagan standard.

The motive behind the unreasonable demands for documents is obvious: Democratic leaders want to stall Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation in any way possible. They hope to bury the Senate in mountains of irrelevant documents to delay his confirmation hearing and to perhaps deny him a vote during this current Congress.

The ranking member's hometown newspaper reported this scheme over the weekend. The headline used the word "stall."

The San Francisco Chronicle called it "a tactic that could postpone a decision until after the midterm elections." The article explained: "The Democrats' strategy . . . is to demand to see every document that crossed Kavanaugh's desk while he served as President George W. Bush's staff secretary from 2003 to 2006." In other words, the Democratic leaders are demanding these documents in order to needlessly delay the process rather than for legitimate purposes. Yet these tactics aren't going to work.

Let me address some of the minority leader's specific points.

He says, traditionally, the Senate Judiciary Committee sends a bipartisan letter that requests documents, and he said we should have sent out this letter 2 weeks ago. What the minority leader fails to point out is, my staff worked extensively with the ranking member's staff to attempt to identify specific Staff Secretary records that might be of some interest to the Democrats, but the Democratic staff was not interested in a reasonable compromise, including my attempts to get them even more documents than the up to 1 million pages of documents we were already in the process of receiving.

After multiple rounds of negotiation, the ranking member's staff still had

not budged from its position that it was entitled to access any of the millions and millions of pages of documents that ever went through the Bush White House. These demands were unprecedented, were unreasonable, and were obviously intended to delay the confirmation process.

I couldn't allow this tactic to further delay this important business of the committee. So, as chairman, I sent a records request for the White House Counsel's documents because we needed to keep this process moving. We couldn't be stalling. It is unfortunate the ranking member didn't agree to sign it because the letter requested documents that both sides agreed we should have. Both sides agreed with the documents that were in my letter, but there was no signature from the minority.

The minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, also says we should have followed the precedent established during Justice Kagan's nomination. In suggesting this point, he is rewriting history. He may not know that, but he is. He conveniently forgets that both Democrats and Republicans agreed we shouldn't have requested documents from Justice Kagan's time as Solicitor General. Everyone agreed that the Kagan Solicitor General documents were too sensitive for disclosure and, in fact, could chill the candidness of internal deliberations for future Presidents and their counsel—their Solicitor General.

This same respect for confidentiality should apply with greater force, then, to Staff Secretary documents, which include some of the most sensitive policy advice going directly to a President. In this case, it was President George W. Bush. Indeed, the White House Staff Secretary is essentially the inbox and outbox for the President of the United States. Now, that is not to say that it is not a very important position, but it doesn't get involved in much policy.

The Senate's current task is to evaluate the qualifications of Judge Kavanaugh, not to relitigate every political and policy disagreement from President George W. Bush's 8 years in the White House.

As my Democratic colleagues keep pointing out, Judge Kavanaugh has described how his time as Staff Secretary was a formative experience for him. Well, Justice Kagan said the same thing about her time as Solicitor General, but in the case of Kagan, the Democrats refused to request her records.

On top of the undisputed relevance of Solicitor General material, Judge Kagan, however, lacked a judicial record. In other words, unlike the more than 300 opinions that Judge Kavanaugh authored and the hundreds more opinions that he joined in during his 12 years of service on the DC Circuit, Justice Kagan had zero judicial opinions that she offered, zero judicial opinions that she joined, and zero years of judicial service.

Her Solicitor General documents were, therefore, even more relevant. Democratic leaders, then, are rewriting the Kagan standard to further their stalling tactics.

The minority leader also tried to draw a parallel—or parallels—with the request for documents from Justice Sotomayor's time as a board member of the Puerto Rican Legal Defense and Education Fund. This, however, was a narrow request, closely tailored to a specific need for information. It resulted in the production of approximately 100 documents, not millions of documents, as are involved with the White House Staff Secretary.

In contrast, Democratic leaders demand access to every single one of the millions and millions of pages of emails and other records from every one of the 100 staffers who served in the White House with Judge Kavanaugh. As I have said repeatedly, I will not put the American taxpayers on the hook for the Senate Democrats' fishing expedition.

Clearly, losing on the substantive arguments, the minority leader has even resorted to personally attacking Mr. Bill Burck, President George W. Bush's attorney. Mr. Burck has been one of President Bush's designated representatives for the Presidential Records Act, going way back to 2009. He is a leading partner in one of America's most respected and, I think, most liberal law firms.

I am told that he has insisted that no lawyer be selected to participate in the review of President Bush's White House papers on the basis of his or her party affiliation or political ideology. Moreover, Mr. Burck has taken the time to personally meet with the ranking member's staff and answer all of their questions about the document review process that I am describing to you here.

The minority leader said at a press conference today that the review by President Bush's lawyers "wouldn't be so bad if he also got a full set of documents from the Archives." Well, that is exactly what I expect to happen—in other words, a full set of documents from the Archives.

President Bush has offered to give us access to copies of documents that we requested from the Archives so that we on the committee can quickly begin our review of Judge Kavanaugh's record while the Archives works through our document request. The minority leader could have learned this by simply having a conversation with me instead of putting on a political show in front of TV cameras earlier today.

I must also address the minority leader's unprecedented intervention into the business of the Judiciary Committee. The minority leader is not a member of that committee. We are not going to let him run the committee. I am the chairman of that committee. He has no business inserting himself

into the committee's business, including the manner in which the committee will obtain the documents needed to review Judge Kavanaugh's record.

But last week he sent a letter to President George W. Bush, asking him to release all records from Judge Kavanaugh's service in the White House, while at the same time criticizing the way that President Bush has chosen to review those records. This letter was an inappropriate attempt to meddle in the committee's business, and I am disappointed that my Democratic colleagues on the committee are tolerating that sort of intervention.

I have also learned that the minority leader called the Archivist on Monday and asked him to "do the right thing" with regard to the documents.

I was disappointed to hear that the minority leader was attempting to pressure a government official—one appointed by President Obama, can you believe—with regard to the committee's business.

I also want to address one argument that my colleague on the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Illinois, has made. My colleague believes Judge Kavanaugh misled the committee during his 2006 confirmation hearing when he said he was not involved in developing the Bush administration's detention and interrogation policies. The senior Senator pointed to a media report that described a 2002 meeting in the White House in which Judge Kavanaugh advised whether his former boss, Justice Kennedy, would accept a legal argument about American citizens' access to counsel.

These allegations have no merit, and here is why. Offering advice on the potential success of a legal position suggested by others—meaning others in the White House Staff Secretary's Office—does not show involvement in developing detention and interrogation policies.

Multiple sources have confirmed that Judge Kavanaugh wasn't involved in developing detention and interrogation policies. Moreover, these allegations were already referred to the Department of Justice, which concluded that they didn't even warrant opening an investigation.

I will further point out that this 2002 meeting occurred while Judge Kavanaugh was in the White House Counsel's Office and, as I have explained, the entire Senate—or at least the entire Judiciary Committee—is going to have access to Judge Kavanaugh's White House Counsel records.

In short, I am proud to preside over what will be the most transparent confirmation process in history. As they have said publicly, Democratic leaders are firmly opposed to Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation, and they have also said that they will do whatever it takes to defeat Judge Kavanaugh. They would like to bury the Senate in a mountain of irrelevant documents to delay the confirmation

process as long as possible. As you can tell from my remarks today—and my remarks three or four times since Judge Kavanaugh was appointed—I am not going to allow the minority to abuse the process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized to speak as in morning business for up to 15 minutes.

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

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, let me just follow up on the remarks of my friend from Iowa.

I think most of us around this Chamber had a chance to meet Judge Kavanaugh. I am in kind of a unique situation in that I am not a lawyer. So I ask different questions than most people do, but I was already convinced, judging from his history in voting and his adherence and commitment to the Constitution, that he is my kind of guy. In fact, I even sent a message to him saying: Don't bother wasting your time on me because you don't need to. But, nonetheless, he came.

This is what is interesting about this guy. Everything that the Senator from Iowa said is true, but over and above that, I have had personal conversations with people who were from his home church. There was one lady who was a close friend of Judge Kavanaugh whose husband died, and every time there is an event, such as a parent-student event, Judge Kavanaugh would go and get the children of his deceased friend and take them to the events as if he were their father. It is not very often that we see that kind of compassion in somebody. So we had a conversation about those things and I was very excited about it.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. President, on Thursday we are going to be passing a bill that I consider every year to be the most significant bill of the year. We know it is going to pass because it has passed every year for the last 57 years. It is going to pass. It is named the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act, and I am pleased that this conference report is the result of an open and bipartisan process.

I have to thank, first of all, Chairman MCCAIN and his staff for working so diligently in leading the legislation that bears his name. This year's NDAA is a fitting testament to him. We are talking about JOHN MCCAIN's policies and his priorities and the lasting legacy on our Nation. John is a true American hero. So it is appropriate that we name this bill after him.

I also want to thank Ranking Member REED. Senator REED has been by my side. The two of us have worked this Defense authorization bill now for several months, and we have been very busy doing that. We have been working closely with Chairman THORNBERRY over in the House, as well as with

Ranking Member SMITH in the House. I thank them for their hard work on this bill.

It always gets around to the big four, after we all meet and we have the meetings with the House and the Senate, our joint conference meetings. But then there are always some things that need to be done, and they have to be done by the big four. I have been involved with several of these, and this year, of course, the chairman of the House committee, the acting chairman of the Senate committee, and the ranking members worked very hard, and we got this done.

So we should all be proud of this week's National Defense Authorization Act, but we shouldn't lose sight of why it is so important. We need to remember the degraded state of our military.

I don't mean this in a partisan way, but we had 8 years of the Obama administration, and one thing that I have always appreciated about previously Senator Obama and then-President Obama is that he is a real, sincere, in-the-heart liberal. Quite often, the priorities of those individuals are not the same as some of us, particularly in a strong national defense. So we are really hurting.

At the end of the Obama administration, in 2016, only 33 percent of our brigade combat teams were at sufficient levels to be deployed; only a quarter of our aviation brigades were ready; and just 40 percent of the Marines' F-18s were flyable—only 40 percent—because the first thing somebody does when they are cutting down on the expense of a strong military is they do away with the maintenance, and that is the problem we had. We were short 1,500 pilots and had shrunk the force by nearly 100,000 servicemembers despite growing threats around the world.

I don't think anyone can argue that this is a threatened world. I think it is the most threatened our country has ever been. Countries around the world have the capability of firing a rocket and hitting a city in America. That didn't used to be the case. You had to be a giant in order to be one of the leaders. Now we have people out there whose judgment we have to question, and they have this capability. So we have a lot of things.

We have fallen behind China and Russia. This year's national defense strategy—the first in a decade—rightfully recognized that China and Russia are strategic adversaries and competitors.

We are also falling behind especially in technologies that will define the future of deterrence and capabilities.

Look at hypersonic weapons. Hypersonic weapons operate at five times the speed of sound. They are still in the experimental stage. We are working on it, but we are behind China and Russia. They are both ahead of us at this time.

The nuclear triad is a modernization program. Over the 8 Obama years, we didn't do anything in that. Consequently, during those years, both China and Russia passed us up.

Long-range artillery. Artillery is measured by the rapid fire and by the range, and right now, in both cases of rapid fire and range, China and Russia are ahead of us.

The national defense strategy identified these vulnerabilities, but it is our responsibility to take that strategy and turn it into policy, and that is exactly what we are doing. This year's NDAA does that. We are investing in training, maintenance, and modernization, restoring our qualitative and quantitative advantage around the world. I say restoring, not achieving, because we lost it. The Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, in the fifth year of the Obama administration, said that we are losing our qualitative and quantitative advantage around the world. It is kind of hard for people to conceive of this. I am used to the fact that most people believed and probably still believe today that the United States has the very best of everything. Well, we have the best troops and the best-trained troops, but our equipment is not all that good, and so we are doing everything to try to change that.

So that is the situation in which we find ourselves. This year's NDAA will fully fund the key priorities we have identified that will ensure that our Armed Forces have the training, resources, and equipment they need to complete their mission. We fully fund what is needed to modernize the force, including procurement for aircraft, shipbuilding, and artillery.

Procurement has always been a problem. It has been a problem since I was serving in the House on the House Armed Services Committee. We are addressing this problem as it has not been addressed before.

We have now fully funded in this bill the modernization of our Nation's nuclear strategy, including the development of low-yield nuclear weapons and a layered missile defense. A lot of people don't realize that Russia had low-yield nuclear weapons and we didn't. So we are trying to catch up in those areas.

We fully funded support for critical allies and partners, including the Afghanistan security forces, coalition support, Iraqi security forces, and Israel.

We have increased end strength to align with the President's budget request and adapt to the growing threats from around the world. Now, this sounds easy, but it is not because we are starting from behind. The NDAA bill we are going to vote on on Thursday goes beyond the President's request to provide greater funding for research and development, ensuring that we can continue to focus on new and emerging threats, like hypersonics, space, and cyber.

We are standing up to China by strengthening our position across the Pacific region. This bill provides support to our allies who stand up against China's military and economic coercion and procures deployable airbase

systems to enhance credible combat power.

The NDAA also calls out China for illegally creating and fortifying islands in the South China Sea. I was in the South China Sea about a month ago. Our allies are looking at us and looking at China, and wondering, whose side do we want to be on? Because all they see is what is happening in China. Those are illegal islands. They don't own the land under them. There are some seven different islands exceeding 3,000 acres that are as if they are preparing for World War III. So we know what their capability is. We know what the problems are.

Then, of course, the NDAA counters Russia's growing aggression and influence across Eastern Europe by directing a study on permanently stationing U.S. forces in Poland and conducting a study on Russia's malign influence around the world. That is in this bill. So we are actually going to take some action.

It wasn't long ago—I think in March—that the RAND Corporation, which makes assessments as to what our capabilities are, said that Russia is to the point right now that if they were to take on NATO, including our forces in NATO and Western Europe, that they would win. That is a pretty frightening thought.

The bill continues limitations on U.S.-Russia military cooperation and provides defensive lethal aid to Ukraine. I happened to be in Ukraine with President Poroshenko way back when they had their Parliamentary elections. I think it was about 4 years ago. That was the first time they had a Parliamentary election where there was not one Communist in the Ukraine Parliament. He was very, very proud. Of course that upset Russia, and Putin started sending people into Ukraine and killing them, and our President at that time, President Obama, would not allow us to send defensive weapons in there to help them.

It keeps faith with our troops by providing a 2.6-percent military pay increase—the first one in about 10 years—and it is modernizing the officer personnel system and supporting our troops and military families.

When Senator REED and I started on this process, we shared a commitment to making sure that this year's NDAA is more than just another piece of legislation; rather, that it is a message to each and every one of our servicemembers. And we did that. The NDAA tells them that they are our top priority. It is what we have to do to defend America. After all, the No. 1 thing we should be doing around here is defending America. A lot of people have forgotten that there is an old document around that nobody reads anymore called the Constitution. The Constitution says what we are supposed to be doing: defending America. I am proud to say that we did. Every soldier, sailor, airman, and marine can look at this legislation and know they have the support and commitment of their country.

I want to speak for a minute about the historical significance of this legislation because the history of the National Defense Authorization Act is a distinguished one.

As I mentioned before, we have passed this for 57 consecutive years. This is the 58th year. But what is unique is the fact that we are passing the legislation this week—a record for how quickly in the year it will be passed and signed into law. This was deliberate. We are moving quickly, but we are thorough, considering hundreds of bipartisan amendments in both committee markup and on the floor. This will be the earliest an NDAA has passed since 1996 when we were considering the legislation for fiscal year 1997. So it is the result of the legislative process working.

We set a budget in February and are authorizing the funding well in advance of next year's fiscal year. So now we can and should turn our attention to passing the necessary appropriations bill on time that aligns with that which we are authorizing today.

About 5 years ago, we were all the way to December before we passed this bill. To remind you, if we don't get it done by the end of December, it means we are not going to get flight pay and hazard pay to our troops who are standing in harm's way. So we have done a good job on this. I am anxious to get this out of the way and vote it into law, which is going to take place on Thursday.

We have to remember that without consistent, continued funding, the critical reforms in this year's NDAA will not be possible, and we won't be able to make the needed investments to restore our competitive advantage over China and Russia. That is exactly what we are going to do—we are going to restore what we have lost, and it is all happening in this bill. I think we will have the chance on Thursday to vote for what I consider to be the most significant legislation each year.

Mr. President, 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 as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the big oil companies—particularly Exxon, Shell, BP, and Chevron—want us to believe they have turned over a new leaf, that they are finally in favor of climate action. All four of them claimed to support the Paris Agreement, and Exxon, Shell, and BP all claim to support putting a price on carbon emissions—a price that would reflect the costs of the damage climate change inflicts on the environment, the economy, and public health.

For example, this is on Exxon's website: "ExxonMobil believes a revenue-neutral carbon tax would be a more effective policy option than. . . ."

and it lists other options. “A properly designed carbon tax can be predictable, transparent, and comparatively simple to understand and implement.”

So it looks as if they are supporting a properly designed carbon tax, but is that support for pricing carbon emissions real, or is it just PR, just greenwashing by companies desperate to improve their images? Well, Senator SCHATZ and I introduced a carbon price bill in 2014 to put a fee on products that produce carbon dioxide emissions, and we have reintroduced it in every Congress since. If the oil companies really supported putting a price on carbon emissions, you would think they might have come to see us, the authors of that carbon price bill. You would think that if the oil companies really supported putting a price on carbon emissions, they might have supported our bill or lobbied other Senators to support it or even come to us to say: You know, we would like to support your bill, but you need to change this or that.

Well, they have done none of that. Despite their public-facing pronouncements on a carbon fee or tax, as they call it, we have had no visits from oil company representatives to our offices to work on this bill, no support for our bill—or any other—no lobbying to help or amend our bill. Nothing. Zero. Zilch. Nada.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch, the giant trade associations these oil companies fund—the American Petroleum Institute, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the National Association of Manufacturers—are all working hard to ensure that Republicans oppose carbon pricing and, indeed, any proposals to reduce carbon emissions.

Look what the big oil companies do when the prospect of getting a carbon fee on the books looks real. This fall, voters in Washington State will vote on a ballot initiative that would initially put a price on carbon. It would price carbon emissions at \$15 per ton. Who is funding the campaign against this carbon price initiative? You guessed it, the oil companies, the very same oil companies that claim to support a carbon fee. Already, Shell, BP, and Chevron have pledged to pour dollars into a super PAC created by the Western States Petroleum Association, which is another trade association that fronts for them to oppose this carbon pricing initiative. The oil companies are backing the opposition in Congress also.

In the House, Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE got wind that some of his Republican Members were working on carbon fee legislation. He introduced legislation stating that pricing carbon emissions would be bad for the economy. Guess who SCALISE’s most generous donors are. You guessed it, the oil and gas industry. The industry has given his campaign more than \$1.1 million, far more than any other industry has given him. The oil and gas industry has also given his PAC \$1.5 million.

Again, far more than from any other industry.

As they say, follow the money. Then, where were the big oil companies on SCALISE’s resolution? Not one opposed it. In fact, when contacted by the press, Exxon, BP, and Shell all declined to comment on the Scalise resolution, but they noted their general support for carbon pricing.

When you look at what the big oil companies actually do on carbon pricing proposals, their general support for carbon pricing begins to look purely hypothetical—or hypocritical. “General support” probably gets them a little good PR, fools the unwary, and I guess it lets their executives hobnob with movers and shakers at cocktail parties in Davos or at home at their golf clubs, without having to bear any shame for disgraceful behavior on climate change.

This phony general support is also belied by the climate denial infrastructure the oil companies have set up and funded for years. They have underwritten dozens of climate-denying front groups over the years. Guess what. Their front groups sprang into action to support the Scalise anti-carbon pricing resolution. It is a neat little trick. You say you support carbon pricing, and then you deploy an armada of front groups that you funded over the years to make sure the thing you claim to support never comes to pass.

On July 9, 18 of these phony front groups wrote to House Speaker PAUL RYAN urging him to bring the Scalise resolution up for a vote. This letter asserts that pricing carbon emissions would harm the economy, citing a bogus study from the fossil fuel industry-funded National Association of Manufacturers.

By the way, I work pretty well with the manufacturers in my State, and there isn’t a manufacturer in my State that subscribes to the National Association of Manufacturers’ climate-denying, anti-climate action policies. Somebody somewhere is interjecting themselves so the national organization has become the tool of the fossil fuel industry, but that is not recognized in Rhode Island.

It is not so easy to follow the money behind all these phony front groups that wrote this letter. They and their donors are all very secretive about that. After all, it ruins the purpose of a phony front group if everyone can see the fossil fuel hand in the phony-front-group glove. Enterprising reporters and researchers have been able to shine a little light into this dark money den.

Let’s see how much money these front groups have received from the four major oil companies, from the American Petroleum Institute, and from trusts and foundations associated with the fossil fuel magnate Koch brothers.

American Energy Alliance, the top one there: Koch-connected organizations gave the American Energy Alli-

ance at least \$1.7 million. A sister organization that shares both the management and the office space of this phony front group received at least \$160,000 from Exxon.

ALEC: Koch-connected foundations gave ALEC at least \$600,000. We know Koch Industries is also a donor, but we don’t know how much it has given. We know Exxon gave at least \$1.6 million before announcing this month it was cutting ties with ALEC. The American Petroleum Institute gave at least \$88,000, while Chevron gave at least \$20,000. Shell and BP also used to fund this front group—we don’t know quite how much they gave—before they quit in 2015.

American Commitment received at least \$21 million from Koch-affiliated organizations.

The Competitive Enterprise Institute: Exxon gave at least \$2 million. Koch-affiliated organizations gave at least \$5.2 million.

Americans for Limited Government received at least \$5.6 million from Koch-affiliated groups.

The so-called National Black Chamber of Commerce: Exxon gave at least \$1 million. American Petroleum Institute gave at least \$75,000. Koch-affiliated organizations gave at least \$25,000.

Americans for Tax Reform: API, the American Petroleum Institute, gave at least \$525,000. Koch-affiliated groups gave at least \$330,000.

The Caesar Rodney Institute: Koch-affiliated groups gave at least \$50,000. The Caesar Rodney Institute is part of the larger so-called State Policy Network, which itself is funded by the Koch organization.

FreedomWorks has received at least \$2.5 million from Koch-affiliated groups and at least \$130,000 from the American Petroleum Institute.

The Heartland Institute—there are some beauties—Koch-affiliated groups gave at least \$7.1 million, and Heartland got at least \$730,000 from Exxon. This is the group, by the way, that has compared climate scientists to the Unabomber—a real classy group. I can see why the others would want to associate with them.

The National Center for Public Policy Research received at least \$445,000 from Exxon and at least \$300,000 from Koch-affiliated groups.

The Energy & Environment Legal Institute—here is another beauty—received at least \$500,000 from Koch-affiliated groups. Energy & Environment Legal Institute, by the way, is a particularly creepy group whose function is actually to harass legitimate scientists. That is actually what they do. Another super classy group. You can understand why they would all want to be affiliated with them.

Western Energy Alliance is an oil and gas industry trade association. The group’s website promises its fossil fuel members that it will “actively influence regulatory actions and legislation on behalf of your business.” It is no

mystery who is behind this group, but, as usual, funding details are hidden.

The Cornwall Alliance's funders are secret. When I tell you a bit more about it, you can see why they would want to be secret. I can tell you, I have seen this bogus front group turning up constantly on the climate denial odd-ball fringe, with other front groups funded by Big Oil. What is more, the Cornwall Alliance's founder doesn't believe in evolution, thinks that tornadoes are a punishment from God, and, quite despicably, believes AIDS is a punishment for being gay—a really great guy for Speaker RYAN to be taking advice from and a great company for all the rest of these groups to be keeping.

CO2 Science received at least \$100,000 from Exxon and \$280,000 from Koch-affiliated organizations.

The Mississippi Center for Public Policy received at least \$340,000 from Koch-affiliated organizations and is also a member of that Koch-funded so-called State Policy Network.

The Institute for Liberty received at least \$1.8 million from Koch-affiliated organizations.

That is a grand total of over \$54 million from Big Oil and their climate denial allies in the Koch network, and that is the minimum. That is what we know. That is what has leaked through the darkness. Because all these groups and donors are so secretive about their clandestine funding network, we know the total is, if anything, much higher.

Of course, a sophisticated political operative like Speaker RYAN recognized that these were phony front groups and blew this letter off in order to pursue the people's serious business before the House.

Actually, no. What did Speaker RYAN do? He agreed to bring the Scalise resolution to the floor for a vote, of course. With his caucus essentially a wholly owned subsidiary of the fossil fuel industry, how could he have said no? Money talks, and big money commands.

With the resolution heading for a vote, the front groups reappeared—this time, 41 strong, the whole fossil fuel front group armada was deployed—with a letter to all House Members.

I don't want to go through the list again and add the new groups and which received funding from Big Oil and which from the Koch network and which from both, but suffice it to say, almost all of them have been funded by the oil industry and/or the Koch network or are otherwise tied to them. This is the web of denial my Senate colleagues and I have come to the floor to call out before.

With this type of orchestrated lobbying campaign by the fossil fuel front groups, passage of the Scalise resolution was assured. Indeed, only six House Republicans had the courage to vote against their fossil fuel overlords.

Instead of listening to, say, Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz or the researchers at Columbia

University and serious think tanks who study this stuff or the dozens of blue-chip companies that all say pricing carbon emissions would be good for the economy, House Republicans listened to these phony fossil fuel-funded front groups, including the group that equated climate scientists with the Unabomber and the group founded by the guy who thinks evolution is fake news and AIDS is punishment for being gay.

How low will you go when your big donors whistle? We just saw. The resolution was rammed through the House.

The failure of the U.S. Congress to act on our climate crisis is a failure of American democracy. When untold tens, even hundreds of millions of special interest dollars slosh through our political system, what voice do the citizens of Rhode Island have or the citizens of Florida or Louisiana who are also confronting ever-rising seas caused by climate change?

When corporate dark money rules and phony front groups get more political respect than Nobel Prize-winning economists—on matters of economics, no less—what chance is there for reason and truth in this body?

The fossil fuel industry and its trade associations and front groups have taken the Republican Party hostage and, with it, our American democracy.

It is corruption in plain view, and history's judgment will not be kind. It is seriously, urgently time for us to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUBIO). The Senator from Maryland.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, the plan had been for me to join with the Senator from Florida, now the Presiding Officer, to address our concerns in two areas. One has to do with the Chinese telecommunications company ZTE and the threat that it poses to the national security of the United States. The second is to discuss the urgent need for this Senate to take action to protect the integrity of our democracy by passing the bipartisan DETER Act, which Senator RUBIO and I have introduced.

Since the Senator from Florida is now presiding in the Chair, I will do my best to cover this for both of us, and I know that he will have an opportunity at some other point to cover these important issues as well.

First, as for ZTE, it is a Chinese telecommunications company. It is a telecommunications company that has been exhibit A in the mix of Chinese companies that have stolen U.S. technology.

In fact, when Secretary Pompeo was before the Senate a while ago, talking about the relationships between the Chinese Government and Chinese companies and talking about how they were stealing U.S. intellectual property secrets for their own purposes, ZTE would be on the top of that list. It is one of the most notorious thieves of

intellectual property anywhere in the world.

In the United States alone, they have been sued for patent infringement 126 times in the last 5 years. That is an astonishing figure, particularly as only a small subset of firms have the resources to even bring litigation before a Federal court. ZTE has reportedly been sued for patent infringement at least 100 times in other countries around the world. This is a company that has developed by stealing high technology from U.S. companies and other institutions around the world.

Second, ZTE poses an espionage threat to the United States—translated: spying on Americans. This past February, FBI Director Wray testified before the Senate Intelligence Committee saying:

We are deeply concerned about the risks of allowing any company or entity that is beholden to foreign governments that don't share our values to gain positions of power inside our telecommunications networks. That provides the capacity to exert pressure or control over our telecommunications infrastructure. It provides the capacity to maliciously modify or steal information, and it provides the capacity to conduct undetected espionage.

That answer was in response to questions from the Senator from Florida, who is now presiding.

ZTE has stolen American technology. According to our national security officials—not just the Director of the FBI but also the head of NSA, or the National Security Agency; and the DNI, or the Director of National Intelligence; and the head of the CIA—ZTA poses an espionage threat.

Now, on top of that—on top of that—ZTE was caught violating the U.S. sanctions against North Korea and Iran, and it is not just that they got caught, but when they got caught, they tried to cover it up.

They were warned not just once but twice, and, again, despite that, they engaged in what Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross called a "multiyear conspiracy to violate U.S. sanctions against North Korea and Iran in an elaborate scheme of coverup." That is why, just a few months back—I think it was in June—Secretary Ross imposed very stiff sanctions on ZTE, including what is called the denial order, to stop them from getting advanced technology components from U.S. companies that ZTE could then use in their phones and their telecommunications systems and then use that to conduct espionage against the United States.

Secretary Ross did the exact right thing. Unfortunately, his decision to impose that denial order was reversed by the President of the United States.

When the President reversed that order, Senators here, on a bipartisan basis—the Senator from Florida, Mr. RUBIO; the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. COTTON; and others, including Senator WARNER—thought it was important to protect the national security of the United States by reimposing those important sanctions that the Secretary of Commerce had put in.

How did we do that? We added a provision to the National Defense Authorization Act that passed overwhelmingly in this body. That provision was first inserted in the Senate Banking Committee. It was then included in what is called the CFIUS bill, and then it was passed by this body.

We urged the conferees in the Senate and the House on the Defense bill to keep that provision in there and not let ZTE off the hook. During that short period of time while it was in conference, a couple months, ZTE spent over \$1.3 million to hire Washington lobbyists to help them pull that provision out of the Defense authorization bill. The sad and really shameful story here is that ZTE and their lobbyists succeeded. They succeeded in lifting that penalty on ZTE.

We have just sent the worst of all signals to China—whether it is ZTE or Huawei or others—that we are not really serious when we say that if we catch you violating our sanctions, we will punish you, or that we are not serious in defending our country from espionage, or that we are not serious about defending our country from the theft of our intellectual property. That is a terrible and very weak message to send.

I am going to keep fighting along with our colleagues, on a bipartisan basis, to keep the pressure on these issues, on ZTE and Huawei, because if we do not get serious about confronting these threats, they will continue to come back to bite us.

I am very disappointed that the conferees did not include that provision, and it does raise serious questions about a bill that provides for our national defense: Why would it have a big loophole in it that creates an opportunity for China to harm our national security?

Now, there is another way that our adversaries can harm our national security, and that is to interfere in our elections to try to undermine our democracy. We know from the heads of all the intelligence agencies that this is exactly what happened in 2016. Our focus in this body should be on making sure that no country interferes in our elections again.

We all know that suspect No. 1 has been Russia. Russia was the country that interfered in 2016, and we know that Russia is planning to interfere in the 2018 midterm elections and beyond.

How do we know that? Well, first of all, the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, a former Member of this body, has said that all of the lights are flashing red—a big warning that Russia plans to interfere in our midterm elections, which are 98 days away.

We also learned just today that Facebook uncovered an ongoing effort by foreign social media entities to disrupt our 2018 elections. This is an ongoing process right now. This was the headline today in the Washington Post: “Facebook says it has uncovered a coordinated disinformation operation ahead of the 2018 midterm elections.”

They document what they are doing to try to prevent that disinformation campaign.

We have the testimony of Dan Coats, the Director of National Intelligence, and other intelligence agency heads. We have Facebook. We also know that the Russians—and, specifically, the same operation, GRU, that interfered in the 2016 elections—have already attempted to interfere in three elections for 2018.

We know one that has been made public, the Senator from Missouri, Mrs. MCCASKILL, where the Russians attempted to get into their system ahead of the 2018 elections. We know all of this is happening, and it would be surrendering our obligation as Members of the Senate, both Republicans and Democrats, for us not to take action to defend the integrity of our elections. The clock is ticking—98 days to go to the elections.

We know from our intelligence agencies, we know from the evidence that surfaced today from Facebook, and we know from the fact that they have already interfered or attempted to interfere in three elections for 2018 that this Russian effort is coming. So for goodness’ sake, don’t we have an obligation to do everything we can to stop it?

That is exactly why Senator RUBIO, who is presiding now, and I joined together to introduce the DETER Act. It is a very straight forward, simple idea. You need to send a signal in advance to Vladimir Putin that if Russia gets caught again, if it gets caught this time interfering in the 2018 elections, there will be automatic and harsh penalties imposed on Russia and it will hurt Russia’s economy. It will hit them where it hurts. That is what the DETER Act does.

Everything we have heard about Russian conduct and behavior is that it is important to try to send these signals early if you want to influence their behavior. So what we need to do is to establish a very credible threat that if they interfere and they get caught again, they will face the penalty.

So what the DETER Act does is it says that the Director of National Intelligence, on behalf of the intelligence community, will make an assessment about whether or not Russia interfered in the 2018 election. This assessment would take place shortly after the 2018 elections, and if their finding is yes, then very harsh penalties take place.

Now, we can talk about the details in the coming days and make sure that we get this exactly right, but where there should be no debate—there should be no debate—is about the need to do something along the lines of the DETER Act and to do it urgently.

As I said, the clock is ticking. We know how the Senate operates. There is not really that much time between now and the elections, given all the other things that we have to do, but I hope the Senate would prioritize defending our democracy. I hope the Senate would prioritize making sure that

we have an election that the people of this country can have confidence in and that we would prioritize making sure that we protect the integrity of our democratic system. What Putin wants to do is to undermine the confidence in the democratic system. He wants to do that in the United States of America. He wants to do that to our allies around the world, and we can’t let that happen.

So this is not a moment where the Senate should just have hearings or just talk about it. This is a moment for action, and I join the Presiding Officer—and I am sorry he wasn’t able to join me here because of his duty in the Chair—but I want to join him not as Republicans or Democrats but as Americans who want to defend our democracy. Let’s get this job done now. Let’s protect the integrity of our democratic process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I want to commend our colleague from Maryland and the Presiding Officer for the good work they have done on this issue.

As a Member of the Intelligence Committee, I have seen firsthand what this has meant. I had a chance, as my colleague the Presiding Officer knows, to question Mr. Ervin Nina, who has been chosen Vice President for a key job in the intelligence field, and I asked him pointblank if he considered ZTE an espionage threat to this day, and the answer was yes.

We are now going to spend the next hour talking about Medicare and Medicaid. This is the 53rd anniversary. But before he leaves the floor, I wanted to commend my colleague from Maryland and the Presiding Officer on the Intelligence Committee for their good work.

53RD ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Mr. President, this week marks the 53rd anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid, our bedrock Federal healthcare programs.

I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues. I see Senators CARDIN and WHITEHOUSE wanting to participate and know of Senator COONS’ support for these programs. Our colleagues will be talking today about why these programs are so vitally important to tens of millions of Americans—literally generations of our people.

Medicare and Medicaid have stood the test of time because the American people have long understood the value of a healthcare guarantee, particularly for seniors and the most vulnerable among us. Medicare—and my colleagues on the Finance Committee talk a fair amount about it—isn’t a piece of paper, and it isn’t a voucher. It is a guarantee, and Americans have always understood that was the case.

It wasn’t that long ago when there wasn’t a guarantee. Getting older or falling on hardship meant healthcare was one of the first of life’s necessities to go out of reach. It wasn’t that long

ago when there were poor farms—literally, poor farms—to try to meet the needs of older people. People, before these programs, often fell through the cracks and into destitution. Their family wasn't there. Seniors ended up in the streets or on those poor farms.

These healthcare promises—the pledges behind Medicare and Medicaid—have lasted for more than half a century because Americans understand that when they get a paycheck, part of that pay goes to supporting the health care guarantees.

Families around the country, however, are beginning to wonder, given the events of the last 1½ years, whether that guarantee will be there when they need it. They aren't wrong for worrying. Every major Republican legislation that has had a pulse in this Congress has increased the risk that Medicare and Medicaid will not be there when it counts. Most recently, Trump's tax law stole billions of dollars and years of security from Medicare's future, all to rain down tax benefits on the largest corporations and wealthy individuals in the country. As a result of this reckless tax legislation, shareholders are now swimming in a sea of tax buybacks and executives have pocketed huge windfalls while Medicare faces a crisis years ahead of the earlier projections.

In addition to leaving a gaping hole on Federal balance sheets after this law passed—I am not sure many Americans know this—the Trump administration released a budget that outlines in black and white just how they plan to make up the difference.

You don't have to take it from me. Here are some examples out of the President's budget document.

On page 52, the President proposes revising the Graham-Cassidy proposal Americans rejected last year, which would repeal the Affordable Care Act, including its ironclad preexisting conditions protection.

On page 53, the President seeks to slash Medicaid by more than \$1 trillion over the next 10 years by eliminating the Medicaid expansion and placing harsh caps on the rest of the program that squeeze out critical care.

On page 54, the President calls for close to \$500 billion in reduced Medicare spending without an explicit guarantee that seniors will not be worse off.

On pages 24, 53, and 64, the President calls in his budget for burdensome paperwork requirements for SNAP—a vital program to help hungry Americans—affordable housing, and healthcare that really create more bureaucracy without making people better off.

So, as we begin this, this isn't some sort of message or something. Those are the pages in the President's budget document—specific numbers on a specific page in a specific report embraced by the President that harm Medicare and Medicaid.

I am just going to spend a minute now because I am looking forward to

my seatmates in the Finance Committee coming up on Medicaid.

Medicaid has endured the single most concentrated attack on its future that I have seen since the days when I was codirector of the Oregon Gray Panthers. In spite of Republican attempts to slash Medicaid, people power stopped that effort. Republicans would have block-granted Medicaid, choking off funding for the program—couldn't keep up with the needs of our people. Without Medicaid's guarantee, two of three seniors who count on Medicaid to help pay for their nursing costs would increasingly have nowhere to turn. People with disabilities who have been able to live and thrive in their homes and communities rather than institutions might not have that same kind of opportunity. Without Medicaid—the promise of affordable care—families and parents working two or three jobs would face yet another unnecessary obstacle to the well-being of their kids and families.

Even without the partisan attacks on Medicare and Medicaid, there are challenges that need to be addressed to keep these programs secure. Drug prices are out of control while the drug industry pockets billions every quarter, with consumers and taxpayers footing the bill. A recent study by the Department of Health and Human Services inspector general found that while the number of brand-name prescriptions in Medicare Part D has decreased in the last 5 years, spending on those drugs has increased by 77 percent during that time. The number of seniors paying more than \$2,000 out of pocket for medicine has nearly doubled. That is unacceptable. Americans are up in arms at the fact that our seniors still get clobbered at the pharmacy window.

In the face of these challenges, there are still opportunities to improve Medicare and Medicaid so that the guarantee is strong for years to come. Earlier this year, on a bipartisan basis, Congress passed one of the most significant updates to the Medicare guarantee in a generation—one that is going to begin the effort to keep up with the rising tide of seniors managing multiple chronic illnesses, such as heart disease, diabetes, or cancer.

Chronic illness is going to drive American healthcare, and this bill begins the effort to improve Medicare so that no matter how seniors get their care, there will be more opportunities for them to thrive in later years.

Finally, when it comes to Medicaid, the country is witnessing a groundswell of Americans who are fed up with partisan gridlock holding up State decisions to expand Medicaid to help more people walking on an economic tightrope. One look makes it clear that this is a winning proposition for any State. When States expand the program, the uninsured rate goes down. The number of opioid-related hospitalizations is lowered in expansion States, medical debt is down, and peo-

ple have more access to preventive care.

While legislators sit on their hands, people are pushing ballot initiatives to force the issue. In Maine, where a Medicaid expansion initiative easily passed, incredibly, the conservative Governor says: Who cares? He is going to stand in its way.

Healthcare in America is too hard to access for too many. The Affordable Care Act was a significant step forward. There were ironclad protections. I am very proud of the fact that it really came from a bipartisan bill I was part of—air tight, loophole-free protection from discrimination for Americans, from sea to shining sea, if they had a preexisting condition. It created a baseline for Medicaid so that fewer Americans fell through the cracks of patchwork health systems. But for too many, premiums increase at a far faster rate than their paychecks, and the price of prescription medicine is still spiking.

We are going to talk more over the next hour about these crucial issues. I am really pleased that two very thoughtful members of the Finance Committee are here to start us off. They have long been part of the effort to stand as a bulwark protecting Americans with debilitating sickness from financial ruin, supporting the Medicare and Medicaid guarantees. I am pleased to be able to yield to the Senator from Maryland who has been involved in these programs and has championed the cause of the vulnerable for years and years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first let me thank my colleague Senator WYDEN for his extraordinary leadership on Medicare and Medicaid and so many other issues.

I remember Senator WYDEN in the House of Representatives as one of the champions when the Medicare and Medicaid Programs were a lot younger. We worked to improve and expand both Medicaid and Medicare, and now Senator WYDEN, in a key role on the Senate Finance Committee—the ranking Democrat—has been one of the real champions to protect the progress we have made in Medicare and Medicaid, recognizing that what we need to talk about is how to improve these programs and make them better.

As we celebrate the 53rd anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid, let me address the point that Mr. WYDEN made; that is, these are two of the most successful programs we ever have enacted in the Congress of the United States that guarantee, as Mr. WYDEN has said, affordable, quality healthcare to our seniors, to individuals with disabilities, to low-income families.

In Medicare alone, almost 45 million Americans are protected under Medicare—seniors and those with disabilities. In Maryland, more than 990 thousand Marylanders are protected under the Medicare Program.

What Mr. WYDEN alluded to—I want to underscore this point: Before there was Medicare, over half of our seniors did not have health insurance, and without health insurance, their access to healthcare was greatly at risk, and many were unable to get access to quality care. Medicare has provided affordability so that our seniors can now get quality healthcare, and we have improved it over its 53-year history. We have done things from adding benefits for end-stage renal disease to adding preventive healthcare.

I remember working with Mr. WYDEN when I was in the House of Representatives, when we expanded the preventive care package to include cancer screenings and diabetes and osteoporosis screenings and diabetes self-management. All of that has been done as we have, together, expanded Medicare over its 53 years in order to provide stronger coverage and better protection to our seniors and those with disabilities.

In my State, we have 1.2 million Marylanders covered under the Medicaid Program. We are talking about veterans, seniors, women, and children. We are in partnership with our State; this is a program in which the Federal Government works in partnership with our State to allow our State flexibility to figure out better and more efficient ways to provide healthcare to vulnerable people. In my State of Maryland, they have taken advantage of that to work out ways to coordinate care, provide more integrated care, so we can take care of people who desperately need help.

The coverage under Medicaid includes such important services as dental care, behavioral healthcare, and, of course, for many of our seniors, a lifeline for long-term care. So these programs are critically important.

Let me underscore the point that Mr. WYDEN made. It is at risk today. We say that because Mr. WYDEN mentioned chapter and verse of President Trump's budget that would jeopardize both Medicare and Medicaid. But we don't have to go to the President; we can look at the Republican budget that was submitted here in Congress and passed in Congress, which provided for a \$1 trillion cut in Medicaid and a \$500 billion cut in the Medicare Program.

This is not hypothetical. We are here today to celebrate the 53rd anniversary but also to say that we should not be jeopardizing these programs through these reckless budget cuts. We should be strengthening these programs.

Let me quickly point out what we need to do. In Medicare, I think we all understand that if an individual only has traditional Medicare, there are quite a bit of out-of-pocket costs they have to incur under the current Medicare laws. It is not going to cover things such as dental care or hearing aids. We should be looking at ways to strengthen the Medicare system, as previous Congresses have done. Let's make it stronger. Let's provide help for

our seniors. Certainly, let's not cut the program.

We need to strengthen the Medicaid Program. Senator WYDEN is absolutely correct. Our States are asking for a waiver authority.

There are some who are slow to act here in Washington, in the Trump administration. Let me give an example in my State of Maryland. My State of Maryland wants to move forward on dealing with the opioid crisis. How important are Medicaid and the Medicaid expansion? Let me give one example. On Monday, we were in Baltimore with Congressman CUMMINGS and Senator WARREN at Health Care for the Homeless looking at a program that provides some of our most vulnerable people the healthcare they need. Many, by the way, are veterans. Before the Affordable Care Act, 30 percent of their clientele were insured. After the Affordable Care Act, 90 percent were insured. That is what Medicaid expansion meant for Health Care for the Homeless in my community.

What did they do as a result of that expansion? They expanded services at Health Care for the Homeless. They have a modern dental facility to take care of their population. They have expanded their behavioral health services. They have been able to expand the quality of service. We need to do more of that.

We haven't yet figured out the opioid crisis. What we want to do in Maryland is expand peer review so that we have people who experienced this problem available to help those who are suffering. That means we need to invest more money in Medicaid to save money.

The mayor of Baltimore wants to establish a stabilization center. What does that mean? Rather than people having OD problems and being taken to our emergency rooms, we can get them to a stabilization center that knows how to follow up their care. They know we get them in care.

There is a challenge when people who are addicted all of a sudden get heroin laced with fentanyl. We have to protect our population who are addicted, and stabilization centers will help. They will save money, but we have to invest to do that. That means we need to expand our budget support for Medicaid, not contract it.

On this 53rd anniversary, I wanted to join my colleagues and just praise the progress we have made. I urge our Republican colleagues to abandon this effort to reduce the Federal Government's commitment to both Medicare and Medicaid. Let's work together in the best traditions, in a bipartisan manner, to strengthen and expand these programs, and let's make that commitment on the 53rd anniversary of Medicaid and Medicare.

I thank my colleague. His usual passion and eloquence is so appreciated and his decades of commitment to these wonderful programs. I thank him.

Senator STABENOW, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator CORTEZ MASTO will have the opportunity to speak. Next in line is Senator STABENOW.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I want to thank our ranking member on the Finance Committee and all of my colleagues who are here to talk about and celebrate two programs that for 53 years have changed the lives of Michigan families and the families of our country for the better.

The words of President Lyndon B. Johnson, who signed the programs into law, are a great reminder of what life was like before Medicare and Medicaid. He said:

No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings that they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years. No longer will young families see their own incomes and their own hopes eaten away simply because they are carrying out their deep moral obligations to their parents, and to their uncles, and to their aunts. And no longer will this Nation refuse the hand of justice to those who have given a lifetime of service and wisdom and labor to the progress of this progressive country.

Thanks to these two programs, we have come a long way toward building that just Nation President Johnson envisioned.

Before Medicare, only about half of Americans age 65 and older had health insurance. Today, more than 98 percent of Americans age 65 and older have health insurance.

In Michigan, more than 675,000 people have gained health coverage through Healthy Michigan, our Medicaid expansion, and 97 percent of Michigan children can see a doctor when they get sick or hurt. The number of people treated without insurance has dropped 50 percent. In Michigan, we ended 2017 with \$413 million more than it invested in the program, which is a savings for taxpayers in Michigan because fewer people were walking into the emergency room who didn't have insurance and couldn't pay the bill.

It is good for State budgets, and it is good for family budgets too. In fact, a recent study found that the finances of low-income residents improved in States like Michigan that chose to expand Medicaid.

I know what a difference these programs make for Michigan families because they share their stories with me.

Ann was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis when she was 40 years old. She has very limited use of her arms and legs. Yet she feels so strongly about Medicare and Medicaid that she traveled to Washington, DC, at my invitation, to speak at a healthcare hearing last year.

Medicare and secondary insurance cover most of the costs of Ann's medication, which costs an astounding \$75,000 a year. That is nearly her entire

household income, including Social Security benefits.

Ann had been caring for her aging mom, but when her mom's dementia worsened, Ann didn't know where she would find \$6,000 a month for nursing home care. Fortunately, Ann's mom qualified for Medicaid. Here is what Ann said:

It was only because of Medicaid that she was able to get the help that she needed at the end of her life. . . . I don't know how I could have cared for my mother on top of managing my own care. My family would have lost our home and all our savings trying to keep up with their bills.

In Felicia's case, she may have lost her life. In 2011, she was an AmeriCorps member with no health insurance. When she started feeling tired all the time and losing weight, she went to the Center for Family Health in Jackson, MI. Felicia was diagnosed with stage 4 Hodgkin's lymphoma. The Center for Family Health helped her get Medicaid and care at the University of Michigan, including a stem cell transplant. Felicia wrote:

Now I am feeling awesome, I am cancer-free, and I am working part time while I am finishing up college. I feel that I owe my life to the Center for Family Health.

Fifty-three years after they were created, Medicare and Medicaid are more than just programs, and that is really why we are here on the floor this evening. They are powerful tools to promote health, to prevent poverty, and to protect families and give them the dignity of knowing that they have healthcare when they need it for themselves, their children, their moms and dads.

LBJ said 53 years ago:

There are men and women in pain who will now find ease. . . . There are those fearing the terrible darkness of despairing poverty . . . who will now look up to see the light of hope and realization.

There just can be no satisfaction, nor any act of leadership, that gives greater satisfaction than this.

I think we share those sentiments, which is why we are not only here celebrating 53 years of Medicare and Medicaid but indicating in the strongest possible terms our commitment to keep Medicare and Medicaid strong for current families and for future generations.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before she leaves the floor, I want to thank my seatmate on the Finance Committee—a strong advocate for the concept that Medicare and Medicaid are guarantees. They are lifelines for working families.

It is a pleasure to have you here on this special occasion, and I look forward to many more partnerships as we start thinking down the road, as Senator CARDIN said, about how we are going to strengthen these programs, not just play defense against Congress.

I thank you.

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely.

Mr. WYDEN. Another outstanding member of the Finance Committee, Senator WHITEHOUSE.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I thank Senator WYDEN.

Mr. President, it is great to be here to have a birthday party to celebrate Medicare and Medicaid, which are the kinds of huge successes for a nation that don't happen very often, but they sure did happen in America. And what a change it made when Medicare and Medicaid were there to support American families. There is scarcely an American family today who doesn't to some extent depend on Medicare or Medicaid. We have planned our lives around the safety and security of those programs, and we have avoided enormous human suffering by virtue of those programs.

Of course, coming from a small State as I do, it is very important for us in Rhode Island to celebrate our role in this important legislation because one of the original authors of the Medicare bill was Representative Aime Forand of Cumberland, RI, who served over in the House for 22 years. He served with great distinction. He was passionate about healthcare and about building this program. He was one of the original groups of the Members of Congress who got together and designed the Medicare Program. When it came time to pass it in 1965, it was Rhode Island Congressman John Fogarty of Providence who was then the chair of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare. So between one of the original authors of the legislation and one of the key chairmen supporting the legislation, there was a lot that Rhode Island did to accomplish these wonderful goals.

It gives me particular pride as a member of the Rhode Island delegation to come here for the Medicare-Medicaid Senator WYDEN birthday party. I am very glad to have the chance to do it.

These programs provide health insurance coverage to over half a million people in my State. That is half the State. Without it, so many lives would be changed for the worse. Nationally, it is a little bit over 130 million Americans. When you consider the families who get the protection of having a family member covered, as I said, it is virtually all of us.

Obviously, it is seniors. Rhode Island has a lot of seniors whom we treasure and whom we love having Medicare and Medicaid being there for, but it is also people with disabilities, children, pregnant women, veterans, and people fighting substance abuse disorders. It is a broad population.

Medicare and Medicaid do their jobs well. They do their jobs efficiently. They do their jobs humanely. They do their jobs with super-low overhead compared to their private sector competition, and they do it in a very reform-oriented way.

It is CMS that is leading the accountable care organizations process that was one of the great achievements of the Affordable Care Act. It is the pro-

viders, the doctors, who are in those accountable care organizations who are redesigning care in ways that are wonderful for their patients.

I will briefly discuss the example—because I am so proud of it and mention it all the time—of Coastal Medical, which is one of our biggest provider groups in Rhode Island. It is a doctor-run accountable care organization. What they did is they signed up early on—what they called Pioneer ACOs. The deal was this: We will take some of the risk of how our patients run up costs in the system, and we will share if we can make money back for you.

Now, in the bad old days of managed care, when insurance companies tried to do this, they went in and said: Well, you can't have that, and we are cutting you off on this, and we are not paying you, and we just hired 50 people to make sure that your claim never gets settled. They just, basically, pushed back on paying for things.

That is not the way the doctors work in the ACO process. They have done things like hire social workers, pharmacists, and home visitors. What they have done is to take their patients and to decide they are going to help make them healthier. They are going to have social workers make sure they get the benefits they need. They are going to have home care workers go to their homes to see what they can get done at home. They use electronic monitoring and testing so they can keep better track of the reports and keep better track of people's care. They engage with their patients.

What we have seen—because a lot of people I know in Rhode Island get their healthcare through Coastal Medical—is a lot of really happy patients. Now you can call at 2 in the morning when you are sick, and at Coastal Medical, you will get a live nurse who will talk you through what is going on and help you decide if you actually need to go to the emergency room or not and get you in quick, first thing in the morning, if you don't go to the emergency room and they still want to see you and check you out.

So, for the patients, this has been an incredible boon. They feel so much better cared for, and they are, in fact, healthier. That comes back to all of us here because—guess what—in the time that Coastal Medical has been doing this, it has lowered the cost of care, year over year, for its patients—\$700 per patient.

When we were passing the Affordable Care Act, we used to talk about how we were going to bend the healthcare cost curve down. We are not bending the healthcare cost curve down at Coastal Medical; we are actually dropping healthcare costs. It is actually below where it was. It is not just not accelerating so fast. That is the kind of leadership that Medicare and Medicaid and CMS support.

This is a really terrific and exciting program in so many ways, not just in

terms of humaneness, not just in terms of security for American families but also in terms of leadership and in helping us continue to develop a healthcare system that we can be very proud of.

I am delighted to serve on the Finance Committee under the leadership of our ranking member, and I thank him for convening us on this terrific birthday. I would only propose that when we do this again, there be cake.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I particularly appreciate the fact that more than anyone else I know in this body, he keeps coming back to the proposition of building the healthcare system around paying for value. My colleague went through some examples in his State and around the country that are doing just that. That is a big part of what we are going to have to do to strengthen Medicare and Medicaid in the years ahead. So I thank my colleague.

We are also so pleased that he has joined the Finance Committee. Particularly, this argument about paying for values has to be right in the center of strengthening Medicare and Medicaid. I thank him for it.

Our colleague from Nevada is its former attorney general and is a champion of the rights of seniors. I am very pleased that she is here tonight.

I will tell my colleagues that we are all trying to play catchup ball as we have started running behind.

I really welcome my colleague Senator CORTEZ MASTO from Nevada, and I look forward to her remarks.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I thank Senator WYDEN.

Mr. President, 53 years ago on July 30, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed landmark legislation to establish Medicare and Medicaid—two essential programs that provide healthcare to over 120 million Americans and over 1 million Nevadans.

When President Johnson signed this historic bill, he said:

No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings that they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years. No longer will young families see their own incomes, and their own hopes, eaten away simply because they are carrying out their deep moral obligations to their parents, and to their uncles, and their aunts. And no longer will this Nation refuse the hand of justice to those who have given a lifetime of service and wisdom and labor to the progress of this progressive country.

On that day, LBJ declared an end to an era in which healthcare was denied to the most vulnerable members of our communities.

So I rise to celebrate the incredible progress we have made since President Johnson created Medicare and Medicaid. We lifted hundreds of millions of Americans out of abject poverty and provided hundreds of millions more with dignity, security, and peace of mind. Then, in 2010, we passed the Af-

fordable Care Act, which was built on the foundation that President Johnson laid, and gave 20 million additional Americans, including hundreds of thousands of Nevadans, access to affordable healthcare coverage.

Yet today is not just for celebration, because our work is not yet done. Prescription drug prices, premiums, and copays are still too high. Too many Americans can't afford the medicine they need in order to live. Too many Americans can't find a doctor whose office is less than a day's drive away. Too many Americans are still struggling to get healthcare that meets their basic needs.

Instead of trying to expand access to healthcare, some of my Republican colleagues here in Congress are working every single day to attack the Affordable Care Act and strip healthcare coverage away from tens of millions of Americans. Some Republican leaders are now threatening to cut Medicare and Medicaid in order to pay for President Trump's massive tax cut to corporations and special interest groups. The Republican tax bill exploded our deficit by \$1.5 trillion, and now Republicans are demanding cuts to critical healthcare programs to pay for their lavish corporate CEO giveaway. So it is not enough to celebrate our progress.

When President Johnson signed the Social Security Amendments Act, he landed an historic blow in the fight against poverty, injustice, and inequality. Today, we have to rededicate ourselves to that fight.

We have to protect, strengthen, and improve the Affordable Care Act. We have to lower the cost of prescription drugs and invest in the health of every community. We have to create an affordable public health insurance option that would be available to everyone in the United States regardless of one's income level. We also have to fight back against cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, because the fight to protect our healthcare is a fight to protect our dignity, our security, and our basic rights.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, suffice it to say, the Senator is someone who gets right to the point. She succinctly got to the central question of ensuring that we build on the guarantee that has been Medicare and Medicaid. She has been a terrific advocate for seniors. I followed her work in the State government and have followed it here. We are so pleased that she is here to be a passionate healthcare advocate for millions of Americans. I thank her.

To my colleagues, we have three Senators who have arrived on time. Unfortunately, the Senate is in its usual position of being a little bit late. We have Senator KING, Senator HIRONO, and Senator HASSAN, if my colleagues can accept that.

I thank Senator KING and look forward to his remarks.

Mr. KING. I thank the Senator from Oregon for bringing us here today.

Mr. President, 53 years ago this week, President Johnson signed the Medicare bill. I believe it to be one of the most important pieces of legislation signed in the last 100 years. It finally removed from the shoulders of the senior citizens of this country the burden, stress, cost, and anxiety of not knowing whether they were going to be able to pay for healthcare, for hospitalization, for doctors' visits, and, later, for prescription drugs.

I will talk for a moment about two things. No. 1 is what it has done to our economy and, particularly, to the economy involving seniors.

Here is a pretty graphic representation.

In 1965, when Medicare was passed, a third of the senior citizens in the country lived in poverty. One-third lived in poverty and in fear of losing everything if they were stricken by health catastrophes or even minor health problems that they could not deal with. Over the next 53 years, this line has come down to 9.3 percent of seniors living in poverty. It has declined by two-thirds, largely because of Medicare, largely because the financial burden of healthcare costs has been eliminated from their shoulders.

Now, Medicare isn't perfect. There are things we can do to strengthen it, to improve it. I think one of the things we need to do is to talk about high drug prices and the effect on seniors under Medicare. We also have to talk about prevention. One of the faults, I believe, with Medicare is that it only pays for medical procedures and it doesn't pay to prevent medical procedures. The cheapest operation is the one that you don't have to have. I believe that is one of the areas in which we can improve Medicare—to provide more preventive services that will lower the costs for seniors, for the taxpayers, and for the whole economy.

Medicare, I would argue, is one of the most successful programs this body, this government, and this country have ever adopted. Yet, as I stand here today, there are people in this Congress who are, essentially, talking about scrapping it. They use all kinds of fancy language about "premium support" and those kinds of things and that they don't want to really do away with Medicare. Make no mistake. Premium support equals vouchers, and vouchers equal the end of Medicare as we know it.

This is a horrible, no-good, rotten, lousy idea, and we shouldn't do it. It will decline. It will diminish the support for the program and, ultimately, put the burden back on seniors of paying the cost of their healthcare.

As to this whole idea of vouchers, who at 85 or 90 years old wants to sort through 10 different insurance policies, compare deductibles and copays, and try to figure it all out? I don't think that is practical. I think it is a cruel joke on our seniors. As long as I am here, I am going to do everything I can to call out this idea for what it is—a

cruel swipe at the protection for seniors that Medicare has provided.

I had a roundtable with seniors in Maine just this week, and we talked about prescription drug prices but also about Medicare. One of the things I learned is about one of the most important programs under Medicare. It is called the SHIP program, or the State Health Insurance Assistance Program, whereby people help seniors to sort through what is still the fairly complex process of signing up and determining Medicare coverage. That has been cut 20 percent in the last 2 years.

One of the things that came out of our roundtable was that what we need, as much or more than anything else, is information and guidance and care and concern. The SHIP program provides that. To be cutting it at this moment, again, is just inexplicable and, ultimately, I feel, is cruel. Now is not the time to be making cuts in Medicare. Now is the time to be strengthening it, to be providing for the future, and to be providing for those citizens who are coming up.

I know people in Maine who can't wait to be 65 because they will be covered by Medicare. I suppose they would just as soon not be 65, but they are genuinely waiting for the time when the burden of healthcare expenses is lifted from them, at least insofar as Medicare can do so. Yes, it needs improvement; yes, we should do more about prevention; yes, we should do more about the cost of prescription drugs, but, fundamentally, this is an important program that is so essential to the lives of seniors across the country and the 200,000 Medicare patients in the State of Maine.

This is an important anniversary. It is one that has really shown an incredible change. If anything has shown a successful track record, it is Medicare, and I am certainly going to do everything I can in my time here to make sure it maintains itself as a bulwark against the risk of medical catastrophe for our seniors. We can do that, and we shall do it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I wish to thank my colleague, particularly, for noting some of the progress over the years as he makes the case for the future.

I remember years ago, when I was director of the Oregon Gray Panthers, it was common for a senior to have 15 or even 20 private health insurance policies that were supposed to supplement their Medicare. Most of them weren't worth the paper they were written on, and finally we passed a law to end that incredible outrage.

So my colleague has really said it well about some of the things that, fortunately, from yesteryear have been changed, but it has highlighted what we have to do in the future. I thank my colleague so much.

We have another advocate for our seniors here, the Senator from Hawaii,

Ms. HIRONO. I have been with her in her home State and have seen the bond she has with older people. We very much welcome her for her remarks.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I would like to start by thanking Senator WYDEN for his leadership in the fight to protect Medicare and Medicaid and for organizing this time for us to speak on this important subject.

I grew up in a three-generation household. My 93-year-old great-grandmother lived with us for over 20 years, and my grandmother lived with us until she was 98. So I, of all people, of course know the importance of Medicare to our seniors.

On May 7, 2015—a full 3 months before he descended a golden escalator to launch his campaign—Donald Trump bragged on Twitter about how he was “the first and only” Republican candidate to run for President to state that “there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.”

He made, and repeated, that promise for a reason.

All across the country, we know Americans across party lines care deeply about healthcare and expect their Members of Congress to protect their healthcare.

Millions of Americans receive their healthcare through Medicaid and Medicare. These two programs have helped tens of millions of Americans since their creation 53 years ago. Medicare provides quality health insurance for millions of seniors, and Medicaid helps them afford nursing home care and other services when they need it.

Medicaid has served working families and the poor who otherwise couldn't afford healthcare coverage, helping to bring our uninsured rate to a historic low, and Medicaid is currently helping tens of thousands of Americans receive drug treatment amidst the ongoing opioid epidemic.

Again, it isn't surprising that Donald Trump pledged to protect these programs while campaigning for President. They are wildly popular programs for a reason, but it also isn't surprising that almost immediately after his election, Donald Trump reneged on his promise to protect Medicare and Medicaid. It began when he appointed Tom Price—the architect of plans to dismantle Medicare and Medicaid—to serve as his Secretary of Health and Human Services.

It continued when the President and congressional Republicans sought to eliminate the Medicaid expansion and cut hundreds of billions of dollars in Medicaid funding during the push to repeal the Affordable Care Act—the ACA.

It continued when the administration issued new rules that allowed States to implement arbitrary work requirements for Medicaid. Four States have already taken advantage of this new authority. If the rest of the country follows their lead, between 1 million and 4 million Americans will lose their healthcare coverage.

It continued when the President proposed turning Medicare into a voucher

program, converting Medicaid to a block grant, and cutting nearly \$2 trillion from both programs as part of his fiscal year 2019 budget.

These changes and cuts would have a devastating impact on the hundreds of thousands of Hawaii residents who depend on these programs for their healthcare and their long-term care needs.

Medicaid, for example, serves around 350,000 Hawaii residents, including 38 percent of all the children in Hawaii and 15 percent of seniors, as well as people with disabilities across our State. These cuts would be particularly devastating to Hawaii residents who access healthcare through our Federally Qualified Community Health Centers, many of which depend on reimbursements through Medicaid to provide high-quality care to those in need.

During the height of the debate to repeal the Affordable Care Act, I spoke with Sheila Beckham, the CEO of Waikiki Health on Oahu. Waikiki Health operates a network of health centers and shelters in Honolulu that cater to high-risk populations, including a significant number of patients living with HIV and AIDS. If the President and congressional Republicans had succeeded in cutting Medicaid, Sheila would have had to lay off between 80 to 100 workers and close all but two of the clinics she operates.

Medicaid cuts would have also had a significant impact on women's health outcomes throughout Hawaii. Last year, I shared a story about a young woman named Anne, who walked into the Kokua Kalihi Valley Clinic 3 years ago. She had no health insurance, and she was pregnant at the age of 15. The doctors at the clinic helped Anne apply for Medicaid, which helped her afford prenatal care and gave her support to stay healthy and in school. Medicaid helped Anne and her husband Dan, age 17, welcome a healthy baby boy named Joseph. Today, Anne is a graduate of Farrington High School, she works part-time and has plans to become a pediatric nurse practitioner. Her family now has health insurance through Dan's employer.

Medicaid also plays a crucial role in providing long-term nursing care for seniors who otherwise would not be able to afford it. I know how important this is for our seniors in Hawaii because we have in Hawaii the fastest growing aging population in the entire country. Across our State, Medicaid provides coverage for three in five nursing home residents. At Hale Makua on Maui, that number is closer to 80 percent, and without Medicaid, many of the residents would not be able to afford to stay there.

One story that has stuck with me came from Keith Moniz. After working as a custodian for more than 40 years at St. Anthony's School, Keith's brother Lester lost his job and his health insurance. Only a few short months later, Keith's brother Lester had a debilitating stroke that left him permanently disabled. Fortunately, Lester

was able to obtain Medicaid coverage and is now a long-term resident at Hale Makua.

Keith was very clear about what would have happened to his brother if the President had succeeded in making large cuts to Medicaid. Keith said:

It would be devastating. We had a difficult time taking care of him when he was at home, and he's gotten the care that he needs at Hale Makua. It would be a big loss. . . . I don't know what we could do, where we would be able to move him to.

Our seniors—in Hawaii we call them kupuna—would also be significantly harmed by the President's plan to voucherize and make huge cuts to Medicare. More than 230,000 kupuna—our seniors in Hawaii—or 17 percent of our State's population are covered by Medicare. Through its payments to providers and purchases of medical equipment, Medicare generates \$2.5 billion for Hawaii's economy.

Our kupuna are already struggling with the rising cost of living and nearly 9 percent of them live in poverty. Many more are living on fixed incomes and would be especially vulnerable to rising costs under the President's plan to turn Medicare into a voucher program.

Last year, I shared the story of Lanny and Anne Bruner from Kauai. Lanny is 80 years old, but he is still working three jobs to make ends meet after losing the family home during the 2008 mortgage crisis. His wife Anne has glaucoma and pays what she calls a "ridiculous amount" for eye drops. Lanny had a heart attack and two knee replacements. Like many of our kupuna living on a fixed income, they simply could not afford to pay the extra money they would be forced to pay if Republicans succeed in their effort to privatize Medicare.

These stories underscore the importance of and the need for Congress to pass specific legislation to protect Medicare and Medicaid from partisan attacks from Donald Trump and congressional Republicans. This week, I will be introducing new legislation that would prohibit Congress from making devastating cuts to Medicare and Medicaid through the budget reconciliation process. It accomplishes this objective by requiring any legislation that seeks to make certain changes to Medicare or Medicaid to receive 60 votes in the Senate before such changes can be implemented. Of course, these changes include increasing the Medicare eligibility age, privatizing or turning Medicare into a voucher program, block granting or imposing per capita caps on Medicaid, and rolling back the ACA's Medicaid expansion.

My legislation builds on the success of an amendment I introduced with my colleague from Indiana, Senator DONNELLY, during last January's budget debate to protect these programs. Although our amendment did not pass—it came pretty close—two Republicans joined us in supporting it. It is nice to

know some of my Republican colleagues are concerned about seniors, children, and working families who rely on Medicare and Medicaid every single day.

I think it is just astonishing that as we are talking about cutting Medicare and Medicaid for millions of seniors throughout our country, and hundreds of thousands in Hawaii, these kinds of changes are being proposed by the very President and the people in Congress who gave the richest 1 percent of the people in our country and corporations a huge—a huge—tax break. By the way, the President is talking about giving the rich people in our country even more of a tax cut. It is just astounding to me that while all of that is happening on the one hand, on the other hand, they propose changes to two huge programs that millions of people in our country rely on. Where are our priorities? They are definitely misplaced if we go along with these schemes.

I call on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in this fight to protect these critical social safety net programs.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I want to thank my colleague for an excellent statement. I thank her, in particular, for her last point, highlighting the proposition that the administration seems to be considering—after all the boondoggles that the fortunate few have already gotten, they seem to be considering the idea of administratively and unilaterally cutting the capital gains tax to provide another windfall, while, as my colleague said—and I went sort of page by page in the President's budget—they seek to clobber Medicare and Medicaid.

The Senator from Hawaii has given us the starkest example of what the priorities ought to be and what they shouldn't be, and I thank her for her excellent presentation. I look forward to working with her.

Our last Senator slated to speak this evening is Senator HASSAN, a Governor who knows inside out how these programs work, understands the federalism aspect of this—the Federal-State partnership, for example—in terms of Medicaid. She has been working with families in her State and with families around the country for years and years as an advocate of these programs. I really appreciate her joining us tonight.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for organizing this evening's recognition.

Fifty-three years ago this week, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed Medicare and Medicaid into law, delivering healthcare to seniors and some of our most vulnerable citizens, and bolstering efforts to expand opportunity and help more of our people thrive. Today, tens of millions of Americans are covered through Medicare and Medicaid.

In communities in New Hampshire and throughout our country, seniors are able to live active, engaging, and high-quality lives, participating physically and economically, because of the care Medicare provides. We know Medicaid has delivered countless benefits to people from all walks of life. Medicaid helps seniors and those who experience disabilities receive supports that allow them to live independently in their homes and in their communities. It also helps countless children who experience disabilities go to school, and it assists school districts in covering costs for special education services and equipment.

New Hampshire's bipartisan Medicaid expansion plan has provided more than 50,000 hard-working Granite Staters with the peace of mind that comes with quality, affordable health insurance.

Experts on the frontlines have said that our Medicaid expansion plan is the No. 1 tool at our disposal to combat the opioid crisis in New Hampshire. What we have learned is that when people who have substance misuse disorders have Medicaid coverage, they have the opportunity to change their lives, people like a Granite Stater named Elizabeth, who at one point in her life was homeless and lost custody of her son as a result of a substance misuse disorder. Elizabeth is in recovery and works at the SOS Recovery Community Organization in Rochester, a facility that recently celebrated an expansion to ensure that they can help even more people in need. Elizabeth has credited her recovery to the services she has received through Medicaid expansion and has stressed its importance in helping people who have struggled with substance misuse disorder find the support and help they need to improve their lives, to get better, to work, to raise a family.

On this anniversary, we must reaffirm our commitment to protecting Medicare and Medicaid and strengthening them so that they are available for future generations. Unfortunately, the Trump administration and my Republican colleagues have repeatedly pushed efforts that would undermine and drastically cut Medicare and Medicaid.

During last year's TrumpCare debate, a top priority for Republicans was instituting massive cuts to Medicaid that would have forced States to choose between slashing benefits, reducing the number of people who can get care, or both, threatening the very services on which children, people with disabilities, and seniors depend. Thankfully, the TrumpCare bill failed, but efforts from this administration to sabotage the health of millions haven't stopped, and Medicare and Medicaid continue to be under threat for drastic cuts, all so that Republicans can pay for their massive tax breaks for corporate special interests.

These attacks on our healthcare must stop. Our constituents understand the benefits of these programs,

and they want us to work together to safeguard them so that they are available and effective for our seniors, our children, our most vulnerable, now and in the future.

With the creation of Medicare and Medicaid, our country acknowledged an obligation to protect the health and wellness of our people, and it has acknowledged and it has seen the value of doing so—for individuals, for communities, and for our economy.

Fifty-three years ago, Americans made a promise to each other, as self-governing people have the unique privilege and power to do. I am going to continue fighting to make good on that promise for years to come.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before my colleague leaves the floor, I want to thank her for her thoughtful remarks in recognizing that as we talk about the future of Medicare and Medicaid, what we see is a constant need to update these terrific programs for the times. When I was director of the Gray Panthers, opioids were not an issue. Today, it is a dominant force in American life. My colleague is a leader in the effort to find smart, passionate, cost-effective programs to deal with those challenges, and I thank her for her thoughtful comments.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WYDEN for his leadership for our seniors, for our Nation's economy, and for all of our people.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. President, I have one brief comment to wrap up. I see my colleague from Florida here. My colleagues have essentially spent close to an hour talking about these programs that are literally a lifeline to millions of Americans, Medicare and Medicaid. As highlighted tonight, it has always been that we have had to play a lot of defense to prevent big attacks on these programs—we even saw them in the President's budget as I went page by page—when what we really would like to do is play offense and think about the future.

My colleague from Florida is here. He has a very large elderly population, as many Senators do.

When I was director of the Gray Panthers, Medicare had two parts. There was Part A for hospitals and Part B for doctors. That was it. If you had a broken ankle and you went to the hospital, that was Part A. If you had a horrible case of the flu, you went to the doctor, and you were taken care of in an outpatient fashion. That is not Medicare today. Medicare today is chronic illnesses—diabetes, heart disease, chronic pulmonary diseases. Eighty percent of the Medicare Program is going to be consumed by chronic illnesses in the days ahead.

Congress has just begun the effort to update the Medicare guarantee to incorporate those hugely important challenges—cancer, diabetes, heart disease. Those are chronic illnesses. I close by way of saying that this update means,

again, that the guarantee reaches into every nook and cranny of our community. That means seniors in traditional Medicare, seniors who secure their healthcare through Medicare Advantage, and seniors in accountable care organizations. All of them, wherever they get their healthcare, ought to be able to secure an updated Medicare guarantee that addresses the upcoming challenge of our times, the great challenge of our times dealing with chronic illnesses.

My colleagues have laid out what our job is all about, which is preventing the effort to go backward, when we like to think about going forward into the future in a fashion that updates the Medicare guarantee for all older people and those who look forward to those years, and protecting the great safety net of our time—Medicaid.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1017 through 1029 and all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Stephen R. Lyons

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Brian T. Kelly

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Mark D. Kelly

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in

the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Timothy J. Madden

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Jeffrey L. Harrigian

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Thomas A. Bussiere

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Kenneth S. Wilsbach

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Stephen M. Twitty

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment as Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps in the United States Marine Corps, and for appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5044:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Gary L. Thomas

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Susan J. Pietrykowski

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jon T. Thomas

IN THE ARMY

The following named officers for appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Army under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Gregory K. Anderson

Col. Christine A. Beeler

Col. Peter N. Benchoff

Col. Mark S. Bennett

Col. Gregory J. Brady

Col. Michele H. Bredenkamp

Col. Edmond M. Brown

Col. Robert M. Collins

Col. Kimberly M. Colloton

Col. David S. Doyle

Col. Thomas J. Edwards, Jr.

Col. Marcus S. Evans

Col. Brett T. Funck

Col. James J. Gallivan

Col. Brian W. Gibson

Col. Amy E. Hannah

Col. Jered P. Helwig
 Col. Donn H. Hill
 Col. Scott A. Jackson
 Col. John D. Kline
 Col. Gavin A. Lawrence
 Col. Kevin C. Leahy
 Col. Michelle M. Letcher
 Col. Charles J. Masaracchia
 Col. Michael C. McCurry, II
 Col. John V. Meyer, III
 Col. Duane R. Miller
 Col. Scott M. Naumann
 Col. Christopher R. Norrie
 Col. Allan M. Pepin
 Col. Andrew D. Preston
 Col. Mark C. Quander
 Col. John L. Rafferty, Jr.
 Col. Jeth B. Rey
 Col. Joseph A. Ryan
 Col. James M. Smith
 Col. Brett G. Sylvia
 Col. Joel B. Vowell
 Col. Todd R. Wasmund

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. James F. Pasqualette

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S
 DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1598 AIR FORCE nominations (23) beginning JACQUELINE E. BERRY, and ending CONNIE L. WINIK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 8, 2018.

PN2156 AIR FORCE nominations (167) beginning ANTHONY J. ACETO, and ending REGIS C. ZOZO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 18, 2018.

PN2216 AIR FORCE nominations (6) beginning MICHAEL A. BASSO-WILLIAMS, and ending IRSHAD A. SHAKIR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 25, 2018.

PN2217 AIR FORCE nomination of Vikhyat S. Bebartha, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 25, 2018.

PN2218 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning MARY F. STUEVER, and ending LAVANYA VISWANATHAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 25, 2018.

PN2225 AIR FORCE nominations (2496) beginning KATHLEEN E. AALDERINK, and ending ISAAH S. ZYDUCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2018.

PN2246 AIR FORCE nomination of Nisha R. Baur, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2247 AIR FORCE nomination of Jay T. Flottmann, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2248 AIR FORCE nomination of Christopher P. Wherthey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2249 AIR FORCE nomination of Issa M. Alvarez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2250 AIR FORCE nomination of Nathaniel P. Lisenbee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2251 AIR FORCE nomination of Sean P. Malanowski, which was received by the Sen-

ate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2252 AIR FORCE nominations (17) beginning JAMES W. BARNES, and ending BRADLEY A. WISLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2253 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning ADAM D. AASEN, and ending GEORGE E. QUINT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2287 AIR FORCE nominations (3) beginning ILDA Y. ISAZA, and ending YOBANKA E. PAEZ-MUNOZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2288 AIR FORCE nomination of Samantha S. Rieger-Pinson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2335 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning STEVEN J. NORDEEN, and ending STEPHANIE E. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2018.

IN THE ARMY

PN2079 ARMY nomination of Alexis N. Mendozadejesus, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 7, 2018.

PN2188 ARMY nominations (2) beginning SAMUEL B. ALBAHARI, and ending RICCARDO C. PAGGETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2189 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JOHNMARK R. ARDIENTE, and ending NATHAN A. GUNTER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2190 ARMY nominations (3) beginning RYAN J. BERGLIN, and ending JAMES A. NARDELLI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2191 ARMY nominations (2) beginning DAVID L. BURRIER, and ending WILLIAM T. CIGICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2192 ARMY nomination of Joshua V. Arndt, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2193 ARMY nominations (7) beginning CHRISTOPHER Z. FARRINGTON, and ending MICHAEL P. THOMAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2194 ARMY nomination of Roderick W. Sumpter, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2195 ARMY nomination of Daniel Torres, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2196 ARMY nominations (42) beginning MICHAEL P. ANTECKI, JR., and ending D014175, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2197 ARMY nominations (291) beginning LISA M. ABEL, and ending D014651, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2198 ARMY nominations (433) beginning DREW Q. ABELL, and ending G010393, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2199 ARMY nominations (473) beginning ELI S. ADAMS, and ending D014147, which

nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 20, 2018.

PN2219 ARMY nomination of Rochell A. Maier, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 25, 2018.

PN2220 ARMY nomination of Robert C. Soper, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 25, 2018.

PN2221 ARMY nominations (53) beginning VINCENTE G. ALCIVAR, and ending EDWARD W. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 25, 2018.

PN2226 ARMY nomination of Benjamin E. Solomon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2018.

PN2227 ARMY nominations (4) beginning WILLIAM J. NELS, and ending KELLIE A. WHITTLINGER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2018.

PN2228 ARMY nominations (2) beginning VENDECK M. DAVIS, and ending RYAN G. LAVOIE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2018.

PN2229 ARMY nominations (2) beginning HARRY A. HORNBuckle, and ending MICHAEL J. KIMBALL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2018.

PN2254 ARMY nominations (3) beginning MATTHEW W. ALLEN, and ending FRANCIS E. SANFORD, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2255 ARMY nomination of Brian C. Morgan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2289 ARMY nomination of Kenneth F. Klock, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2290 ARMY nomination of Brandon C. Klink, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2291 ARMY nomination of Burton C. Glover, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2292 ARMY nomination of Manuel Reyes, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2293 ARMY nomination of Emmanuel D. Eisenstein, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2294 ARMY nomination of Marshall L. Bartee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2296 ARMY nominations (18) beginning ETHAN P. CARTER, and ending SAMUEL R. WETHERILL, IV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2297 ARMY nominations (6) beginning PATRICIA J. RASMUSSEN, and ending KENT J. VINCE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2298 ARMY nominations (3) beginning JEREMY W. BERNDT, and ending AMY M. RAMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2299 ARMY nominations (4) beginning SCOTT M. EVERHART, and ending ALBERT SOHNEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2300 ARMY nomination of William Perez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2301 ARMY nominations (6) beginning ROBYN D. BOLGLA, and ending RHONDA D. WYNDER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2302 ARMY nominations (17) beginning MICHAEL C. AMPELAS, and ending KURT G. ZIMMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2303 ARMY nominations (12) beginning MICHAEL S. ALLAIN, and ending CARMEN M. TUCKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2304 ARMY nominations (8) beginning DONNA M. KENTLEY, and ending DAVID J. SKELLEY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2305 ARMY nomination of Kimberly D. Dejesus, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2306 ARMY nominations (3) beginning ROYAL M. MINOR, III, and ending BENITO E. RODRIGUEZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2307 ARMY nominations (8) beginning EDWARD L. BARRON, JR., and ending MICHELE M. RICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2308 ARMY nominations (30) beginning LORI J. ALLERT, and ending LARA K. TERAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2309 ARMY nominations (44) beginning CARL W. ADAMS, and ending JOHN H. WU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2336 ARMY nominations (20) beginning DAWUD A. A. AGBERE, and ending D010823, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2018.

PN2337 ARMY nomination of Cynthia A. Hopkins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2018.

PN2338 ARMY nomination of Michael J. Loomis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2018.

PN2339 ARMY nomination of Latonia M. Mahnke, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2018.

PN2340 ARMY nomination of Justin A. Evison, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2018.

IN THE NAVY

PN2230 NAVY nomination of Travis A. Montplaisir, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2018.

PN2231 NAVY nomination of Ariana P. Bensusan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 28, 2018.

PN2256 NAVY nomination of Bruce S. Kimbrell, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2257 NAVY nomination of Samantha C. Dugan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2258 NAVY nomination of Brian L. Lees, which was received by the Senate and ap-

peared in the Congressional Record of July 9, 2018.

PN2310 NAVY nominations (28) beginning KORY A. ANGLESEY, and ending BENJAMIN C. WAITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2311 NAVY nominations (32) beginning DAVID W. ALEXANDER, and ending HAROLD B. WOODRUFF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2312 NAVY nominations (48) beginning JONATHAN D. ALBANO, and ending JAMES P. ZAKAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2313 NAVY nominations (70) beginning JANE J. ABANES, and ending MICHELLE L. WESTCOTT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2314 NAVY nominations (25) beginning MATTHEW S. BAILEY, and ending ADAM B. YOST, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2315 NAVY nominations (42) beginning LYNDA S. AMELL, and ending CHADWICK Y. YASUDA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2316 NAVY nominations (52) beginning LALEH ABDOLAZADEH, and ending CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2317 NAVY nominations (145) beginning LISA L. ABELS, and ending JERRY YUAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

PN2318 NAVY nomination of Javier Lopezmartinez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 18, 2018.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, FINANCIAL SERVICES, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, one of the interesting developments in our public debate in America today is Russia and the elections of 2016. Lost in all the noise and all the debate and all the legitimate issues that arise from it is this perception that if you are taking on Russian interference, that is a Democratic position or an anti-President Trump position, and that if you think this is all much ado about nothing, then you are taking a pro-President position. Nothing could be further from the truth. Vladimir Putin is neither a Republican nor a Democrat. He is not interested in making America great; he is interested in making America weak.

The reason Vladimir Putin is interested in making America weak is because while America is not at war with Vladimir Putin, Vladimir Putin is at

war with America. You may say: Well, that doesn't sound right because war means bullets, rockets, missiles, aircraft, and launching attacks. This misses the broader point. For Russia, under the Russian doctrine of conflict, information is a weapon; information war is a part of war. We are not in an armed conflict, but sadly, while we Americans go on about our lives and do not spend all day obsessing about Russia—until 2016 and some of the issues that arose there—Vladimir Putin is obsessed with America, and those in his government who surround him are as well.

We Americans look at Russia and say they are an important country. They have nuclear weapons and significant conventional military capabilities. But they have a very small economy of \$2 trillion—about the size of Italy's or Spain's. They are not really geopolitically relevant in many parts of the world. They still can't project power the way they used to during the Soviet Union. Yes, they are involved in Syria and other places, and they are doing more of that than ever before, and they have a veto vote on the United Nations Security Council. They are not really a relevant nation. Culturally, their people have much to be proud of and have contributed a tremendous amount to the world. On a daily basis, Russia may be a nuclear and somewhat military peer competitor of the United States but not economically, not commercially.

But the Russian Government's view of America is very different. They view America as an aggressive power that seeks to destroy Russia. I know that sounds bizarre to Americans who know that we spend little, if any, time thinking about how to go to war with Russia, but in their mindset, we do. They view us as an aggressive power that wants to fight and degrade them. They hold us responsible for the end of the Soviet Union, which, to them, represented power—not so much ideology, but power—for the current leaders. They blame us for expanding NATO in a way they feel encircles them. They blame us for the color revolutions throughout Europe, and they believe we want one of those to happen in Russia as well. Most of all, they think we are seeking to take advantage of Russia and humiliate them. This is the view of Russia's leaders. This is why, while we are not at war with Russia on information, Russia, under Vladimir Putin, is at war with the United States.

We keep talking about this issue as if it were espionage. I have had people come to me and say that everybody spies on everyone. This is not about espionage—trust me. Many countries in the world spy, and on each other, including our allies. This is not about espionage; this is about information warfare.

Information warfare is a part of the Russian doctrine of confronting an enemy and weakening them from within. What happened in 2016 and what is

happening now is nothing less than an information war against America—not for purposes of electing Donald Trump President or having Republicans win or vice versa but for purposes of dividing us among each other so they can weaken us from within, opening a permanent front domestically in order to hurt this country.

They do this all over the world. They do this in Eastern Europe. They do it all over the world where they have an interest, and it takes different forms. In many of the countries in which Russia is involved in information warfare, one of the things they do is openly and strongly financially support pro-Russian candidates, pro-Russian parties, or they may support pro-Russian separatists the way they did in parts of Ukraine.

We don't have a pro-Russia party in the United States. We don't really have pro-Russian constituencies in American politics—certainly not in large numbers that yield any power or influence. Instead, the way to weaken us is to divide us from within by pitting us against each other. The weapons they use in this war are their goals. Let me start with their goals.

How do they weaken us? The first is they seek to amplify political and social divisions in our country. You will see that both in 2016 and in the current efforts I am about to show that they focus largely on issues of race, immigration, and gun control. They know the issues that pit Americans against each other. They know the hot-button issues that get us to fight and call each other names and accuse one another of horrible things, and that is why they focus on those issues.

Another goal they have is to undermine confidence in our democracy—to be able to go around saying that our elections are rigged—so that we may come to doubt that a winner of an election really won.

The third is that they seek to weaken our image globally—for example, making up stories about how American troops in some country are killing civilians or committing war crimes and things of that nature, doctoring photos and video, and spreading fake news through their Russian propaganda outlets.

This is how they seek to weaken us. The methods they use are enlightening because they used them in 2016, and they are using them even at this very moment that I am speaking to you now. How do they amplify our political and social divisions? What do they do to get us to fight with one another? Because if they just put a bunch of segments on RT—everyone knows RT is the Kremlin's television station, but they are keen watchers of American habits. What do they know? They know a significant and growing percentage of Americans get their news and their information from social media.

In the old days, if you wanted to start a rumor, you started a rumor, and people had to tell someone else.

Propaganda and informational warfare is not new. What is new is the ability to spread it to millions of people instantaneously by using platforms that were not available just a short time ago. They know Americans increasingly, as I said, get information from social media.

The first thing they do is they develop networks of followers for fake social media accounts. "Fake" meaning they are real accounts but fake in that it is not the person. It is a Russian operative who creates a social media account. Initially, the account may not even have anything to do with politics. It might have a variety of different topics in order to attract people to follow it, until you get to 10,000 15,000, 20,000, 30,000 followers. Once they have reached a critical mass—and they have dozens of these—then, they use those platforms to inject divisive or false content or memes. They can use that, for example, to just sow instability and get us to fight with one another, but they can also use it to target specific candidates.

For example, they are using these networks, potentially, to leak stolen documents from a computer they hacked; or email doctored documents, where they change a few words and make it sound like you said something you never said; or, an even greater and growing threat, potentially, one day develop deepfake videos that you will watch on your news feed. You will look at the video, and it looks like someone saying and doing something, but it was carefully doctored and only an expert can tell. By the time a campaign or candidate bats it down, the election has passed, and that video has been spread far and wide and probably even found its way into regular media.

They know how the metrics work. How does the story pop up on your news feed, for example, on Facebook? It is based on how many people click and look at it. They unleash automated bots and even potentially paid advertising to drive traffic to those sites so those fake stories or that false content and that divisive content begins to rise on the news feed, meaning more people will read it. The result is, you have started a massive internet rumor that you know is going to get Americans to fight against one another.

This is not a relic of 2016. This is happening now. This is happening today. We were reminded of it earlier this morning, earlier today.

I want to show you two slides that Facebook revealed—two slides of content that Facebook has now removed because they have identified it as the work of Russian intelligence and their informational war against the United States.

Our first slide, under a fake account named Resisters, was posted on the 1st of September of last year. It says: Millions of indigenous people died during the conquest of America. History is history. But if we want integrity and

equality, we have to erase these bloody memories and start over. Congratulations, Louisiana.

What it posts is a picture—a picture with a sign on it that says: Christian terrorism begins in 1492.

Sorry. It says, Congratulations Los Angeles because what it was referring to was Los Angeles canceled Columbus Day. Columbus Day is no more in the Nation's second-largest city.

Why do they put that on Facebook? Why would they post that? Because they know it is going to get us to fight. Some people will see that and be outraged about Christian terrorism. It will make them angry that this kind of thing is happening, and they will ascribe this as the work of the political left. Others, potentially who agree with this message, will send it to their group of followers, saying: Look, this is exactly right. This is what we have been saying all along.

The point is, this is a message that would divide Americans against each other. It will get us to fight along religious lines and potentially ethnic lines. That is the purpose of this kind of stuff—a fake account they boosted with automated bots so it got on people's news feeds.

By the way, they do dozens and dozens of these sorts of posts. This is just one example of it. This may reach 4,000 there, 18,000 people over there. This stuff adds up.

Let me show you a second slide. This is a slide from Aztlán Warriors. As you can see, it is pictures and the names of various Native American figures from America's past giving thanks to our vets in the 500-year war against colonialism.

Look at that one. Why would they post that? Geronimo, Crazy Horse, Chief Joseph, and the like. Why would they post that? Again, this is just two examples of things they were pushing to get people to fight. Maybe they are hoping some political or well-known figure will like it and then create a scandal about them in the press, but they know this will outrage people.

This is an outrageous message. This is a message designed to generate outrage. This is not a pro-Trump message or pro-Democratic message; this is an outrage message. This is informational warfare. They know we have a First Amendment. This is protected speech, oftentimes. They use it against us. You can't do that in Russia. This stuff is censored in Russia, but they have figured out how to use this information to get us to fight against one another.

There are dozens of other ads like this that today were removed. One of them attacks President Trump as a Nazi—a divisive message designed to get us to fight. Again, these are not ads designed to win a campaign.

This ad is not going to lead you to directly go out and vote for your Congressman or against him or for your Senator or against him. This is designed to drive conflict, along lines in this country that they know drives

conflict. These are conflict messages. This is informational warfare. This is what they are doing now year-round. In campaigns, they may tailor it for something else, but this is what they are doing to us year-round.

This is what they did in 2016, with the primary objective of getting us to be divided, with the primary objective of ensuring that no matter who won that election—Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump—the next President of the United States was going to take office with a dark cloud over their head and a nation continually debating these issues and divided over it.

This is how you weaken an adversary from within. This is 21st century information warfare, and this is what is happening to our country. The target of this campaign is not the Democratic Party. It is not the Republican Party. It is you, the American people. A foreign country, under a foreign dictator, is coming into your homes, across your computer screen and your mobile phones, and targeting you for psychological and informational warfare. That is what we have to fully accept, as well as the implications it has for our country, for its future, for our Republic, for our elections, and for our ability to do work here.

They are better at this today than they were 2 years ago. Imagine when they start using that to try to influence the debates in the Senate or the House—contemporary issues. It is coming.

I don't have a magic solution for how to stop it. This is a 21st century reality. We have to address it and be prepared for it. I know this. I don't like Vladimir Putin. I don't respect Vladimir Putin. I don't consider him to be a great leader or anything like that. I largely consider him to be a weak and very corrupt man whose government is largely based on corruption and the ability to provide wealth to those who surround him, as long as they give him some of their money. He is largely an organized crime figure in charge of a nuclear arsenal and a great nation of great people. He has empowered himself with that. I do know he is a calculated actor. We have every reason to believe he makes decisions by weighing the benefits and the costs.

I believe, in 2016, he looked at the efforts in 2016 and said: I think weakening America from within through an informational warfare campaign will yield great benefits at a cost I am willing to pay.

I believe as we get closer to 2018 and future elections, he will have to make that decision again. I believe one of the things we can do is something that the Senator from Maryland, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, spoke about earlier and we are working on together; that is, we have to do what we can to ensure that when he makes a decision about what to do in 2018 or beyond, the price of doing it is substantially higher than the benefit he thinks he will gain from informational warfare.

That is the purpose of the DETER Act, a bill we have filed together and continues to gain cosponsors. It is to make sure Vladimir Putin knows how high the price will be in comparison to the benefit before he decides what he wants to do about 2018 or beyond.

The bill is pretty straightforward. It doesn't deal with 2016. It doesn't look backward. It looks forward. It says two things. The first is, after every election, the Director of National Intelligence has to issue a report, after consulting with the Attorney General, with the White House, with all the heads of the intelligence agencies, about whether Russia attempted to interfere in our elections.

I am not talking about five Russian guys on Twitter. I am talking about a real campaign to interfere in our elections and conduct informational warfare for the purposes of disrupting our election, for the purposes of undermining confidence in the ballot box, for the purposes of driving divisions in America. If the answer is yes, it defines very clearly a set of specific, very hard-hitting sanctions in waiting—sanctions in waiting—that will be imposed if, but only if, there is interference. Sanctions are important as a penalty for what has been happening in the past, but deterrence happens when people know it is going to happen in the future.

He has already paid the price for 2016. Those sanctions are already in place. That is already baked into the equation now. You can't reimpose the same sanctions. Vladimir Putin is well aware what will happen if he conducts a massive cyber attack on our infrastructure. He is well aware of what will happen if he launches a rocket, a missile against one of America's cities. He knows very well what will happen if he tries to shoot down one of our airplanes.

Right now, he is kind of wondering what will happen if "I did this again because they seem pretty divided about this whole thing. Maybe I can get away with it."

We have to change that equation, and that is what this bill is about. The best way to prevent these things is to change that calculus. The best way to deal with this or any problem is to prevent it from happening in the first place. I cannot guarantee that if we pass a strong deterrence bill, he will not still wage informational warfare, but I can almost guarantee that if we don't, he will at some point in the future, and the target could be the Republicans the next time or anyone, for that matter. Vladimir Putin is not a Republican. He is anti-American, and he seeks to destroy this country from within, with driving an informational warfare campaign.

We are prepared to change and tailor our bill. There are some parts of that bill that need to be altered and refined. We recognize that. We are working to do that. We are willing to take ideas from anyone. The purpose of this is not

to do something reckless or irresponsible. I am not interested, and I know Senator VAN HOLLEN is not interested, in a talking point or a messaging exercise. We want to pass a law, which means it has to have 60 votes in the Senate, a majority in the House, and something President Trump can sign.

We are willing to change the bill so long as it can pass, and it will actually have strong enough deterrence. That is good public policy without unintended consequences. That is the purpose of this.

I will close where I began. We make a terrible mistake if we think this somehow is an effort by Vladimir Putin to engage himself in a partisan competition in the United States. His goal is not to elect one party or any individual candidate. His ultimate goal is to divide us against each other.

I ask everyone this. If a stranger came into your home—no matter what problems you may have with your family member or your children—and actively encouraged you to fight with your spouse and fight with your kids and fight with your relatives, constantly trying to instigate, I know most people would tell this person: Listen, we are family, and we argue with one another, but you are not. You have no place to come into our home and get us to fight with one another.

We need to do that with our country. We need to do that with America. That is what we are hoping we can do here; 2016 is being dealt with. The Intelligence Committee that I sit on continues to do its work. We learn more every day that I think will help us be stronger for the future.

Is the independent counsel doing his work? I think the best thing that could happen is that all the truth can come out. The best thing for the President, the best thing for the country is that he be allowed to finish his work and that we know everything that happened in detail. The truth, I truly believe, is what is in the best interest of everyone, including the President of the United States.

We can't change the past. We can react to it, but we can't change it. We have a chance to influence the future, and that is the point of the DETER Act and why I hope we can make progress.

The election in the fall is less than 100 days away now. We are running out of time to put in place the things we need to put in place to ensure that this does not continue to happen.

We already are pretty irritated about these issues in America. The last thing we need is for some foreign, malign power, which seeks to weaken us, to have a foothold in making things worse and, in cases like what I just showed, getting us fighting with one another over things that aren't even real. We are the target of a psychological and informational war. It is time we stand up for ourselves, and I hope we will pass something like the DETER Act to do so.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. 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. LANKFORD. Mr. President, over the past week, the Senate has debated and amended the financial services and general government appropriations bill. It is the first time that this bill has the potential to cross the floor of this Senate since 2007, when the bill was created. Not one time has it passed the Senate since this appropriations bill was created.

Usually, this particular appropriations bill is airdropped into an end-of-the-year spending package or an omnibus without ever being publicly debated, without ever coming to the Senate floor, without a single amendment. This year changed that.

This bill has been on this floor this entire week. And it was here last week. And it is being amended. And it is going through a process. That may not seem like a big deal to some. That should be a no-brainer for most Americans, certainly for most Oklahomans. They would think, of course, the bill is being amended and debated. But that has not happened since 2007, and we are changing a process, trying to relearn how to actually pass bills—to debate them and to go through this process.

I think countless Americans across the country who complain about the inaction of Congress and all the back-room deals have been justified in their complaints about this bill. But I am telling you, we are at a historic turning point of trying to shift this process around. We have demonstrated that appropriations bills can be debated and amended in an open, orderly, and fair process for all of the country to see.

I was grateful to accept the role of chairman of the subcommittee earlier this year because of the agencies and programs that are impacted by this particular appropriations bill. It affects the lives of millions of Americans, plays an important role in supporting the American economy, and promoting private sector growth.

The funding for this particular appropriations bill is \$23.688 billion. It includes funding for entities across all three branches of government, from the White House to the Supreme Court, to a diverse group of 27 independent agencies and the Treasury.

In fact, more than half of this particular appropriations bill, \$12.7 billion, funds the Department of the Treasury, the offices of which execute important functions that promote economic growth, combat illicit finance, safeguard our financial system, administer the Internal Revenue Code, and manage the Federal Government's fiscal operations.

Last year, the Tax Cut and Jobs Act passed this Congress and is now law. It

provided much needed relief to Oklahomans and all Americans by lowering tax rates for the middle class, simplifying tax rates for every American, and dramatically changing how we tax businesses.

The tax reform bill has helped small and large businesses and individuals throughout this year. In fact, as a direct result of that bill passing last year, this past quarter, our economy grew at 4.1 percent. Unemployment is down to historic levels. Wages have started to increase again.

We have seen some significant growth in our economy, but with that significant growth, from a new Tax Code, there are also significant changes that are happening in tax administration. This particular bill provides the funds necessary for the IRS to be able to complete its work to implement the tax reform bill to ensure that the tax forms and all of the IT systems are ready for the filing system and April 15. We want to make sure that Americans get their questions answered because there will be additional questions coming this next year as they file under a new system—hopefully a simplified system.

The bill also provides funding for the taxpayer assistance centers to ensure that local offices in my State—like those in Enid, Lawton, Oklahoma City, and Tulsa—remain open and available for individuals to have face-to-face conversations with someone from the IRS and that there is also the opportunity for them to be able to call directly, if they have questions for the IRS. These important centers help Oklahomans resolve tax issues, change tax account information, arrange payments, as well as get answers to questions regarding the new tax law.

This bill also includes \$159 million for the Office of Terrorism and Financial Intelligence. It is at the Treasury Department, but it levies the sanctions against terrorist organizations, international narcotics traffickers, rogue regimes, and individuals and entities involved in the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. It is an incredibly important office that functions in our Treasury.

The State of Oklahoma knows firsthand the devastation that can be caused by terrorism, and I am pleased that this terrorism finance entity received a \$17.2 million increase in our bill. It increases their capacity to curb terrorist financing and dismantle the financial networks that support them. If you stop the flow of money to terrorism and to cartels, you can stop the flow of drugs and violence and every other evil thing that they bring.

This bill also includes \$118 million for the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network or what is called FinCEN. It combats money laundering. In 2018, financial institutions in Oklahoma have filed over 12,000 suspicious activity reports that they identified with FinCEN to identify suspicious activities or potentially suspicious activities that

helped FinCEN to follow the money and track down drug kingpins, money laundering, human smugglers, and other criminal enterprises.

Furthermore, this bill makes critical investments in our Nation's financial markets by providing targeted increases for the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. The SEC—Securities and Exchange Commission—works to ensure that our financial markets are fair, orderly, and efficient. This helps Oklahoma companies have access to the capital they need to get started, to grow, to hire, and to thrive.

Over the past year, the SEC has made protection of Main Street investors its top priority. This will help ensure that Wall Street insiders can't manipulate stocks prices for retirees in Norman or give unscrupulous financial advice to investors in Broken Arrow. I am pleased we were able to fund this initiative. Households in Oklahoma have more than \$164 billion in mutual fund assets, and the SEC regulates investment companies that issue these securities so that families are not victims of Ponzi schemes or fraud that wipe out their entire life savings. With \$164 billion in Oklahoma money invested, it is incredibly important that we get this regulated and get it done right.

The bill provides funding, as well, for the CFTC, which ensures that derivatives markets in the United States are free from fraud, manipulation, and abuse of practices while ensuring that they remain globally competitive.

Some people may say: Well, the CFTC doesn't affect me directly. Do you know what? If you are a soybean farmer or a rancher or you are involved in oil and gas production in Oklahoma, CFTC markets help these people hedge their risk. It is very important to them and to our economy.

I am pleased that the CFTC Chairman, Christopher Giancarlo, is visiting Oklahoma next week to meet with agriculture and energy groups face to face and listen to their needs as the agency implements thoughtful rules and regulations that encourage participation and innovation in the markets. We welcome the CFTC Chairman to Oklahoma.

The bill also provides \$280 million for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program, which supports law enforcement agencies operating in major drug trafficking regions and corridors. One of those initiatives in this program is the Texoma HIDTA, which encompasses a handful of counties in North Texas, as well as Cleveland, Comanche, McIntosh, Muskogee, Oklahoma, Pittsburg, Sequoyah, and Tulsa Counties. Those counties are sometimes used as a transnational shipping distribution area for drugs arriving from Mexico that are destined for Oklahoma and other parts of the country.

With this funding, the Texoma HIDTA coordinates training, information sharing, and joint task forces that

connect 70 different Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies in Oklahoma and North Texas. For example, this week, from Wednesday to Friday, the Texoma HIDTA is hosting a training for local street patrol officers, investigators, and detectives to increase awareness of the trends, methods of operations, and drug activity of the most commonly encountered criminal street gangs. It is important that this program stays in place.

The bill includes \$99 million for the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the Drug-Free Communities Support Program that supports community coalitions to prevent youth drug use. Many youth have a difficult time navigating junior high and high school and early college, trying to stay away from drugs—and keep away. This program supports grants and nonprofit organizations in towns in my State like Oologah, Lexington, and Hulbert in their efforts to reduce teen substance abuse.

The bill also provides funding increases to the U.S. Postal Services inspector general to address the growing concern of narcotics trafficking through the mail. This funding increase will enable the inspector general to address the increase in the number of allegations of postal employees stealing drugs from the mail or postal employees assisting drug trafficking organizations in the delivery of narcotics shipped through the mail.

We have thousands and thousands of great employees in the U.S. Postal Service, but, sometimes, if we have a bad apple in the group, the mail itself is used to deliver some of the worst narcotics to Americans. We need to increase for the inspector general to be able to track down a bad actor, even in our U.S. Postal Service.

The bill provides full funding to the Federal Communications Commission to help close the digital divide between metropolitan areas and rural areas in Oklahoma. We want to protect consumer and public safety and improve the regulatory process for telecommunications companies throughout the State. This also sets the precedent for increasing cell phone coverage in some of the most rural areas in the country, including rural areas in Oklahoma.

Oklahoma receives the second largest allocation of Lifeline funds in the entire country, \$128 million. But there is some waste and inefficiency, and there are some individuals even in my State who are getting Lifeline funds but should not. So we have increased the ability to be more efficient and to make sure that Lifeline funds are targeted to people who actually need it the most.

Further, this bill provides full funding for the Federal Trade Commission to fulfill its mission to prevent anti-competitive mergers and anti-competitive business practices in the marketplace.

Each of the programs that I just mentioned has a real impact on Okla-

homa and Oklahoma families. But it is important to note that we are not just sending a check to these entities and agencies, and walking away.

Prior to passing the bill, we held open hearings to require agency leaders to publicly defend their budget requests, and we will continue to hold hearings and have conversations with agency heads and senior leaders and budget directors about the use of their funds. In some cases, we have made cuts already, and there will be others that may have to be made in the future.

Last year, we provided \$150 million for the Technology Modernization Fund at the GSA, the General Services Administration. They came back this year and asked for \$210 million. We said no. We have not seen results from that program yet, and we don't have any data on it, and I wasn't going to allocate \$210 million to something that we don't know is working.

The National Archives and Records Administration does incredibly important work to protect our Nation's history, but we reduced their budget for administrative expenses in this bill. They responded by finding more efficiencies to compensate for that. This can be a model for other agencies and entities.

There are ways to help protect Americans' money, and it begins by the government remembering that the money that is allocated in this bill is not our money; it is money that is coming out of the paychecks of hard-working Americans, and they want us to be responsible with it—rightfully so.

Again, this is a historic week for the Appropriations Committee, for this particular subcommittee, and for the Senate. I do applaud the determination of Chairman SHELBY and Vice Chairman LEAHY as they push these bills through and publicly debate these bills on the floor.

I also want to thank the ranking member of the subcommittee, Mr. COONS. He has been a great partner in this effort. Our team and his team have worked very cooperatively together through a lot of difficult issues.

I appreciate everyone's engagement on these issues as we try to solve this long term.

I look forward to continuing oversight in the months ahead as we pass this bill and then watch over how those dollars are actually spent. We want to make sure that decisions that have been made are best for the American people, best for the agencies, and best for the future of our country.

I look forward to seeing this bill completed in just the next few hours or next couple of days and finishing the work and then partnering this bill with what the House has passed to get a final conference report and put it on the President's desk.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the Senator pre-

ceding me, and I thank him very much. He has worked very hard in the Appropriations Committee.

Senator SHELBY and I have worked very hard to get a bipartisan bill. I would hope that we could have a consent agreement very soon to bring the current bills to a conclusion.

I would note that both Mr. SHELBY and I have done our best to work with Members of both parties. Many people on the Appropriations Committee have concerns, some of which are by nature parochial, many national. I think we have tried to accommodate as many people as possible, and I hope that Senators can reach an agreement soon so we can know exactly what we will be voting on if not tonight, tomorrow morning.

I thank the Senator for his comment.

I see my friend is about to speak, so I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the kind remarks and the comments about the appropriations process and bill by the ranking member, the vice chairman of the committee.

In this package of appropriations bills is the FSGG that was just talked about by the Senator from Oklahoma, the chairman of the subcommittee of which I am a member. Tonight, I want to speak about an aspect of that appropriations bill. I want to speak on the evolving threats in cyber security that not only pose harm to individual Americans but also to Federal agencies that are tasked with ensuring the economic and national security of our Nation.

In recent years, it has become clear that threats in cyber security are rapidly changing. Cyber attacks are not only growing in volume but also in complexity.

I chair a subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security. I have convened hearings and publicly questioned Federal agencies and private corporations alike to determine what standards and practices they have in place to better protect their customers' personal and financial data.

With examples of breaches exposing the personally identifiable information of tens of millions of Americans, such as in the 2015 breach within the U.S. Office of Personnel Management, the ability to compromise data networks in the Federal Government cannot be overstated. Companies must do all they can to prevent hackers from gaining access to their customers' information. The Federal Government and State officials must do the same.

Advancements in information technology, or IT, will continue to drive the changes in our Nation's security, economic competitiveness, communications, healthcare, privacy, and other areas. The Federal Government must keep pace with these changes through nimble, expeditious, and results-driven decision making.

A stringent and cumbersome budgeting and acquisition process has tied the hands of Federal agencies in their efforts to modernize their IT systems in an efficient fashion.

The U.S. Government Accountability Office's 2015 "High-Risk Series" report highlighted several issues it deemed critical to improving IT acquisition. Specifically, the report stated that about 75 percent of the \$80 billion the Federal Government spends annually on IT investments is spent on operating and maintaining outdated and unsupported legacy systems, creating major cyber security vulnerabilities at home and abroad. In fact, the Federal Chief Information Officer, Suzette Kent, recently testified to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform last week, where she identified the replacement of legacy IT systems as critical to achieving stronger Federal cyber security protections.

With the support of the Trump administration, I partnered with Senator TOM UDALL of New Mexico to introduce the Modernizing Government Technology Act, which is being referred to as the MGT Act, in an effort to address the foundational cyber security threats that outdated legacy systems in our Federal agencies pose.

The MGT Act establishes IT working capital funds for 24 CFO Act-eligible agencies and allows them to use savings obtained through streamlining IT systems, replacing legacy products, and transitioning to cloud computing for further modernization efforts for up to 3 years.

The bill also creates the Technology Modernization Fund, a separate centralized fund within the Department of the Treasury. These resources would be administered across the Federal Government by the head of the General Services Administration in consultation with a board of Federal IT experts.

It is fitting that the MGT Act was signed into law last year as part of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018, as cyber security policy is increasingly interwoven into comprehensive national security discussions.

As contributors to the original drafting of the MGT Act, Senate appropriators demonstrated their continued support for the innovative policy by appropriating \$100 million to the Technology Modernization Fund for fiscal year 2018, last year's appropriations bill. Of this original funding, the Technology Modernization Fund has already awarded substantial grants to applicant agencies, including the Departments of Housing and Urban Development, Energy, and Agriculture, to replace their outdated, unsupported, and vulnerable systems.

Given these early-stage successes, I was disappointed to find that the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for Financial Services and General Government, FSGG—the subcommittee that the Senator from Oklahoma chairs and that I am a member of—pro-

vided no funds for the Technology Modernization Fund in the mark for this fiscal year, 2019.

I appreciate the opportunity to work with Subcommittee Chairman LANKFORD and his staff. It was clear to me in that conversation and those discussions that GSA and OMB need to provide more information on individual agency proposals submitted to and awarded by the Technology Modernization Fund.

I worked with the subcommittee to include specific reporting requirements in this bill for the agencies to provide Congress. Agency officials have been providing necessary information to appropriators since the markup of the bill, so progress is being made.

These commonsense requirements are absolutely critical and will lead to more transparency, and it is important that the GSA and OMB work closely with the Appropriations Committee on proposals for moving forward. Congress and the Federal agencies must work hand-in-hand to provide the necessary resources to the Technology Modernization Fund, which, used responsibly, is a vital tool for the Federal Government's task of keeping our Nation's critical IT infrastructure efficient and secure.

Inherently tied to improving our Nation's critical IT infrastructure is bolstering cyber security efforts against those who try to do us harm in the cyber domain. The Federal role in cyber security involves both securing Federal systems and assisting in protecting non-Federal systems. Under current law, all Federal agencies have cyber security responsibilities relating to their own systems, and many have sector-specific responsibilities.

One of the most well-known topics related to our Nation's cyber security capabilities relates to the intelligence community indicating that Russian cyber actors interfered with U.S. elections. These exposures threatened to compromise one of the most sacred privileges we have, as Americans, afforded to us in our constitutional freedom to participate in democracy through election.

Back-end election systems, including voter registration databases, ballot creation systems, voting machine configuration systems, absentee processing and reporting, and tabulation software, are increasingly vulnerable and have been compromised by both private and state actors. While States are charged with the primary responsibility of securing their systems, the Federal Government can bolster those efforts through legislation, such as the Secure Elections Act, which I cosponsored in an effort to strengthen protections against foreign interference and prevent Russian meddling in our election, as they did in 2016.

Our Nation faces existential threats from adversaries such as Russia and China in a warfare we cannot see that rages in the shadows of cyber space, where cyber attacks know no bounds,

affecting our Federal systems, States, and crossing the line among numerous sectors in our Nation's critical infrastructure.

As our intelligence and other communities analyze cyber threats, whether attacking our democracy or our critical infrastructure, it is important that the Federal Government promptly streamline and share cyber security information with State, local, and private sector partners.

Although talk of cyber threats to our State networks and critical infrastructure across all sectors continues to grow, this threat is not new. Just last July, we saw hackers infiltrate a network of companies that run nuclear plants in the United States, including a nuclear powerplant in my home State of Kansas.

Incidentally, a cross-section of stakeholders at the State and Federal level and among the private sector are represented at the Kansas Intelligence Fusion Center, which plays a critical role in analyzing and comparing cyber data and intelligence among public-private partners and Federal agencies to identify similarities, anomalies, and ways our cyber defenses can improve. The Fusion Center, headquartered in Topeka and managed by the Kansas National Guard, has analytical capability that works as an intermediary, supporting companies across the United States in our financial and energy sectors, as well as our intelligence community and the Department of Defense, the Department of Energy, and the Department of Homeland Security. With the Fusion Center's ability to access, analyze, and transmit data at classified levels, they are able to more accurately assess cyber threats from the vantage point that private sector partners cannot. Similarly, they are able to share what they learn from cyber attacks on private sector partners to Federal agencies.

As we look for ways to improve IT systems across the Federal Government, there is much to be gained from the private sector and their experience and exposure to cyber attacks. As the Departments of Defense, Energy, and Homeland Security develop an assessment of our Nation's cyber infrastructure, I hope they seek the perspective of our private sector partners that have just as much at stake in protecting our infrastructure across the country as does the Federal Government.

We must do all we can to keep our Nation's ability to detect, prevent, and respond to cyber security attacks, which is why fully funding the Technology Modernization Fund is so important to bolstering an environment that incentivizes organizations to strengthen their IT systems.

I hope my colleagues recognize the importance of investing in defensive cyber security capacity and join me in supporting funding for the Technology Modernization Fund in the Financial

Services and General Government appropriations bill and supporting the Secure Elections Act.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to call up and consider the amendments in the managers' package, which is at the desk, with a modification to amendment No. 3670, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, Senator SHELBY and I and Senator MORAN have worked on this. We have no objection.

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

The amendments will be considered en bloc.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3406; 3428; 3436; 3437; 3438; 3447; 3454; 3468; 3476; 3480; 3482; 3492; 3493; 3517; 3540; 3546; 3551; 3560; 3562; 3563; 3566; 3578; 3582; 3585; 3595; 3607; 3608; 3613; 3615; 3621; 3633; 3645; 3646; 3650; 3651; 3661; 3665; 3666; 3684; 3668; 3669; 3670, AS MODIFIED; 3671; 3675; 3676; 3677; AND 3679 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3399

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be made pending, en bloc, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are now pending en bloc.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments (Nos. 3406; 3428; 3436; 3437; 3438; 3447; 3454; 3468; 3476; 3480; 3482; 3492; 3493; 3517; 3540; 3546; 3551; 3560; 3562; 3563; 3566; 3578; 3582; 3585; 3595; 3607; 3608; 3613; 3615; 3621; 3633; 3645; 3646; 3650; 3651; 3661; 3665; 3666; 3684; 3668; 3669; 3670, as modified; 3671; 3675; 3676; 3677; and 3679) were agreed to en bloc, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3406

(Purpose: To authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide technical assistance relating to a disaster caused by a volcanic eruption)

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide to any State or county impacted by a volcanic eruption covered by a major disaster declared by the President in calendar year 2018 in accordance with section 401 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) technical assistance—

(1) to assess damage to agricultural production and rural infrastructure; and

(2) to develop recovery plans for impacted farmers, ranchers, and rural communities.

AMENDMENT NO. 3428

(Purpose: To require a report on engagement with local interests relating to intelligent transportation systems technologies and smart cities solutions)

At the appropriate place in title I of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 1 _____. Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives a report on efforts by the Department of Transportation to engage with local communities, metropolitan planning organizations, and regional transportation commissions on advancing data and intelligent transportation systems technologies and other smart cities solutions.

AMENDMENT NO. 3436

(Purpose: To require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to submit a report on implementation of NextGen at commercial service airports in the United States)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. **REPORT ON NEXTGEN IMPLEMENTATION.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of NextGen at commercial service airports in the United States.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The number and percentage of commercial service airports in the United States that have fully implemented NextGen.

(2) The percentage completion of NextGen implementation at each commercial service airport in the United States.

(c) DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARD TO DETERMINE PERCENTAGE IMPLEMENTATION OF NEXTGEN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator shall develop a standard for determining under subsection (b)(2) the percentage completion of NextGen implementation at commercial service airports in the United States based on factors that may include an accounting of efficiency benefits achieved, the degree of NextGen technology and infrastructure installed, and the extent of controller training on NextGen.

(2) INCLUSION IN REPORT.—The Administrator shall include in the report submitted under subsection (a) the standard developed under paragraph (1).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration.

(2) NEXTGEN.—The term “NextGen” means the Next Generation Air Transportation System.

AMENDMENT NO. 3437

(Purpose: To provide a set-aside for the dryland agriculture research program)

On page 315, line 13, insert “of which not less than \$2,000,000 shall be available to carry out the dryland agriculture research program;” before “and of which”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3438

(Purpose: To strike section 531)

Strike section 531.

AMENDMENT NO. 3447

(Purpose: To provide additional funds for grants from the Historic Preservation Fund for historically Black colleges and universities, with an offset)

On page 17, line 4, strike “\$88,910,000” and insert “\$91,910,000”.

On page 17, line 14, strike “\$5,000,000” and insert “\$8,000,000”.

On page 40, line 7, strike “\$134,673,000” and insert “\$131,673,000”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3454

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a working group to conduct research relating to ocean agriculture)

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

RESEARCH ON OCEAN AGRICULTURE

SEC. _____. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture, in coordination with the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, shall establish a working group (referred to in this section as the “working group”)—

(1) to study how mangroves, kelp forests, tidal marshes, and seagrass meadows could help deacidify the oceans;

(2) to study emerging ocean farming practices that use kelp and seagrass to deacidify the oceans while providing feedstock for agriculture and other commercial and industrial inputs; and

(3) to coordinate and conduct research to develop and enhance pilot-scale research for farming of kelp and seagrass in order—

(A) to deacidify ocean environments;

(B) to produce a feedstock for agriculture; and

(C) to develop other scalable commercial applications for kelp, seagrass, or products derived from kelp or seagrass.

(b) The working group shall include—

(1) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(2) the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(3) representatives of any relevant offices within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(4) the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy.

(c) Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the working group shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

(1) the findings of the research described in subsection (a);

(2) the results of the pilot-scale research described in subsection (a)(3); and

(3) any policy recommendations based on those findings and results.

AMENDMENT NO. 3468

(Purpose: To set aside funds for the development of a map depicting pyrrhotite occurrences throughout the United States)

On page 21, line 23, insert after “2020:” the following: “of which \$100,000 shall be made available to the United States Geological Survey Mineral Resources Program for the development of a map depicting pyrrhotite occurrences throughout the United States;”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3476

(Purpose: To provide for the use of funds to ensure that survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault do not face housing discrimination)

At the appropriate place in division D, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall continue to engage in efforts authorized by the Violence Against Women Reauthorization Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-4; 127 Stat. 54) to ensure that survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault are not unlawfully evicted or denied housing by certain landlords based on their experience as survivors.

(b) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to Congress a report on the efforts described in subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 3480

(Purpose: To encourage the Department of Transportation and the Corps of Engineers to cooperate to develop a path forward in allowing freight funding eligibility for inland waterways improvements)

At the appropriate place in title I of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Transportation shall consult with the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works to identify any existing authorities and any additional authorities that may be needed to leverage funds from Department of Transportation programs for purposes of inland waterway project costs.

AMENDMENT NO. 3482

(Purpose: To set aside funds for the conduct of certain wood utilization research)

On page 84, line 5, insert after “2022” the following: “, of which not less than \$500,000 shall be made available for wood utilization research to develop woody and agricultural biomass conversion of low-value woody biomass using microwave-assisted liquefaction”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3492

(Purpose: To ensure safe and timely completion of the flexible sleeper berth pilot program)

On page 455, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

SEC. 13. To the maximum extent practicable, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration shall ensure the safe and timely completion of the flexible sleeper berth pilot program of the Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 3493

(Purpose: To require the Secretary of Agriculture to submit a report on conservation programs administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service relating to ocelots)

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

SEC. _____. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report describing the ways in which conservation programs administered by the Natural Resources Conservation Service may be better used for the conservation of ocelots (*Leopardus pardalis*) and any action taken by the Chief of the Natural Resources Conservation Service relating to the conservation of ocelots.

AMENDMENT NO. 3517

(Purpose: To set aside funds for the Colorado River Basin salinity control program)

On page 5, line 5, strike the period and insert the following: “: *Provided*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$2,000,000 shall be made available to carry out the Colorado River Basin salinity control program.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3540

(Purpose: To set aside additional funds for grants for the conduct of certain hazardous fuels management activities)

On page 85, line 17, strike “\$15,000,000” and insert “\$20,000,000”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3546

(Purpose: To require the Rural Housing Service to submit a report on certain properties)

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Rural Housing Service of the Department of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report including—

(1) a description of—

(A) the number of properties assisted under title V of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1471 et seq.) that are reaching the end of their loan term;

(B) the location of each property described in subparagraph (A);

(C) the number of units in each property described in subparagraph (A); and

(D) the date on which each the loan for each property described in subparagraph (A) is expected to reach maturity;

(2) the strategy of the Rural Housing Service to preserve the long-term affordability of the properties described in paragraph (1)(A) when the loan matures; and

(3) a description of the resources and tools that the Rural Housing Service needs from Congress in order to preserve the long-term affordability of the properties described in paragraph (1) (A).

AMENDMENT NO. 3551

(Purpose: To provide funding to study and combat harmful algal blooms)

On page 22, line 10, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, not less than \$200,000 shall be used for activities to better understand mechanisms that result in toxins being present in harmful algal blooms.”.

On page 65, line 5, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, not less than \$5,000,000 shall be used to investigate health impacts from exposure to harmful algal blooms and cyanobacteria toxins, and to develop innovative methods to monitor, characterize, and predict blooms for early action.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3560

(Purpose: To require FinCEN to submit to Congress a report on Geographic Targeting Orders)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network and the appropriate divisions of the Department of the Treasury shall submit to Congress a report on any Geographic Targeting Orders issued since 2016, including—

(1) the type of data collected;

(2) how the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network uses the data;

(3) whether the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network needs more authority to combat money laundering through high-end real estate;

(4) how a record of beneficial ownership would improve and assist law enforcement efforts to investigate and prosecute criminal activity and prevent the use of shell companies to facilitate money laundering, tax evasion, terrorism financing, election fraud, and other illegal activity; and

(5) the feasibility of implementing Geographic Targeting Orders on a permanent basis on all real estate transactions in the United States greater than \$300,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3562

(Purpose: To prohibit certain companies from receiving assistance)

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available to the Small Business Administration in this Act may be provided to a company—

(1) that is headquartered in the People's Republic of China; or

(2) for which more than 25 percent of the voting stock of the company is owned by affiliates that are citizens of the People's Republic of China.

AMENDMENT NO. 3563

(Purpose: To provide for the use of funds from the Indian Irrigation Fund)

On page 34, line 19, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That of the funds made available under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be derived from the Indian Irrigation Fund established by section 3211 of the WIIN Act (Public Law 114–322; 130 Stat. 1749).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3566

(Purpose: Of a perfecting nature)

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Out of amounts appropriated to the Food and Drug Administration under title VI, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, shall, not later than July 1, 2019, and following the review required under Executive Order 12866 (5 U.S.C. 601 note; relating to regulatory planning and review), issue advice revising the advice provided in the notice of availability entitled “Advice About Eating Fish, From the Environmental Protection Agency and Food and Drug Administration; Revised Fish Advice; Availability” (82 Fed. Reg. 6571 (January 19, 2017)), in a manner that is consistent with nutrition science recognized by the Food and Drug Administration on the net effects of seafood consumption.

AMENDMENT NO. 3578

(Purpose: To add a provision to clarify eligibility and establish an eligibility appeal mechanism under the rural broadband loan and grant pilot program)

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. In administering the pilot program established by section 779 of division A of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 (Public Law 115–141), the Secretary of Agriculture shall—

(1) ensure that applicants that are determined to be ineligible for the pilot program have a means of appealing or otherwise challenging that determination in a timely fashion; and

(2) in determining whether an entity may overbuild or duplicate broadband expansion efforts made by any entity that has received a broadband loan from the Rural Utilities Service, not consider loans that were rescinded or defaulted on, or loans the terms and conditions of which were not met, if the entity under consideration has not previously defaulted on, or failed to meet the terms and conditions of, a Rural Utilities Service loan or had a Rural Utilities Service loan rescinded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3582

(Purpose: To increase funding for 1890 land-grant colleges, with an offset)

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

1890 LAND-GRANT COLLEGES, INCLUDING TUSKEGEE UNIVERSITY

SEC. 7 _____. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amounts made available by this Act to carry out sections 1444 and 1445, respectively, of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3221, 3222) shall each be increased by \$3,000,000.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available under the heading “(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)” under the heading “AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES” under the heading “AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS” in title I shall be decreased by \$6,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3585

(Purpose: To set aside funds for the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children)

On page 41, line 4, strike the period and insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$400,000 shall be made available to the commission established by section 3(a) of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act (Public Law 114-244; 130 Stat. 981).”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3595

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to enforce certain requirements with respect to added sugars in the rules issued by the Food and Drug Administration on nutrition labels)

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to enforce the requirement in the final rule entitled “Food Labeling: Revision of the Nutrition and Supplement Facts Labels”, published in the Federal Register on May 27, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 33742), that any single ingredient sugar, honey, agave, or syrup (including maple syrup) that is packaged and offered for sale as a single ingredient food bear the declaration “Includes ‘X’g Added Sugars”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3607

(Purpose: To require the use of Environmental Protection Agency funds to implement recommendations relating to clean and safe water compliance)

At the end of title II of division A, insert the following:

Using funds appropriated under this title, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall implement the recommendations described in the report of the Office of Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled “Management Weakness Delayed Response to Flint Water Crisis”, numbered 18-P-0221, and dated July 19, 2018, to ensure clean and safe water compliance under the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.). If the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency does not implement 1 or more recommendations required by the preceding sentence, the Administrator shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations and Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committees on Appropriations and Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report explaining why the Administrator did not implement the recommendation and identifying specific actions the Administrator is implementing to address the concerns raised in the report.

AMENDMENT NO. 3608

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to implement certain new policies of the Federal Transit Administration relating to the Capital Investment Grant program)

On page 472, between lines 6 and 7, insert the following:

SEC. 163. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used for the implementation or furtherance of new policies detailed in the “Dear Colleague” letter distributed by the Federal Transit Administration to capital investment grant program project sponsors on June 29, 2018.

AMENDMENT NO. 3613

(Purpose: To set aside funds for the United States Semiquincentennial Commission)

On page 16, line 18, strike the period and insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 9(a) of the United States Semiquincentennial Commission Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-196; 130 Stat. 691),

\$500,000 of the funds made available under this heading shall be provided to the organization selected under section 9(b) of that Act for expenditure by the United States Semiquincentennial Commission in accordance with that Act.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3615

(Purpose: To require the Small Business Administration to conduct a study on match-making programs for veteran entrepreneurs)

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Small Business Administration shall conduct a study on whether the provision of match-making services that, using data collected through outside entities such as local chambers of commerce, link veteran entrepreneurs to business leads in given industry sectors or geographic regions, would enhance the existing veterans entrepreneurship programs of the Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 3621

(Purpose: To require the Comptroller General of the United States to issue a report on the removal of lead-based paint and other hazardous materials)

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Within Available funds, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall issue a report on efforts by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the removal of lead-based paint and other hazardous materials, which shall include—

(1) a description of direct removal efforts by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Environmental Protection Agency;

(2) a description of education provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Environmental Protection Agency to other Federal agencies, local governments and communities, recipients of grants made by either entity, and the general public relating to the removal of lead-based paint and other hazardous materials;

(3) a description of assistance received from other Federal agencies relating to the removal of lead-based paint and other hazardous materials; and

(4) any best practices developed or provided by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the removal of lead-based paint and other hazardous materials.

AMENDMENT NO. 3633

(Purpose: To require a report on Federal agency compliance with respect to establishing an Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization)

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall—

(1) work with Federal agencies to review each Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization’s efforts to comply with the requirements under section 15(k) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 644(k)); and

(2) not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives—

(A) a report on Federal agency compliance with the requirements under such section 15(k); and

(B) a report detailing the status of issuance by the Small Business Administration of detailed guidance for the peer review process of the Small Business Procurement Advisory Council in order to facilitate a more in depth review of Federal agency compliance with the requirements under such section 15(k).

AMENDMENT NO. 3645

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds for the enforcement of certain requirements with respect to certain roads)

On page 487, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

SEC. 1 _____. (a) Subject to subsections (c) and (d), none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Transportation by this or any other Act may be obligated or expended to enforce or require the enforcement of section 127(a) of title 23, United States Code, with respect to a segment described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) if the segment is designated as a route of the Interstate System.

(b) The segments referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The William H. Natcher Parkway (to be designated as a spur of Interstate Route 65) from Interstate Route 65 in Bowling Green, Kentucky, to United States Route 60 in Owensboro, Kentucky.

(2) The Julian M. Carroll (Purchase) Parkway (to be designated as Interstate Route 69) in the State of Kentucky from the Tennessee State line to the interchange with Interstate Route 24, near Calvert City, Kentucky.

(c) Only a vehicle that could operate legally on a segment described in paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (b) before the date of designation of the segment as a route of the Interstate System may continue to operate on that segment, subject to the condition that, except as provided in subsection (d), the gross vehicle weight of such a vehicle shall not exceed 120,000 pounds.

(d) Nothing in this section prohibits a State from issuing a permit for a nondivisible load or vehicle with a gross vehicle weight that exceeds 120,000 pounds.

AMENDMENT NO. 3646

(Purpose: To provide funding to the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct an inventory and evaluation of certain land for inclusion in the National Wilderness Presentation System)

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Within available funds for the National Forest System, the Secretary of Agriculture shall conduct an inventory and evaluation of certain land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Flatside Wilderness Adjacent Inventory Areas” and dated November 30, 2017, to determine the suitability of that land for inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(b) The Chief of the Forest Service shall submit to the Committees on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, Appropriations, and Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the results of the inventory and evaluation required under subsection (a).

AMENDMENT NO. 3650

(Purpose: To provide for the conduct of a study to identify underlying contributing factors for pediatric cancer that are unique to certain States and to provide assistance to support States with a high incidence of such cancer)

At the appropriate place in Division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ADDRESSING PEDIATRIC CANCER RATES IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) REPORT IDENTIFYING GEOGRAPHIC VARIATION OF TYPES OF PEDIATRIC CANCER.—Using

funds appropriated under the heading “Toxic Substances and Environmental Health” for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, a report that provides details on the geographic variation in pediatric cancer incidence in the United States, including—

(1) the types of pediatric cancer within each of the 10 States with the highest age-adjusted incidence rate of cancer among persons aged 20 years or younger;

(2) geographic concentrations of types and prevalence of pediatric cancers within each such State, in accordance with Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guidelines; and

(3) an update on current activities related to pediatric cancer, including with respect to carrying out section 399V-6 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-17).

(b) SUPPORT FOR STATES WITH HIGH INCIDENCE OF PEDIATRIC CANCER.—Using funds appropriated under the heading “Toxic Substances and Environmental Public Health” for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may conduct public outreach, in collaboration with State departments of health, particularly in the 10 States with the highest age-adjusted incidence rate of cancer among persons aged 20 years or younger, to improve awareness by residents, clinicians, and others, as appropriate, of possible contributing factors to pediatric cancer, including environmental exposures, in a manner that is complementary of, and does not conflict with, ongoing pediatric cancer-related activities supported by the Department of Health and Human Services.

(c) PRIVACY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall ensure that all information with respect to patients that is contained in the reports under this section is identified and protects personal privacy of such patients in accordance with applicable Federal and State privacy law.

AMENDMENT NO. 3651

(Purpose: To require a study on the financial impact of the mineral pyrrhotite in concrete home foundations)

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with relevant regulators, shall conduct a study that—

(1) examines the financial impact of the mineral pyrrhotite in concrete home foundations; and

(2) provides recommendations on regulatory and legislative actions needed to help mitigate the financial impact described in paragraph (1) on banks, mortgage lenders, tax revenues, and homeowners.

AMENDMENT NO. 3661

(Purpose: To designate a rest area on the Mount Vernon Trail as the “Peter B. Webster III Memorial Area”)

On page 41, line 4, strike the period at the end and insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That within available amounts provided under this heading, the Secretary of the Interior shall designate the rest area bound by Alexandria Avenue, West Boulevard Drive, and the George Washington Memorial Parkway on the Mount Vernon Trail within the George Washington Memorial Parkway as the ‘Peter B. Webster III Memorial Area’ and

any reference in a law, map regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the rest area shall be deemed to be a reference to the ‘Peter B. Webster III Memorial Area’; *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall accept and expend private contributions for the design, procurement, preparation, and installation of a plaque honoring Peter B. Webster III on the condition that the Director of the National Park Service shall approve the design and placement of the plaque.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3665

(Purpose: To ensure continued passenger rail operations on long-distance routes)

On page 464, line 24, strike “regulation.” and insert the following: “regulation: *Provided further*, That not less than \$50,000,000 of the amount provided under this heading shall be for capital expenses related to safety improvements, maintenance, and the non-Federal match for discretionary Federal grant programs to enable continued passenger rail operations on long-distance routes (as defined in section 24102 of title 49, United States Code) on which Amtrak is the sole tenant of the host railroad and positive train control systems are not required by law (including regulations): *Provided further*, That none of the funds provided under this heading shall be used by Amtrak to give notice under subsection (a) or (b) of section 24706 of title 49, United States Code, with respect to long-distance routes (as defined in section 24102 of title 49, United States Code) on which Amtrak is the sole tenant of the host railroad and positive train control systems are not required by law (including regulations), or otherwise initiate discontinuance of, reduce the frequency of, suspend, or substantially alter the schedule or route of rail service on any portion of such route operated in fiscal year 2018, including implementation of service permitted by section 24305(a)(3)(A) of title 49, United States Code, in lieu of rail service.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3666

(Purpose: To extend by 1 year the deadline for expenditure for transportation projects awarded funding from the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) 2012 and 2013 discretionary grant programs of the Department of Transportation)

On page 414, line 24, strike “determines” and insert the following: “determines: *Provided further*, That funds provided for national infrastructure investments for passenger rail transportation projects under title I of division C of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-55; 125 Stat. 641), may be expended until September 30, 2019: *Provided further*, That funds provided for national infrastructure investment for port infrastructure projects under title VIII of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6; 127 Stat. 432) shall be available until September 30, 2020: *Provided further*, That of the unobligated balances of contract authority for the TIFIA program (as defined in section 601(a) of title 23, United States Code), \$13,000,000 shall be permanently rescinded, and the associated obligation limitation shall be reduced by an equal amount.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3684

(Purpose: To improve the amendment)

On page 1, line 2, strike “That” and all that follows through “amount” on page 2, line 9, and insert the following: “That such sums provided for national infrastructure investments for passenger rail transportation projects under title I of division C of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appro-

priations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-55; 125 Stat. 641), shall remain available for expenditure through fiscal year 2019 for the liquidation of valid obligations of active grants incurred in fiscal year 2012: *Provided further*, That such sums provided for national infrastructure investments for port infrastructure projects under title VIII of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6; 127 Stat. 432) shall remain available through fiscal year 2020 for the liquidation of valid obligations of active grants incurred in fiscal year 2013: *Provided further*, That the 2 preceding provisos shall be applied as if they were in effect on September 30, 2018: *Provided further*, That after calculating the distribution of obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways for fiscal year 2019 under section 120(a), the obligation limitation shall be reduced by \$52,000,000 to a total of \$45,216,596,000: *Provided further*, That the reduction in the preceding proviso shall be applied to the obligation limitation determined under section 120(a)(4) for the TIFIA program (as defined in section 601(a) of title 23, United States Code)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3668

(Purpose: To increase the amount set aside for the breastfeeding peer counselors program)

On page 360, line 13, strike “\$60,000,000” and insert “\$67,500,000”.

AMENDMENT NO. 3669

(Purpose: To prohibit the use of funds to carry out requirements relating to electronic logging devices)

At the appropriate place in title I of division D, insert the following:

SEC. 1 _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Transportation may be obligated or expended to implement, administer, or enforce the requirements of section 31137 of title 49, United States Code, or any regulation issued by the Secretary pursuant to such section, with respect to the use of electronic logging devices by operators of commercial motor vehicles, as defined in section 31132(1) of such title, transporting livestock, as defined in section 602 of the Emergency Livestock Feed Assistance Act of 1988 (7 U.S.C. 1471) or insects.

AMENDMENT NO. 3670, AS MODIFIED

(Purpose: To prohibit funds made available to the Federal Transit Administration from being used for the procurement of rolling stock from manufacturers supported by certain foreign governments)

At the appropriate place in title I of division D, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Federal Transit Administration under this title to carry out sections 5307, 5311, 5337, and 5339 of title 49, United States Code, may be used in awarding a contract or subcontract to an entity on or after the date of enactment of this Act for the procurement of rolling stock for use in public transportation if the manufacturer of the rolling stock is incorporated in or has manufacturing facilities in the United States and receives support from the government of a country that—

(1) is identified as a nonmarket economy country (as defined in section 771(18) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1677(18))) as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) was identified by the United States Trade Representative in the most recent report required by section 182 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2242) as a priority foreign country under subsection (a)(2) of that section; and

(3) is subject to monitoring by the Trade Representative under section 306 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2416).

(b) This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with the obligations of the United States under international agreements.

(c)(1) This section shall not apply to the award of a contract or subcontract made by a public transportation agency with a rail rolling stock manufacturer described in subsection (a) if the manufacturer “produces” rail rolling stock for an eligible public transportation agency through a contract executed prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) A rail rolling stock manufacturer described in subsection (a) may not use funds provided under a contract or subcontract described in paragraph (1) to expand the manufacturer’s production of rail rolling stock within the United States to an “amount of rolling stock vehicles or railcars” that is greater than the amount required under contractual obligations of the manufacturer as of the date of enactment of this “Act including all options per for additional rolling stock.”

(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to funds that are not appropriated or otherwise made available to the Federal Transit Administration under this title.

AMENDMENT NO. 3671

(Purpose: To prohibit funds from being used to provide housing assistance benefits to individuals convicted of certain criminal offenses)

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to provide housing assistance benefits for an individual who is convicted of—

(1) aggravated sexual abuse under section 2241 of title 18, United States Code;

(2) murder under section 1111 of title 18, United States Code; or

(3) any other Federal or State offense involving—

(A) severe forms of trafficking in persons or sex trafficking, as those terms are defined in paragraphs (9) and (10), respectively, of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102); or

(B) child pornography, as defined in section 2256 of title 18, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 3675

(Purpose: To provide for rural health and safety education programs to address and combat the opioid abuse epidemic)

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

RURAL HEALTH AND SAFETY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Any funds provided by this Act for rural health and safety education programs authorized under section 502(i) of the Rural Development Act of 1972 (7 U.S.C. 2662(i)) may be used under those programs to address the opioid abuse epidemic and to combat opioid abuse in rural communities.

AMENDMENT NO. 3676

(Purpose: To provide an additional \$2,000,000 for hiring staff for tribal detention facilities by reducing the amounts made available through the Working Capital Fund of the Department of the Interior)

At the appropriate place in title I of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) There are appropriated under the heading “Operation of Indian Programs” under the heading “Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education”, in addition to any other amounts made available under such heading and in order to provide additional funding for hiring staff for tribal detention facilities, including address-

ing the needs of newly funded tribal detention facilities, \$2,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2020.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading “Working Capital Fund” for the Department of the Interior is hereby reduced by \$2,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 3677

(Purpose: To require the National Railroad Passenger Corporation to grant a discount to members of the public benefit corporation Veterans Advantage)

On page 464, line 4, strike the period at the end and insert “: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading and the heading ‘National Network Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation’, not more than \$500,000 may be made available to provide a discount of not less than 15 percent on passenger fares to veterans (as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code).”

AMENDMENT NO. 3679

(Purpose: To provide that up to \$6,000,000 be used for UAS integration activities)

On page 424, line 12, strike the period and insert “*Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated under this heading, up to \$6,000,000 shall be used for providing matching funds to qualified commercial entities seeking to demonstrate or validate technologies that the Federal Aviation Administration considers essential to the safe integration of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) in the National Airspace System at Federal Aviation Administration designated UAS test sites: *Provided further*, That not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall identify essential integration technologies that could be demonstrated or validated at test sites designated in accordance with the preceding proviso.”

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motion on H.R. 6147 be withdrawn. I further ask that the only remaining amendments in order be the following: Leahy No. 3464, Lee No. 3522, Baldwin No. 3524, and Cruz No. 3402; further, that at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, August 1, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed; that the Leahy, Lee, and Baldwin amendments be subject to a 60-affirmative vote threshold; and that following the disposition of the Cruz amendment, the Murkowski amendment No. 3400 be withdrawn, the substitute amendment No. 3399, as amended, be agreed to, and the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of H.R. 6147, as amended. I also ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes of debate prior to each vote in this series.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have no objection.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3585, AS MODIFIED

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Murkowski amendment No. 3585 be modified with the changes that are at the desk.

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

The amendment (No. 3585) previously agreed to is modified, as follows:

At the appropriate place insert the following: “: *Provided further*, That of the amounts made available under this heading, \$400,000 shall be made available to the commission established by section 3(a) of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act (Public Law 114-244; 130 Stat. 981).”

AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 2.

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2) entitled “An Act to provide for the reform and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.”, and ask a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

COMPOUND MOTION

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and authorize the Chair to appoint conferees on the part of the Senate at a ratio of 5 to 4.

I know of no debate on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate 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.

The Senator from Vermont.

APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would again note that Senator SHELBY and I have been working very hard on this appropriations bill, but so have a whole lot of other Senators, my colleague from Kansas being one of them.

Both Republicans and Democrats want to bring the Senate back to the way it should be, where we work things out between both parties. It means that everybody has to give something, and not everybody wins everything, but the country does very well. That is what we are trying to do on the appropriations bill. I think we can wrap these up, and I would hope that the other body, when they get back from their vacation, will be able to work

with us to get them finalized and to the President.

I must point out that it has taken the courage of a lot of Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, to work together to get this done. As the dean of the Senate—the longest serving one here—I applaud them very, very much. I yield the floor.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST SPECIAL OLYMPICS GAMES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today I want to say a few words about a special anniversary. Earlier this month, we celebrated the 50th anniversary of the very first Special Olympic Games, which took place at Soldier Field in Chicago, IL.

The Special Olympics didn't just give people a chance to compete; it gave them a chance to come out of the shadows. It is hard to imagine, but before the Special Olympics, people with intellectual disabilities were offered little education and oftentimes were left in isolation and despair. Thankfully, Eunice Shriver shared the compassion and vision to create these games, but I want to talk about someone whose role in the games creation is often overlooked: Illinois Supreme Court justice and my friend, Anne Burke.

Before becoming a justice on Illinois' Supreme Court, Anne was a physical education teacher. She had an idea to create a summer jamboree where kids with special needs could compete in an athletic competition at Soldier Field, just like other children who attended day camps across the State of Illinois. So Anne took that idea to Washington, DC, and Eunice Shriver. What did Eunice Shriver say to Anne's proposal? Unacceptable. It was simply too small. Eunice decided it needed to be bigger. With Eunice's help, Anne returned home to Chicago, rewrote the proposal, and made it a national Olympic program. Eunice joined Anne in Chicago on July 20, 1968, and they celebrated the first Special Olympic Games.

During those first games in 1968, Mayor Richard Daley told Eunice: "The world will never be the same after this." Eunice Shriver and Anne Burke knew it. Eunice boldly predicted that 1 million of the world's intellectually challenged would someday compete in these games. Well, she was wrong. Today, more than 5 million athletes train year-round in all 50 States and 172 countries.

Here are just a couple examples of how the world changed after that summer day in Chicago. In 2003, after the games were held in Dublin, Ireland rewrote its antidiscrimination laws. Across the Middle East, people who were once forced into the shadows now play soccer in the light of day. That is the legacy of the Special Olympics: inclusion.

I will close with one more story from those first games at Soldier Field. After one athlete, Frank Olivo, finished competing, he said: "People al-

ways put me down. And said, I wouldn't amount to anything. And now they say, he does amount to something. He's special." That is what makes the Special Olympics so special.

Congratulations to the Special Olympics for 50 years of making athletes like Frank understand that hearts beat the same.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the July 30, 2018, vote on Executive Calendar No. 1006, the motion to invoke cloture, on Britt Grant, of Georgia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit. I would have voted no.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b) (1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 18-30, concerning the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Kingdom of Denmark for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$152 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA, Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18-30

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Kingdom of Denmark.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment*—\$130 million.
Other—\$22 million.
Total—\$152 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Up to forty-six (46) Standard Missile, SM-2 Block IIIA Vertical Launching Tactical All-Up Rounds, RIM-066M-03-BK IIIA (VLS).

Up to two (2) Standard Missile, SM-2 Block IIIA Telemetry, Omni-Directional Antenna, Warhead Enabled, RIM 066M-03-BK IIIA (VLS).

Up to two (2) Standard Missile, SM-2 Block IIIA Telemetry, Omni-Directional Antenna, Warhead Dud Capable, RIM 066M-03-BK IIIA (VLS).

Non-MDE: Also included are MK 13 MOD 0 Vertical Launching System Canisters, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Navy (DE-P-AED).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: July 31, 2018.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Denmark—SM-2 Block IIIA Standard Missiles

The Government of Denmark has requested to buy up to forty-six (46) Standard Missile, SM-2 Block IIIA Vertical Launching Tactical All-Up Rounds, RIM 066M-03-BK IIIA (VLS); up to two (2) Standard Missile, SM-2 Block IIIA Telemetry, Omni-Directional, All-Up Rounds, RIM-066M-03-BK IIIA (VLS); and up to two (2) Standard Missile, SM-2 Block IIIA Telemetry, Omni-Directional Antenna, Warhead Dud Capable, RIM 066M-03-BK IIIA (VLS). Also included are MK 13 MOD 0 Vertical Launching System Canisters, operator manuals and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$152 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy and national security of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally that is an important force for political stability and economic progress in the European region.

This proposed sale would support Denmark's anti-air warfare capabilities for the Royal Danish Navy's IVER HUITFELDT Frigate Class ships. The SM-2 Block IIIA missiles, combined with the Anti-Air Warfare System (AAWS) combat system, will provide significantly enhanced area defense capabilities over critical Northern Europe air-and-sea-lines of communication. Denmark will have no difficulty absorbing this equipment and support into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of these systems and equipment will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Raytheon Cooperation in Tucson, Arizona; Raytheon Company, Camden, Arkansas; and BAE of Minneapolis, Minnesota and Aberdeen, South Dakota. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Denmark.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 18-30

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. A completely assembled Standard Missile-2 (SM-2) Block IIIA with or without a conventional warhead, whether a tactical, telemetry, or inert (training) configuration, is classified CONFIDENTIAL. Missile component hardware includes: Guidance Section (classified CONFIDENTIAL), Target Detection Device (classified CONFIDENTIAL), Warhead (UNCLASSIFIED), Dual Thrust Rocket Motor (UNCLASSIFIED), Steering Control Section (UNCLASSIFIED), Safe and Arming Device (UNCLASSIFIED), Autopilot Battery Unit (classified CONFIDENTIAL), and if telemetry missiles, AN/DKT-71 Telemeters (UNCLASSIFIED).

2. SM-2 operator and maintenance documentation is usually classified CONFIDENTIAL. Shipboard operation/firing guidance is generally classified CONFIDENTIAL. Prefiring missile assembly/pedigree information is UNCLASSIFIED.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that Denmark can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to Denmark.

INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT BILL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish to discuss H.R. 6147, which includes the Fiscal Year 2019 Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations bill. This bill provides critical funding for the U.S. Geological Survey, USGS, and the Advanced National Seismic System, ANSS.

In recent years, USGS funding for external grants for local earthquake monitoring and research has become highly competitive and does not always reach areas of need. In a solicitation from May 2017, for example, USGS only funded approximately 15 percent of the grant proposals that were submitted to the agency for funding in this area.

I am particularly concerned by USGS's reduction of funding and utilization of local earthquake monitoring programs and ANSS partner facilities in areas of moderate earthquake risk, particularly in the northeast region of the United States.

It is true that most earthquakes tend to occur in zones where past earthquakes have taken place. However, each year, there are earthquakes that take place at unexpected locations, including in my home State of Massachusetts. The Northeast is a region of high population density, and the cities and

towns in this region are often home to older buildings that are situated on soft soil and vulnerable to earthquake activity. This means that even small earthquakes can be felt by local residents and can be misinterpreted another disaster or even as a terrorist event if accurate and timely information is not readily made available.

While we cannot yet identify the active faults in the Northeast, earthquake data and research are pointing us toward those localities where we need to look for active faults. Once these faults are found, they can be studied to better define the probabilities of future potentially damaging earthquakes in the Northeast and New England region. Important advancements in understanding earthquake hazards and in promoting earthquake risk reduction activities are realized because of the efforts of local seismic experts at places like Weston Observatory in my home State of Massachusetts. These external partners play critical roles in delivering accurate earthquake assessments and warnings to State and local emergency management agencies and the general public.

I look forward to working with USGS to identify ways to expand funding for research at ANSS partner facilities that will improve their ability to deliver accurate earthquake assessments and products to their local populations across the United States, including the Northeast. As recently as 2011, a Northeast region stakeholder plan for ANSS called for improved delivery of seismic information to users in the region; an improved understanding of earthquake hazards in the Northeast; improved education and outreach on earthquakes and earthquake safety; and a multi-hazard approach to earthquake monitoring in this region. The stakeholders also called for funding support to local earthquake monitoring centers in the Northeast for these activities. Damaging earthquakes are rare, but they have happened in the past, and the evidence is overwhelming that they can happen again at some point in the future.

In order to be fully prepared, I urge the USGS to begin now to reinvest in local seismic monitoring programs and ANSS partner facilities in the Northeast and in New England in particular.

Thank you.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to speak on recent legislation extending the National Flood Insurance Program on a short-term basis.

The National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP, was created in 1968 in response to the lack of flood insurance available at the time. The program's intent was to encourage folks to protect their homes and communities to adopt sound floodplain management standards.

I would like to reiterate the findings of the 1966 Presidential Task Force on Federal Flood Control Policy: "A flood insurance program is a tool that should be used expertly or not at all. Correctly applied it could promote wise use of flood plains. Incorrectly applied, it could exacerbate the whole problem of flood losses. For the Federal Government to subsidize low premium disaster insurance or provide insurance in which premiums are not proportionate to risk would be to invite economic waste of great magnitude"

In less than a year, we have extended the program seven times, most attached to must-pass bills, without any needed reforms. The program is over \$20 billion in debt, even though we forgave \$16 billion of that debt just last year. With our Federal debt now above \$21 trillion, we need to address the solvency of the NFIP as soon as possible.

We can begin doing that by bringing some meaningful reform to the program, including moving towards more risk-based premiums. More importantly, interest from the private flood insurance market is growing. Their involvement means more flexible flood policies, integrated coverage with other insurance policies, and lower-cost coverage for some customers. Increasing private insurance's participation in flood insurance markets would reduce the financial risk obligations of this program for the Federal Government. I hope Congress will further clarify private insurers' role in the flood insurance market. As it stands, the NFIP cannot stand on its own feet, and it requires significant reforms to put it on sound financial footing. I urge my colleagues to find bipartisan, sustainable reforms to this program. We must stop kicking the can down the road on the necessary reforms needed to make this an effective program.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I agree with my colleague that homeowners affected by flood disasters would benefit from greater certainty through a longer-term reauthorization. I would agree that meaningful reform is necessary to sustain the National Flood Insurance Program, NFIP. As chairman of the Senate Banking Committee, it is my goal to bring bipartisan reform to the program. Our Nation has seen some devastating disasters involving floods and related natural disasters, especially in the last two decades. With those disasters, the NFIP has amassed significant debt to the US Treasury. The underlying program is not structurally sound and too few people are protected from flood risk. Comprehensive reforms to the program are important to improve the program's fiscal condition, ensure more homeowners are covered against the risk of loss from flooding, and enable the program to better serve current policyholders.

I agree with Senator ENZI. There is still work to be done to make the NFIP

more sustainable. Any long-term reauthorization must include important bipartisan reforms. While short-term extensions are not ideal, short-term extensions afford Congress needed time to address numerous concerns.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague and his committee for their efforts to address these concerns. I am hopeful reform is just around the corner, and I encourage my colleagues to continue to support reform of the National Flood Insurance Program.

3D PRINTED GUN SAFETY ACT AND THE UNTRACEABLE FIRE- ARMS ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the 3D Gun Safety Act and the Untraceable Firearms Act. I applaud my colleagues, Senators NELSON, BLUMENTHAL, and MARKEY, for their work on these bills.

Days ago, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention announced a 31-percent increase in homicides involving guns between 2014 and 2016.

In 2016 alone, there were 14,415 gun homicides in America.

I have asked over and over, what is it going to take? When are we, as a nation, going to act and do something to save lives that are needlessly lost year after year?

Yet, instead of working to enact commonsense, gun safety measures to keep families, schools, and children safe, the Trump administration took a reckless and dangerous step that puts all of us in danger.

The Trump administration has now allowed a private company to publish step-by-step instructions on how to manufacture assault weapons and other guns using a 3D printer.

These instructions are going to be available on the internet, for anyone to use and follow, starting tomorrow. Think about that.

The Trump administration is giving away free instructions on how to manufacture weapons of war to anyone with a 3D printer, which can be bought online for less than \$1,000.

These people could be dangerous criminals, terrorists, children, or those who suffer from mental illness.

I think this is absolutely unconscionable.

We should be working on ways to stop gun violence and keep our communities safe, not expand the proliferation of these dangerous weapons.

Several of us have written to the Justice Department and the State Department asking them to reverse this decision.

We have also introduced legislation today. The 3D Gun Safety Act, introduced by Senator NELSON, would prevent anyone from intentionally publishing 3D gun designs.

In addition, multiple state attorneys general have now sued the Trump administration and the purveyor of the 3D gun designs to prevent the dissemina-

tion of the 3D gun design instructions.

I am also pleased to support Senator BLUMENTHAL's bill, the Untraceable Firearms Act, which closes legal loopholes that allow individuals to build their own untraceable firearms using "gun-making kits."

Guns made from these kits are known as ghost guns because the guns do not have serial numbers or any other traceable features.

In other words, ghost guns—like 3D guns—are dangerous because any person, even those prohibited under Federal law from possessing guns, can just make a gun at home.

This is already happening.

For example, last November, a 44-year-old man named Kevin Janson Neal killed five people and injured eight others with a ghost gun in Tehama County, CA.

Neal made the ghost gun at home because he himself could not legally purchase a gun after being ordered to relinquish all guns under court order months before.

Tragically, with his ghost gun in hand, Neal shot his wife, his neighbors, and then went to a nearby elementary school.

He crashed through the elementary school gates with a truck, got out, and started firing in the center of the school's quad and at nearby windows and walls.

Neal fired approximately 100 rounds at the school, injuring seven children.

He did all of this with his homemade AR-15 military-style rifle.

We must act in the face of the real threat of untraceable ghost guns and 3D-printed firearms.

Our communities are at risk, and as lawmakers it is our solemn duty to act and protect our communities. So I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these bills.

STRENGTHENING CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY ACT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, on Monday of last week, the Senate passed H.R. 2353, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, with a Senate amendment. On Wednesday, the House of Representatives followed suit. This measure reauthorizes the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, which was last reauthorized in 2006.

President Trump signed this important bill into law today at a ceremony at the White House that I was fortunate enough to have been invited to attend.

The bill modernizes our career and technical education programs in our Nation's high schools, and community colleges, technical colleges, and other institutions of higher education to provide the skills needed to support State and local employer's workforce needs. The bill is also designed to align with other Federal education and workforce laws.

While we are currently experiencing the best economy in 18 years, there are still 6.6 million unfilled jobs, many of these jobs offer high wages, but require workers to have specific or a high-level set of skills. In order to have a productive workforce and sustain a strong economy, we need to ensure today's workers and future workers have an opportunity to learn these needed skills.

Our bill is an important step in helping States and local communities do that.

First, as States are designing their State career and technical education—CTE—plans, they will need to consult with a variety of education and workforce stakeholders. This means, for the first time, employers and business leaders will work with the State on designing education programs that focus on preparing students for in-demand and emerging jobs.

Second, local school districts are required to conduct an evaluation of their current programs and how those programs align with in-demand industry sectors or occupations. In order to accomplish this, school districts will work with local community and business leaders to determine what those sectors and occupations are, if they are not fully aware of them already. The bill also makes a significant change to the way funds flow to States. Current law sends funds to States based on the population in the State but dictates States cannot receive less than what they received in 1998. Our bill updates this formula as populations have dramatically shifted with some States seeing significant growth over the past 20 years.

Another area that was improved was better aligning with other workforce initiatives. This bill would align CTE program plans with State Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act plans so that States that want to submit a combined plan may do so. The Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act is a Federal workforce development law that provides training to adults already in or seeking employment.

In their CTE plans, States must determine levels of performance for several indicators of performance, which are outlined in the bill. The indicators at the secondary level include graduation rate, achievement of academic standards as defined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, ensuring academic rigor in programs, and accounting for students who enter postsecondary education, the military, national service, or are employed, to name a few. There are additional and similar indicators for postsecondary education.

The State determined levels of performance for these indicators must be expressed as a percentage of students and demonstrate that the State is striving to improve year after year. States must determine the level for each indicator for the group of all CTE concentrators, which are the group of students at the secondary level taking

at least two courses in a single program or program of study, or at the postsecondary level, students taking at least 12 credits in a single program or program of study, and for each subgroup defined in the Every Student Succeeds Act and for each special population defined in this bill.

However, States are only held accountable for the group of all CTE concentrators. One of the important changes in the law is that the Secretary will no longer negotiate the levels of performance with the States. Going forward, States will determine their levels and submit them to the Secretary, who will approve them if they meet the conditions highlighted earlier. This is a point worth saying again: The bill heading to the President's desk eliminates any involvement by the Secretary in determining levels of performance with the States.

However, a State is required to meet certain conditions in order to have their plan approved by the Secretary. Specifically, the Secretary must ensure that plan includes levels of performance and that those levels of performance have been made public for comment. In the submitted plan, the State must include the comments along with their response to those comments. Further, the State must develop their plan in consultation with various stakeholders and provide descriptions of their goals and programs, how those meet employment and workforce needs, and what they will do to close and eliminate performance gaps in areas where gaps exist for subgroups and special populations.

If a State has met the requirements in developing their plan, then the Secretary must approve the plan and may not alter or change the elements of that plan.

The bill allows but does not require a State to revise the levels of performance after 2 years. If a State elects to revise their levels, the new level must not be below the average of the actual performance of the previous 2 years. States may revise their levels downward when taking advantage of this option, so long as it meets the requirements of the law. Further, there has been some concerns raised that a State would be required to go through an entire State plan process in order to make revisions. The language in the bill is clear that a State making revisions to their levels of performance need only seek public comment on those targets and does not need to go through the more extensive consultation process or an additional public comment period. When submitting the revised levels to the Secretary, they must include the public comments and the State response.

Heading into this reauthorization, a major concern of current law was that there was too much burden on local schools that deterred many from pursuing Federal funds. They cited the burdensome local plan, the multitude of requirements and reporting burden.

This bill addresses all of those items and reduces burden for local governments.

First, this reauthorization focuses reporting and accountability on just CTE concentrators, reducing the number of students States must collect data on to only those truly enrolled in a CTE program. Second, the number of requirements of what must be included in the local application is reduced from 12 to 9. Third, the required use of funds at the local level drops from nine to six.

One last item that I would like to address about the bill is its accountability provisions. The bill maintains the current law structure of accountability which requires that, if a State does not meet 90 percent of their State-determined level of performance for any of the indicators, then the State must submit an improvement plan indicating how it plans to improve.

If a State has not achieved 90 percent of their level of performance after 2 years following the implementation of their improvement plan, the Secretary is granted the discretion to withhold funds from that State.

There are a number of education and business groups supporting this bill, which include National Governor's Association, National School Boards Association, Rebuilding America's Middle Class, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, National Association of Manufacturers, Jobs for the Future, Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors Association, Heating, Ventilation, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration Coalition, Education Trust, Boeing, and IBM.

Chairwoman FOXX and Ranking Member SCOTT, along with Representative THOMPSON and Representative KRISHNAMOORTHY, deserve a good deal of thanks for their work in the House on passing the Perkins CTE Act.

I also want to thank Senator ENZI and Senator CASEY for their work in the Senate on this bill. They have worked hard to reach a bipartisan result and should receive the recognition they deserve for it.

I would also like to thank Ivanka Trump for her leadership in helping create an environment where we could get a result. Her interest in helping train the next generation of our country's workers and making the reauthorization of this bill one of her priorities helped keep Congress focused on passing this bill. I was pleased that she attended our committee markup of the bill and thank her for her hard work.

I also want to thank the ranking member of the committee, Senator MURRAY. This bill is another in a long list of accomplishments this committee has achieved.

Finally, I would like to thank the following staff: from the Congressional Research Service, Boris Granovskiy, Becky Skinner, and Adam Stoll; from the Office of Legislative Counsel, Kristin Romero, Margaret Bomba, and Amy Gaynor; from Senator CASEY's office, Julia Sferlazzo and Rachel McKinnon; from Senator ENZI's office, Tara Shaw,

Garnett Decosimo, and Steve Townsend; from Senator MURRAY's office, Evan Schatz, Kara Marchione, Amanda Beaumont, and Katherine McClelland; and my staff, David Cleary, Bob Moran, Jake Baker, Richard Pettey, Bobby McMillin, and Lindsey Seidman.

I am pleased that President Trump signed this bill into law today to help States and local communities meet the needs of the current and future workforce.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, although President Trump has spent the majority of his Presidency undermining workers and their economic security, today President Trump is taking a small step in the right direction by signing the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act into law.

This doesn't undo President Trump's actions to roll back health and safety protections for workers or his efforts to make it easier for corporations to take advantage of their workers or his continued attempts to gut workforce training programs, including WIOA and our registered apprenticeships, but this bill makes clear that, when Republicans and Democrats work together and put the needs of students, workers, businesses, and educators at the forefront, even President Trump would not stand in the way.

Now, I want to talk about what went into passing this law, what is included in it, and why that is so important. As we were working to reauthorize the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act, we heard from employers, workers, students, educators, advocates, and our own colleagues on the need to update this law.

While I agreed reauthorizing Perkins was critical to giving workers and students the tools and skills they need to get better jobs and higher wages, we could not pass a law for the sake of passing a law; we needed to ensure this law improved the current Perkins program and was able to adapt to a changing 21st century economy.

That meant putting aside partisanship and working together, across party lines, with the goal of improving career and technical education programs for the communities we represent.

I am pleased we were able to move away from attempts to voucherize this program, an idea that was widely rejected by the CTE community because it would mean programs teaching career and technical education would receive less funding, and though the theory of privatization has been championed by some in this administration, including Secretary DeVos, it has never worked in practice.

We also rejected attempts to change Perkins funding to competitive grants, which would make it significantly harder for communities to apply for and receive funding.

Instead we worked together and focused on what businesses, educators, and students were asking for.

The details here are so important, and I want to make it very clear where we landed in this agreement.

To better improve career and technical education for students, workers, local businesses, and communities, this bill will require States, schools, and training programs to update education and job training programs to meet the needs of the local economy, ensuring students are being provided with the skills they need to find high-skill, high-wage, or in-demand jobs where they live.

Because the economy is constantly changing, and new equipment, technology, and curriculum are needed to help students and workers keep up with technological advancements, this bill would authorize a new innovation grant program to allow States to explore new and creative ways to improve career and technical education that use evidence-based measurements to ensure students are still receiving high quality education and training.

Updating career and technical education programs and promoting innovation is important, but we cannot lose sight of our top priority: improving the quality of the career and technical education students are receiving.

For that reason, this bill appropriately balances State and local flexibility with protections and guardrails to ensure our students are receiving the best possible education and training.

I want to dig a little deeper into these protections today because it is so important we get this right.

First, on the role of the Secretary of Education, I want to be very clear: This bill does not prohibit the Secretary's authority to oversee this law in any new way.

The Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act gives States the ability to determine what education and training is most needed in their communities and what accountability levels those programs have to meet.

At the same time, it ensures the Secretary has the ability and the authority to implement and enforce the law as we intended.

This bill allows the Secretary to issue rules to implement the law, including notifying Congress before a rule is issued and allowing Congress to provide input on those proposed rules.

Second, this bill includes a number of measures to support States and ensure their top priority is student success.

Because regions of the country have different needs and economies, this bill will allow States to set their own levels of performance, but each State must meet minimum requirements when they set those levels of performance, including ensuring our most vulnerable students are making meaningful progress and performance gaps in the States are closing.

Under current law, we have data on performance gaps and disparities, but no one is required to do anything about

those gaps. So for the first time, in this law, States and local recipients will not only have to report data on performance gaps and disparities, they will have to describe how they will address those disparities and gaps.

We also improved the quality of data in this bill. Right now, there are not many common definitions in the Perkins law, so it is hard for local businesses and communities to know which career and technical education programs are high quality and which programs need more resources to improve. This law establishes more common definitions so that the data collected going forward will be more meaningful and comparable among localities and States and will provide more actionable data to help local communities improve these programs.

As I mentioned before, this bill gives States and local CTE providers flexibility to design their own improvement programs for States or locals failing to meet 90 percent of the goals they set for themselves, but it also includes basic requirements to ensure low-performing programs improve in the specific areas they are underperforming, something all parents, educators, and community members want for the programs that serve their children—because, if programs don't have to improve and help the students and workers who need it most, there is no way our communities will be ready for the economic challenges the 21st century holds for us all.

Our bottom line should always be that we support students to succeed. If we aren't, then we have a responsibility to do better. This new law maintains the authority of the Secretary to hold States' feet to the fire to do just that.

Finally, I want to thank my negotiating partners in this legislation, Chairman ALEXANDER, Senator CASEY, and Senator ENZI, for working with me on a bipartisan bill that makes important, needed updates to career and technical education, while maintaining guardrails to ensure States and programs receiving Federal money are focused on providing students and workers with the skills they need and providing businesses with workers they need to compete in the 21st century economy.

I also want to take a moment to recognize the hard work and long hours our staff put in to make this a bill we were all proud to support.

I want to thank David Cleary, Bob Moran, Jake Baker, and Richard Petty from Senator ALEXANDER's office, Garnett Decosimo from Senator ENZI's office, and Julia Sferlazzo from Senator CASEY's office.

I want to thank members of my own staff, including my staff director Evan Schatz, my deputy staff director John Righter, and my education policy director Kara Marchione.

I also want to thank Amanda Beaumont, Katherine McClelland, Katharine Parham, Manuel Contreras, and

Mairead Lynn for their hard work and support.

This law shows that, if we keep students, workers, and businesses at the forefront, we can work together and build an economy that works for all.

Thank you.

FOREIGN INVESTMENT RISK REVIEW MODERNIZATION ACT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to enter into a colloquy with Senators CRAPO and BROWN.

The integrity of our elections is a vital national security interest. It is imperative that our elections infrastructure—the technology and services needed to conduct our elections—remains free from foreign influence.

We know that our elections are under foreign threat from cyber attacks and disinformation efforts through social media. Our democratic process can also be manipulated through foreign investments in elections infrastructure. In fact, just this month, the Federal Bureau of Investigation notified Maryland officials that Russian oligarch Vladimir Potanin maintained a substantial investment in a firm used by the Maryland State Board of Elections to register voters and deliver online ballots.

This June, the Senate voted overwhelmingly in favor of the Foreign Investment Risk Review Modernization Act, legislation to enhance our national security by strengthening the review process of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, CFIUS. Specifically, the new law would allow CFIUS to review transactions beyond just those that could result in foreign control of a U.S. business, to include “other investments” by a foreign person in a U.S. business involved in U.S. critical infrastructure. Critical infrastructure, as defined by the Department of Homeland Security, DHS, includes election infrastructure, such as voter registration databases and associated systems, systems used to manage elections, voting systems, storage facilities for election and voting systems, and polling places, to include early voting locations.

I ask Senator CRAPO, do you agree that critical infrastructure, as defined by DHS, includes certain elections infrastructure?

Mr. CRAPO. Yes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I ask Senator BROWN, do you agree that, once this bill is enacted into law, existing CFIUS authority is broadened to review certain “other investments” involving elections infrastructure by a foreign person?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

ANIMAL DRUG USER FEE AMENDMENTS OF 2018

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the commitment letter

for the Animal Drug User Fee Agreements of 2018.

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

ANIMAL DRUG USER FEE AMENDMENTS OF 2018
ADUFA REAUTHORIZATION PERFORMANCE GOALS
AND PROCEDURES—FYS 2019 THRU 2023

The goals and procedures of the FDA Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM) as agreed to under the “Animal Drug User Fee Amendments of 2018” are summarized as follows:

I. DEFINITIONS

1. For the application/submission goals below, the term “review and act on” is understood to mean the issuance of a complete action letter after the complete review of an animal drug application, supplemental animal drug application, or investigational animal drug submission which either (1) approves an animal drug application or supplemental application or notifies a sponsor that an investigational animal drug submission is complete or (2) sets forth in detail the specific deficiencies in such animal drug application, supplemental animal drug application, or investigational animal drug submission and, where appropriate, the actions necessary to place such an application, supplemental application, or submission in condition for approval. Within 30 days 17 of submission, FDA shall refuse to file an animal drug application, supplemental animal drug application, or their reactivation, which is determined to be insufficient on its face or otherwise of unacceptable quality for review upon initial inspection as per 21 CFR 514.110. Thus, the Agency will refuse to file an application containing numbers or types of errors, or flaws in the development plan, sufficient to cause the quality of the entire submission to be questioned to the extent that it cannot reasonably be reviewed. Within 60 days of submission, FDA will refuse to review an investigational animal drug submission which is determined to be insufficient on its face or otherwise of unacceptable quality upon initial inspection using criteria and procedures similar to those found in 21 CFR 514.110. A decision to refuse to file an application or to refuse to review a submission as described above will result in the application or submission not being entered into the cohort upon which the relevant user fee goal is based. The Agency will keep a record of the numbers and types of such refusals and include them in its annual performance report.

2. A minor amendment is understood to mean information requested by FDA during the review of the application or investigational submission. FDA may request minor amendments to animal drug applications, supplemental animal drug applications, and investigational animal drug submissions during its review of the application or submission. At its discretion, the Agency may extend an internal due date (but not a user fee goal) to allow for the complete review of an application or submission for which a minor amendment is requested. If a pending application is amended with significant changes, the amended application may be considered resubmitted, thereby effectively resetting the clock to the date FDA received the amendment. The same policy applies for investigational animal drug submissions.

3. The term “submission date” means the date the FDA Center for Veterinary Medicine (CVM) Electronic Submission System (ESS) receives an application or submission. Upon receipt of an application or submission, the CVM ESS creates an electronic receipt that contains the date of receipt and is sent to the submitter.

4. The term “labeling supplement” is understood to mean certain applications as de-

scribed in 21 CFR 514.8(c)(2)(i)(A) and (D) that require approval of a supplemental application prior to distribution of the drug made using the change.

5. The term “presubmission conference” (PSC) is understood to mean one or more conferences between a potential applicant and FDA as described in 21 CFR 514.5 to reach a binding agreement establishing a submission or investigational requirement.

6. The term “dosage characterization” is understood to mean a justification of the dosage (dose or dose range, dosing frequency, and the dosing duration) and a characterization of the critical aspects of the dose response relationship related to each intended use and associated conditions of use.

II. APPLICATION/SUBMISSION GOALS

Beginning October 1, 2018, all applications and submissions under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) section 512(b) and 571 must be created using the eSubmitter tool and submitted to the Agency through CVM’s ESS.

1. *Original New Animal Drug Applications (NADAs)*

Review and act on 90 percent of original NADAs within 180 days after the submission date.

An application is incomplete if it would require additional data or information to enable the Agency to complete a comprehensive review of the application and reach a decision on the issue(s) presented in the application.

The Agency will review and act on 90 percent of reactivated applications:

i Within 180 days after the reactivated NADA submission date if the Agency determines and notifies the sponsor that the deficiencies are substantial;

ii Within 135 days after the reactivated NADA submission date if the Agency determines and notifies the sponsor that the deficiencies are not substantial; and the NADA reactivation must be submitted no more than 120 days after the Agency’s dated incomplete letter to qualify for the shorter review time; and

iii Within 180 days after the reactivated NADA submission date if the NADA reactivation is submitted after 120 days of the Agency’s dated incomplete letter or new substantial information is provided in the reactivated application.

The Agency will generally favor using the shorter reactivation timeframe of 135 days, where possible. The Agency will state in the incomplete letter the appropriate timeframe for review of the reactivation. Sponsors wishing to discuss the selected timeframe should contact the Agency prior to reactivation of the application. The shorter review time of 135 days for reactivated NADAs for which the deficiencies are determined not to be substantial is not intended to prevent the use of minor amendments during Agency review of an application.

2. *Administrative NADAs*

Review and act on 90 percent of administrative NADAs (NADAs filed after all scientific decisions already have been made as part of the investigational new animal drug process) within 60 days after the filing date.

3. *Non-manufacturing Supplemental Animal Drug Applications*

Review and act on 90 percent of non-manufacturing supplemental animal drug applications (i.e. supplemental animal drug applications for which safety or effectiveness data are required) within 180 days after the submission date.

A supplemental application is incomplete if it would require additional data or information to enable the Agency to complete a comprehensive review of the supplement and

reach a decision on the issue (s) presented in the supplement.

The Agency will review and act on 90 percent of reactivated supplements:

i Within 180 days after the reactivated supplemental NADA submission date if the Agency determines and notifies the sponsor that the deficiencies are substantial;

ii Within 135 days after the reactivated supplemental NADA submission date if the Agency determines and notifies the sponsor that the deficiencies are not substantial; and the reactivation to the supplemental application must be submitted no more than 120 days after the Agency’s dated incomplete letter to qualify for the shorter review time; and

iii Within 180 days after the reactivated supplemental NADA submission date if the reactivation to the supplemental application is submitted after 120 days of the Agency’s dated incomplete letter or new substantial information is provided in the reactivated supplement.

The Agency will generally favor using the shorter reactivation timeframe of 135 days, where possible. The Agency will state in the incomplete letter the appropriate timeframe for review of the reactivation. Sponsors wishing to discuss the selected timeframe should contact the Agency prior to the reactivation of the supplement. The shorter review time of 135 days for reactivated supplements for which the deficiencies are determined not to be substantial is not intended to prevent the use of minor amendments during Agency review of a supplemental application.

4. *Prior Approval Manufacturing Supplemental NADAs and Reactivations*

Review and act on 90 percent of Prior Approval manufacturing supplemental NADAs within 120 days after the submission date. A Prior Approval manufacturing supplemental NADA includes: one or more major manufacturing changes as described in 21 CFR 514.8(b)(2)(ii) and in accordance with Guidance for Industry 83 (Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls Changes to an Approved NADA or ANADA); and, changes submitted as “Supplement-Changes Being Effected in 30 Days” that require prior approval according to 21 CFR 514.8(b)(3)(v)(A). If a Prior Approval supplement does not clearly identify any major manufacturing changes, the Prior Approval supplement will be designated by the Agency as a “Supplement-Changes Being Effected” with a 180 days review goal (see “Supplement-Changes Being Effected Manufacturing Supplemental NADAs and Reactivations” below).

A submission is incomplete if it requires additional data or information to enable the Agency to complete a comprehensive review of the submission and reach a decision on the issue(s) presented in the submission. If the Agency determines that the deficiencies are not substantial for manufacturing supplements requiring prior approval, the Agency will allow the manufacturing supplements to be resubmitted as “Supplement Changes Being Effected in 30 Days” as described in 21 CFR 514.8(b)(3) and the drug made with the change can be distributed 30 days after the resubmission according to 21 CFR 514.8(b)(3)(iv). The Agency will review and act on 90 percent of these reactivated manufacturing supplements within 180 days after the resubmission date of a complete submission. If the Agency determines that the deficiencies remain substantial or new substantial information is provided, prior-approval is required according to 21 CFR 514.8(b)(3)(v)(A). The Agency will review and act on 90 percent of these reactivated manufacturing supplements within 120 days after the resubmission date of a complete submission.

5. *Supplements—Changes Being Effected Manufacturing Supplemental NADAs and Reactions*

Review and act on 90 percent of “Supplement—Changes Being Effected” manufacturing supplemental NADAs and reactivations submitted according to 21 CFR 514.8(b)(3)(vi) and in accordance with Guidance for Industry 83 (Chemistry, Manufacturing, and Controls Changes to an Approved NADA or ANADA), including manufacturing changes not requiring prior approval according to 21 CFR 514.8(b)(3) within 180 days after the submission date.

6. *Investigational New Animal Drug (INAD) Study Submissions*

Review and act on 90 percent of INAD study submissions within 180 days after the submission date.

An INAD study submission is incomplete if it would require additional data or information to enable the Agency to complete a comprehensive review of the submission and reach a decision on the issue(s) presented in the submission.

The Agency will review and act on 90 percent of resubmissions:

i Within 180 days after the resubmitted INAD study submission date if the Agency determines and notifies the sponsor that the deficiencies are substantial;

ii Within 60 days after the resubmitted INAD study submission date if the Agency determines and notifies the sponsor that the deficiencies are not substantial; and the resubmission must be submitted no more than 120 days after the Agency’s dated incomplete letter to qualify for the shorter review time; and

iii Within 180 days after the resubmitted INAD study submission date if the resubmission is submitted after 120 days of the Agency’s dated incomplete letter or new substantial information is provided in the resubmission.

The Agency will generally favor using the shorter resubmission timeframe of 60 days, where possible. The Agency will state in the incomplete letter the appropriate timeframe for review of the resubmission. Sponsors wishing to discuss the selected timeframe should contact the Agency prior to resubmitting the application. The shorter review time of 60 days for resubmissions for which the deficiencies are determined not to be substantial is not intended to prevent the use of minor amendments during Agency review of a submission.

Review and act on 90 percent of microbial food safety hazard characterization submissions within 100 days after the submission date.

7. *INAD Protocols without Data Submissions*

Review and act on 90 percent of INAD submissions consisting of protocols without data, that the Agency and the sponsor consider to be an essential part of the basis for making the decision to approve or not approve an NADA or supplemental NADA, within 50 days after the submission date.

An INAD protocol without data submission is incomplete if it would require additional information to enable the Agency to complete a comprehensive review of the protocol and reach a decision on the issue(s) presented in the protocol.

The Agency will review and act on 90 percent of resubmitted INAD protocol without data submissions:

i Within 50 days after the resubmission date if the Agency determines and notifies the sponsor that the deficiencies are substantial;

ii Within 20 days after the resubmitted INAD protocol without data submission if the Agency determines and notifies the spon-

sor that the deficiencies are not substantial; and the resubmission must be submitted no more than 120 days after the Agency’s dated nonconcurrence letter to qualify for the shorter review time; and

iii Within 50 days after the resubmission date if the resubmission is submitted after 120 days of the Agency’s dated non-concurrence letter or new substantial information is provided in the resubmission.

The Agency will generally favor using the shorter resubmission timeframe of 20 days, where possible. The Agency will state in the non-concurrence letter the appropriate timeframe for review of the resubmission. Sponsors wishing to discuss the selected timeframe should contact the Agency prior to resubmission of the protocol without data. The shorter review time of 20 days for resubmitted INAD protocol without data submissions for which the deficiencies are determined not to be substantial is not intended to prevent the use of minor amendments during Agency review of a submission.

Sponsors are not required to submit study protocols for review. However, for each protocol voluntarily submitted prior to the commencement of the study that the Agency and the sponsor consider to be an essential part of the basis for making the decision to approve or not approve an animal drug application or supplemental animal drug application, the Agency will issue a complete action letter providing comments resulting from a complete review of the protocol. The complete action letter will be as detailed as possible considering the quality and level of detail of the protocol submission; will include a succinct assessment of the protocol; and will state whether the Agency agrees, disagrees, or lacks sufficient information to reach a decision that the protocol design, execution plans, and data analyses are adequate to achieve the objectives of the study.

If the Agency determines that a protocol is acceptable, this represents an agreement that the data generated by the protocol can be used to support a safety or effectiveness decision regarding the subject animal drug. The fundamental agreement is that having agreed to the design, execution, or analyses proposed in protocols reviewed under this process, the Agency will not later alter its perspectives on the issues of design, execution, or analyses unless the Agency by written order determines that a substantiated scientific requirement essential to the assessment of the study appeared after the Agency’s protocol assessment, or public or animal health concerns unrecognized at the time of protocol assessment under this process are evident.

The Agency will permit comparability protocols as described in 21 CFR 514.8(b)(2)(v) to be submitted as protocols without substantial data in an INAD file. The Agency will review and act on 90 percent of INAD submissions consisting of protocols without substantial data within 50 days after the submission date of the protocol. For potentially more complex comparability protocols, for example sterile process validation protocols, the sponsor should discuss and have Agency concurrence regarding the appropriate filing strategy.

8. *Labeling Supplements*

Review and act on 90 percent of qualifying labeling supplements as described in 21 CFR 514.8(c)(2)(i)(A) and (D) within 60 days after the submission date. Qualifying labeling supplements are defined as those for which the sponsor provides and certifies a complete list of label changes made in the application and that CVM can determine upon initial review do not decrease the safety of drug use.

The Agency will review and act on 90 percent of non-qualifying labeling supplements within 180 days after the submission date.

Additional Performance Goals

Work Queue Review Procedures

The Agency will review all submissions in accordance with procedures for working within a queue. An application/submission that is not reviewed within the applicable Application/Submission Goal time frame (noted above) will be reviewed with the highest possible priority among those pending.

III. PRE-APPROVAL FOREIGN INSPECTIONS

The Agency and regulated industry are committed to improving the review and business processes that will facilitate the timely scheduling and conducting of pre-approval inspections (PAIs). To improve the timeliness and predictability of foreign PAIs, sponsors may voluntarily submit 1) at the beginning of the calendar year, a list of foreign manufacturing facilities that are specified in an animal drug application, supplemental animal drug application, or investigational animal drug submission and may be subject to foreign PAIs for the following fiscal year; and 2) a notification 30 days prior to submitting an NADA, a supplemental NADA, or INAD submission that informs the Agency that the application/submission includes a foreign manufacturing facility. Should any changes to the annual list occur after its submission to the Agency, the sponsor may provide the updated information to the Agency.

The Agency will keep a record of the number of foreign PAIs conducted for new animal drug applications, along with the average time for completing the PAIs, and include this information in its annual performance report. The time for completing the PAI is understood to mean the time from the inspection scheduling request through notification to the Center of inspectional findings.

IV. FOREIGN GMP INSPECTIONS

The Agency commits to working to implement the US-EU GMP Inspection Mutual Recognition Agreement starting in FY 2019 for establishments manufacturing animal/veterinary drugs. The Agency will provide annual progress updates to the industry.

1. *Supporting Information for Presubmission Conferences and INAD Protocols without Data Submissions*

The Agency and the regulated industry agree that data and/or information which uniquely describes the general attributes of the new animal drug (e.g. the known characteristics of the drug that can impact safety, effectiveness and/or quality) needs to be submitted early in the new animal drug development process in order to enable the parties to reach agreement at a presubmission conference or to begin review of a protocol. The intent of this provision is to avoid the submission of data or information between the presubmission conference and the submission of a protocol. Eligibility both for short justifications in protocols and for concurrent supporting data and protocol review described below is predicated on the sponsor submitting information early in the new animal drug development process.

The Agency will allow for the inclusion of this data and/or information in presubmission conferences; however it would not preclude holding a presubmission conference without such data.

The Agency will allow short justifications within INAD protocols without data submissions that are limited in scope (e.g., no more than ten pages or no more than two (peer-reviewed) journal articles).

The Agency will allow for the concurrent submission of supporting data (INAD H submissions) and protocols (INAD E submissions) provided that the protocol is not submitted until the supporting data has been in the Agency’s queue for at least 50 days.

2. Dosage Characterization

The Agency and the regulated industry agree that dosage characterization is part of the effectiveness technical section of an investigational new animal drug file. In instances where data and/or information about the dosage is integral to the review of a protocol, the Agency and the regulated industry agree that this data and/or information should be submitted as supporting data (INAD H submission) well in advance of the protocol submission. Such information may be needed to ensure selection of optimal study time points and would be particularly important for novel drugs and drugs with modified-release characteristics.

3. Animal Drug Availability Act (ADAA) Combination Medicated Feeds Applications

Review and act on 90 percent of qualifying ADAA Combination Medicated Feeds Applications within 60 days after the submission date. An ADAA combination application will qualify for the 60 day review timeframe only if the following criteria are met:

- i. The regulatory requirements for an ADAA combination application have been met as outlined in 21 CFR 514.4(c)(2)(ii)
- ii. A presubmission conference has been conducted and either
 - a. No data are needed (i.e., no tissue residue non-interference study is required) and this is documented in the memorandum of conference for the presubmission conference; or
 - b. A justification for not conducting a tissue residue noninterference study has been submitted, reviewed and found acceptable under an INAD, prior to the submission of the ADAA combination application; or
 - c. A tissue residue non-interference study has been submitted, reviewed and found acceptable under an INAD, prior to the submission of the ADAA combination application.
- iii. No effectiveness or target animal safety data are required.
- iv. No manufacturing data requirements—sponsor can address in meeting assay non-interference, but data submission is not required.
- v. All other information is referenced to previous drug experience reports.
- vi. Sponsor makes submission and it includes: Bluebird labeling, Veterinary Feed Directive (if applicable).
- vii. Includes a request for categorical exclusion from the need to prepare an environmental assessment (EA); i.e., no EA required.
- viii. Reference to presubmission conference.
- ix. Right of reference (if applicable) to NADA(s) not owned by the filing sponsor of the ADAA combination application has been received by the Agency.

Review and act on 90 percent of ADAA combination applications within 100 days for those applications initially accepted for the 60-day timeframe but subsequently determined to need minor amendments.

If any of the above conditions cannot be met, the ADAA combination application will be given a 180-day review timeframe and placed in the original NADA application cohort.

4. Categorical Exclusions

Review and act on 90 percent of resubmissions of a previously completed Environmental Impact technical section within 60 days after the resubmission date where:

- i. A Categorical Exclusion was issued; and
- ii. All other technical sections have been submitted; and
- iii. Information contained in the other technical sections reveals a change in the conditions of use of the drug that may affect the previous determination of categorical exclusion.

5. Presubmission Conferences

Conduct 90% of qualifying presubmission conferences within a 60-day timeframe when all of the following conditions are met:

- i. All background materials, including presentations, have been submitted, and
- ii. A complete agenda has been agreed upon by the Agency and the sponsor

A sponsor and the Agency can mutually agree to exclude a particular presubmission conference from this performance goal. If a sponsor accepts a date beyond the 60-day timeframe for their scheduling purposes or is unable to meet with the Agency on Agency available dates, the submission will be excluded from the presubmission conference cohort.

6. Tissue Residue Method

Commence 90% of tissue residue method demonstrations within 120 days of completion of the “3-hour meeting” process or equivalent process milestone where there is a single laboratory validation tissue residue method demonstration.

V. WORKLOAD ADJUSTMENT

The workload adjustment will continue to be calculated per CVM Program Policy and Procedures Manual 1243.3022, except that, for purposes of calculating the workload adjustment, it has been agreed to reset the base years to FY 2014–FY 2018. There will be no workload adjustment for FY 2019. Workload adjustments are one-time adjustments, and are calculated annually.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to discuss the importance of the Justice Department’s independent investigation into Russia’s interference in the 2016 Presidential election.

The interference with our election process by a hostile government was an attack on our democracy and a threat to our national security, carried out by Russian operatives at the direction of Vladimir Putin himself. As the intelligence community’s unclassified report concluded, “We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election. Russia’s goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess Putin and the Russian Government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.”

Since Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein appointed Robert Mueller as special counsel to investigate Russia’s attack, 32 indictments have been returned in connection with the investigation, including indictments against Russian individuals and companies, as well as former Trump campaign manager Paul Manafort and deputy campaign manager Rick Gates, who were charged with “conspiracy against the United States.” Mr. Mueller has also secured guilty pleas from other campaign advisers, including George Papadopoulos and Michael Flynn.

Despite this ample evidence of wrongdoing, the President has attempted to impede the Russia probe every step of the way, falsely branding it a “witch hunt.” So far, the Mueller

investigation has continued to produce results, despite these attacks. We must be clear that any attempt to remove special counsel Robert Mueller or Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein would take our Nation into uncharted territory. I am disturbed that, last week, a group of the President’s allies in the House of Representatives filed unwarranted articles of impeachment against Mr. Rosenstein, who has worked to uphold the rule of law and ensure that the independent Russia investigation can continue.

Both Mr. Rosenstein and Mr. Mueller have admirable records of public service. Mr. Mueller, whose qualifications, experience, and character I have previously detailed on the floor, was a decorated hero of the Vietnam war, a U.S. Attorney, and a widely respected director of the FBI. There is no one better equipped to lead the Russia probe.

Mr. Rosenstein, like Mr. Mueller, also has a long and distinguished career in public service. A native of Philadelphia, Mr. Rosenstein graduated from the Wharton School and Harvard Law School, after which he clerked for Judge Douglas Ginsburg of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

He initially joined the Department of Justice nearly 30 years ago through the Attorney General’s Honors Program. He started as a trial attorney with the Public Integrity Section of the Criminal Division, prosecuting public corruption cases. Mr. Rosenstein rose through the ranks, serving as counsel to the Deputy Attorney General; special assistant to the Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division; associate independent counsel in the Office of the Independent Counsel; and assistant U.S. attorney in Maryland. He was recognized for his work at the Department of Justice with a 1993 “Commendation Award” from the Criminal Division, a 1994 “Outstanding Contribution to Justice” award from the Office of the Deputy Attorney General, and a 1997 “Appreciation Award” from the Criminal Division’s Public Integrity Section.

In 2001, he became Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General for the Tax Division, where he supervised the criminal sections, coordinated tax enforcement activities, and oversaw civil litigation. Then, in 2005, he returned to the Maryland U.S. attorney’s office, this time as the top Federal prosecutor. He served as U.S. Attorney for over a decade, until he was nominated to become Deputy Attorney General in 2017. His nomination to this critically important post, at a critically important time for our Nation, was approved overwhelmingly by this body, by a vote of 94 to 6.

Mr. Rosenstein has a wealth of experience at the Department of Justice and has served our country and the American public with honor and distinction since he entered the legal profession. During his many years at the

Department of Justice, he has shown his commitment to the rule of law and the legal process.

At no time could such commitment be more vital. Our rule of law is under siege from multiple fronts, including from members of this administration and the President himself.

Rod Rosenstein and Robert Mueller have so far been able to oversee an independent investigation, but the threat of interference still remains. Both of these respected public servants have been the target of vicious and unfounded partisan attacks with no purpose but to discredit and delegitimize the Russia investigation. These attacks are not only shameful; they are undemocratic.

We cannot successfully counter foreign threats to our democracy without holding up our own institutions from within. A fundamental principle of our democracy—equal justice under law—has been tested by this President and his advisers since he entered the White House. We, too, are being tested. As Members of Congress, will we step up as a coequal branch of government and ensure that there are consequences when our principles are breached? As Americans, will we hold our public officials accountable when they work to undermine the democratic values that define us as a nation?

That is why I call on Leader MCCONNELL to bring the bipartisan Special Counsel Independence and Integrity Act to the floor for a vote. It is why I want to emphasize that any interference with this investigation, whether it is with Mr. Mueller, Mr. Rosenstein, FBI Director Wray, or any other official at the Department of Justice, is a line in the sand that must not be crossed. No one—even and especially the President of the United States—is above the law.

REMEMBERING SERGEANT FIRST CLASS RESTITUTO OYOLA-ALVAREZ

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to SFC, Retired, Restituto "Tuto" Oyola-Alvarez, a courageous member of our military and devoted family man. Sadly, Sergeant First Class Oyola-Alvarez passed away on July 22, 2018, at the age of 101. He will be remembered for his tireless, dedicated service to our nation.

Sergeant First Class Oyola-Alvarez was born in Arecibo, PR, and he enlisted in the U.S. Army at Fort Buchanan on January 22, 1941. He went on to serve in Puerto Rico's 65th Infantry Regiment during the Korean war. The regiment was referred to as the Borinqueneers, and Sergeant First Class Oyola-Alvarez and the rest of his Latino-segregated unit played a valuable role in helping American war efforts.

Unfortunately, despite their remarkable dedication, the Borinqueneers' contributions went largely overlooked

once the war ended. After 20 years of Active service and many more decades during which it went unrecognized, Sergeant First Class Oyola-Alvarez was at last granted the awards his unfailing support of our Nation deserved. On Veterans Day in 2012, I was honored to present him a number of hard-earned medals at his home in Hartford, CT. Four years later, I was proud to present him and his fellow Borinqueneers with the Congressional Gold Medal at the Connecticut State Capitol. At the ceremony, Sergeant First Class Oyola-Alvarez also received more medals acknowledging his efforts on behalf of America, including the World War II Victory Medal and Korean Service Medal, among others.

Honorably discharged in 1961, he gained proper recognition for his service when he reached his mid-90s. Citations and certificates from his home State of Connecticut were given by the Connecticut General Assembly, the secretary of the State of Connecticut, and the mayor of Hartford. In 2014, Sergeant First Class Oyola-Alvarez's tenacious defense of our democracy earned him the Lifetime Achievement Award from the Latino Puerto Rican Affairs Commission in Connecticut.

His sincere devotion to his birth island of Puerto Rico, the United States, and the U.S. Armed Forces carried into his family life as well. Sergeant First Class Oyola-Alvarez cherished his wife of 70 years, the late Sarah Rivera, as well as his only daughter, Sara Victoria, his son-in-law, Merrill, and his many grandchildren and great-grandchildren. His years of outstanding leadership, loyalty, and commitment are a model for all of us and have left a lasting positive impact upon the country.

My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our deepest sympathies to Restituto's family during this difficult time. May their many wonderful memories of him provide them solace and comfort in the days ahead.

HONORING EUGENE EARLEY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life and legacy of a brave American, Eugene Joseph Earley.

Eugene's story begins in 1884 in Wattertown, MN, where he was born to Bernard and Cordelia Earley. He was one of 16 children. He grew up on his parents' farm, learning independence, grit, and an ability to fend for himself.

From his parents' farm, he left to homestead and log the nearby forests in the Black River Country of Northern Koochiching County, MN. There, his determination was tested by the hot summers and long, brutal winters. Through the many challenges he faced, Eugene persevered.

After the United States entered World War I, Eugene enlisted as a private in the U.S. Army 23rd Infantry Regiment, 2nd Division. It wasn't long before he was deployed to France as a part of the American Expeditionary Forces led by General John Pershing.

Under Pershing's command, Eugene prepared for battle. On September 12, 1918, in Saint-Mihiel, France, Eugene and his comrades contributed to a major turning point. The American offensive caught the Germans unaware and in the process of retreating. The courage and determination of the American forces solidified the stature of U.S. military might in the eyes of our European allies and enemies.

During the second day of fighting, Eugene endured a shrapnel wound that would prove fatal. He died on the field of combat in northeast France, less than 2 months before the end of the war. Eugene was just 24 years old. He is buried in the Saint-Mihiel American Cemetery in Thiaucourt, France, alongside 4,153 of his fellow fallen comrades.

Back in Minnesota, Eugene's family honored his memory and mourned his death for the rest of their lives. In the years after his death, Eugene's mother established a local American Legion Post in his name. Watertown American Legion Post 121 still honors the memory and the name of Eugene Earley today.

Earlier this year, Eugene's grandnephew Jim Bruggeman and his daughters Megan and Molly traveled to France to visit his grave. Through their hard work, Eugene was awarded with the Purple Heart Medal in the centennial year of his death. His life and brave service will live on through this honor and the memory that his loved ones hold dear.

To Eugene Joseph Earley, on behalf of myself, Montana, and a grateful nation, I extend our deepest thanks for Eugene's service, sacrifice, and valor.

REMEMBERING MARYON PITTMAN ALLEN

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to remember and honor Maryon Pittman Allen, a former Member of this body, who passed away on July 23, 2018. Maryon Allen was one of only two women ever to represent the State of Alabama in the U.S. Senate.

Born in Meridian, MS, in 1925, Maryon Pittman and her family moved to Alabama in 1926 in order for her father to open a Caterpillar tractor franchise. She grew up in Birmingham, attending Avondale School and Ramsay High School, before matriculating at the University of Alabama, where she planned to major in journalism. While in college, she met and married her first husband, attorney Joshua Mullins, and they had three children. After the marriage ended in divorce in 1959, Maryon entered the workforce, first as a secretary, then in insurance sales, and eventually putting her journalism training to use writing for the "Shades Valley Sun" as society editor.

In the 1960s, Maryon joined the Birmingham News as women's editor. Two weeks into her new job, she drove to Montgomery to interview then-Lieutenant Governor James B. Allen in

connection with a speech he had delivered to the Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs. She and Allen, a widower with two children, were instantly attracted to each other and married in August 1964, after a whirlwind, 4-month courtship.

When Alabama Senator Lister Hill chose not to seek reelection to the U.S. Senate in 1968, Jim Allen sought and won election to his seat. In January of 1969, Maryon and Jim moved to Washington, D.C., as Jim began his term in the 91st Congress. From Washington, Maryon began writing a new column called Reflections of a News Hen, which was regionally syndicated in several southeastern newspapers and won Alabama Press Association awards for "best original column." She also served as chair of the Blair House Fine Arts Commission in 1974, appointed to the position by President Gerald Ford.

Jim Allen died suddenly, of a heart attack, on June 1, 1978. One week later, Alabama Governor George Wallace appointed Maryon to fill her husband's seat until the special election, which was scheduled to take place in November. Mrs. Allen pledged to "continue to espouse the great principles of government to which Senator Allen dedicated his life. When I cast a vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate, it will reflect the philosophy he expressed so eloquently and strongly during his almost 10 years of service."

Mrs. Allen served 5 months in the Senate. She was the first woman to serve on the Judiciary Committee, and she presided over the Senate on several occasions, but even as a Senator, she stayed true to her roots and continued writing her "Reflections" newspaper column.

Shortly after Mrs. Allen left the Senate in 1978, Washington Post editor-in-chief Ben Bradlee invited her to write a weekly social column about life and events inside the Beltway. Until 1981, Allen remained in Washington, writing "Maryon Allen's Washington" and entertaining Post readers with her trademark wit and style. Eventually, however, Maryon returned to Birmingham to be near her family and friends. Back home, she began yet another career as one of America's finest restorers of antique wedding dresses, christening gowns, and other heirloom textiles, using skills she had learned from her grandmother. Allen and her extraordinary artistry were featured in several national magazines.

My wife, Louise, and I wish to extend our gratitude for Mrs. Allen's service, as well as our condolences for her loss to her children Joshua Sanford Mullins, III, and his wife Eugenia; John Pittman Mullins and his wife, Alison; and Maryon Allen Allen, widow of the late Stephen Allen; to her stepson James Browning Allen, Jr., and to her six grandchildren, and four great-grandchildren.

Maryon Allen was independent, intelligent, and charismatic, with a self-described "penchant for being irrev-

erent." She faced life's challenges fearlessly, refusing to be defeated by adversity. She can now rest in peace after a life well-lived.

REMEMBERING LAURA EFURD

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to commemorate the life and public service of Laura Efurd who passed away on July 2, 2018.

Losing someone as hard-working, level-headed, and good humored as Laura is not easy. I was proud that Laura was willing to return to public service as my State administrative manager. She provided a steady, experienced hand, and balanced it with her kindness and genial nature. Her regular, day-to-day presence helped me and my staff a great deal. We miss her.

Laura had a life well-lived. She was born in Kona, HI and raised in Mililani.

Laura left Hawaii for college at Ouachita Baptist University in Arkadelphia, and earned a master's degree from American University in Washington, DC. She established herself professionally on Capitol Hill working first for Congressman Robinson from Arkansas, then as legislative director for almost 9 years to my friend, Congresswoman Patsy T. Mink of Hawaii.

Patsy was well known for standing up for underserved communities, including women and minorities, and a tireless fighter for social justice and expanding access to quality health care and education. While Patsy was a force of nature, we all know what an important role that staff plays in a congressional office to support and execute the work of their Members. As legislative director, Laura was instrumental in working with Patsy. She helped spearhead the establishment of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, CAPAC, founded by Representative Mink and Norm Mineta, D-CA, in 1994. Laura served as the caucus's primary staffer during Representative Mink's term as chair. CAPAC's creation helped to initiate and provide a much needed voice for the AAPI community in Congress. At its start, CAPAC was made up of two Senators and five AAPI House Members representing Hawaii, California, American Samoa, and Guam. Since then, the caucus has grown to 22 members, with 3 Senators and 19 House Members representing 10 States and territories.

Laura was also a founding member of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Staff Association, CAPASA, and helped to support the internships that CAPASA sponsors through the Asian Pacific American Institute for Congressional Studies.

Through her commitment to public service—particularly in the Asian American and Pacific Islanders, AAPI, community—a greater number of individuals have had the opportunity to realize their dream of service to our Nation.

After nearly a decade serving on the Hill, Laura moved to the executive

branch, where she served in the U.S. Department of Labor before working in the Clinton White House. There, as Deputy Director of the Office of Public Liaison, she worked to build bridges for the AAPI community across the country into the highest levels of our Nation's government. She helped to identify and confirm key AAPI appointments and was instrumental in the creation of the White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, another institution to expand opportunity to the AAPI community that is still in existence today.

After her service in the White House, Laura headed to San Francisco and worked for ZeroDivide, a nonprofit focused on helping underserved communities understand and unlock technology as a means of expanding economic opportunity, civic engagement, and healthy outcomes.

In recognition of her work building enduring institutions that expand opportunity within the AAPI community, Laura was awarded this year's Jose M. Montano, Jr. Award from the Congressional Asian Pacific American Staff Association. This award recognizes a Capitol Hill alum who has gone above and beyond to sustain a pipeline of AAPI staffers and leaders on the Hill.

Over the years, she has found other ways to serve and promote opportunity. She served as a member of the Federal Communications Commission Consumer Advisory Committee, with the Center for Women's Policy Studies, and as, chair of the Governor of California's Task Force on Broadband, Community Development, and Public/Private Partnerships. In these roles, Laura's work was always about giving a voice to people who had all too often been overlooked or forgotten.

All along, Laura touched many people with her care and compassion, generosity of spirit, and gracious tenacity. She poured all of her energy into whatever she was working on. In one instance, I recall that for our staff retreat, she worked at great length to create games that brought staff with diverse backgrounds together for a common purpose, to share the uniqueness of Hawaii, and to reinforce the reason why those of us in public service do what we do.

It is difficult when we lose someone who was so full of life and still had much potential. We remember Laura as a giving individual who shared so much with so many. Laura made a positive impact during her life, one that extends from coast to coast, and took her from Hawaii to the highest levels of our government. As her brother Steve wrote on the day she passed:

Her impact on people was never more evident than during the outpouring of support she had during the past year and especially during the past few weeks. The impact she had will be felt way beyond the end of her time on earth. Her time here with us is pau. But Laura will live on in our hearts, our memories, our actions, our stories, as well as in programs she helped guide, in legislation she helped to craft, and in her crafts, and in

the example she set. Our celebration of her life here with us is going to be a special one.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO FRED GRIMSEY

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Fred Grimsey, in whose honor a beach in Waterford, CT, will be named Grimsey Beach on August 11, 2018. I have had the honor of seeing firsthand the many amazing accomplishments of Fred Grimsey over the past decade.

Mr. Grimsey is the founder and president of Save the River-Save the Hills, Inc., a nonprofit, grassroots environmental organization focused on preserving the health of the Niantic River Estuary, its watershed, and the natural beauty of the Oswegatchie Hills.

In 2003, Mr. Grimsey built a system to use his boat as a pump-out vessel. Relying on his personal funds for 2 years to keep what became the Pump-Out Program going, Mr. Grimsey has since secured grants from the DEEP and the towns of Waterford and East Lyme, CT, to maintain it. Just this year, over 16,000 gallons of sewerage were pumped from boats on the Niantic River, preventing a significant amount of pollution from being dumped in the river.

As director of the Pump-Out Program and president of Save the River-Save the Hills, Mr. Grimsey has worked long hours to improve the diversity and amount of aquatic life in the estuary, encourage safe recreation, and enhance economic growth of the Niantic River area. His determined dedication has helped lead to the designation of the river and the Long Island Sound as a Federal No Discharge Zone.

Mr. Grimsey's significant environmental efforts has extended Statewide, including serving on numerous committees centered on improving waterways in and around Connecticut.

Currently, Mr. Grimsey and Save the River-Save the Hills are working on a Unified Water Study with the Connecticut Fund for the Environment. The goal of the study is to encourage collaboration between multiple monitoring groups in order to measure the ecological health of a local bay, cove, or harbor.

Mr. Grimsey's positive impact upon the Niantic River has greatly benefited our State. In 2008, he received the President's Volunteer Service Award for the State of Connecticut, and in 2017, I was proud to recognize his environmental achievements by presenting Mr. Grimsey with the Aquarion Environmental Champion Award in the adult category.

I applaud his tireless efforts to improve and protect the Niantic River, and I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Mr. Grimsey on his well-earned honor.●

REMEMBERING DORIS IVY

• Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Doris Ivy of Illinois. In 1991, Doris Ivy received a second chance at life after receiving a new kidney from a generous donor.

The way her family sees it, Doris was able to live an extra 27 years, thanks to that kidney transplant. She made the most out of those years. She was an active volunteer, an election judge, a talented cook, a choir singer, and a mother to nine children. On June 29, 2018, Doris passed away at the age of 85.

Her family members, which include Illinois' Secretary of State Jesse White, are thankful for those extra years. Due to Doris's successful transplant, they all became strong advocates for organ and tissue donations.

Doris is survived by her sister Cora, 6 of her 9 children, 12 of her 17 grandchildren, 39 of her 40 great-grandchildren, and 12 of her great-great-grandchildren. Her service to her community is remarkable, and her story inspiring. I stand here today to remember her life and applaud the generosity of all organ donors across America.●

REMEMBERING HELEN SHORES LEE

• Mr. JONES. Mr. President, it is my honor today to celebrate the life and service of Judge Helen Shores Lee of Alabama, who died on July 2, 2018. The daughter of respected civil rights attorney Arthur Shores, Judge Lee was a civil rights advocate and pioneer in her own right. She was the first African-American woman to serve as judge in the civil division of the circuit court in Jefferson County, AL, and she devoted her life to making sure that all people are cared for, concerned about, and spoken up for.

Helen Shores Lee lived a life of exemplary courage, dedication, and generosity, and I am fortunate to have known her. I am even more blessed to have called her my friend.

Helen developed courage as a young girl growing up in the Smithfield area of Birmingham. The Shores family home was on "Dynamite Hill," so named because of the dozens of unsolved bombings there during the civil rights struggles that convulsed the Birmingham area from the late 1940s to the 1960s. In the summer of 1963, Helen's own home was bombed twice, just weeks before a bomb exploded at the 16th Street Baptist Church nearby, killing four little girls who were her friends. Two years later, another bomb was discovered in the Shores' yard, but fortunately, that one was defused before it exploded. Despite the damage they caused and the terror they were intended to inspire, those bombs did not deter or displace the Shores family, nor did they dissuade the rest of the African-American community from the patient pursuit of equality.

Though her father was small in stature, Judge Lee described him as a

"giant in life." Helen used to tell a story about one time, when a car full of White men was driving around her neighborhood pointing a gun out the window. Frustrated and frightened, young Helen ran in the house and got a gun of her own. Her father followed her out onto the porch, took the gun from her hands, and taught her the importance of fighting "the right way."

Judge Lee's courage was bolstered by her faith, which she also learned from her father. Recalling the threats and the bombings, Judge Lee said, "It was our Christian faith that got us through this ordeal. My dad prayed constantly. We witnessed that." The Shores home was directly across the street from the First Congregational Church, where Shores was Sunday school superintendent, deacon, and trustee. Even at the end of his life, his daughters pushed him across Center Street in a wheelchair so he could get to church. Arthur Shores died in that house on Dynamite Hill, now an unofficial landmark of the civil rights movement.

With her sister Barbara and author Denise George, in 2012, Judge Lee published "The Gentle Giant of Dynamite Hill," a biography of her father that tells how Shores, a former high school principal, became one of the Nation's top civil rights attorneys. Shores handled a number of high-profile cases, including representing Autherine Lucy, the first Black student to attend the University of Alabama. Shores also represented the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., when he was indicted for leading the Montgomery Bus Boycott.

From 1971 to 1987, Judge Lee worked as a clinical psychologist, serving her patients and the community with dedication and compassion. In 1986, she dedicated herself to a new kind of service, becoming a magistrate for the city of Birmingham. After graduating from the Cumberland School of Law in 1987, she joined her father to form Shores & Lee, where she practiced law until she was appointed circuit judge of the Tenth Judicial Court of Alabama and assumed the bench in January 2003. She was twice reelected by the citizens of Jefferson County. Although she retired in 2015, Judge Lee continued to give generously of her time and talent to a number of organizations.

Judge Lee's commitment to her community included serving as a member of the Alabama State Ethics Commission from 1996-2000 and as its chairwoman from 1999-2000. She also chaired the community advisory board of the University of Alabama at Birmingham's Minority Health and Research Center, she was a trustee for Leadership Birmingham, she was a member of the Cumberland School of Law advisory board, and she served on the boards of Blue Cross Blue Shield of Alabama, Campfire, Inc., the Civil Rights Institute, the Young Women's Christian Association, and many more. In 2013, the Young Women's Christian Association of Central Alabama honored Judge Lee with the Jeana P.

Hosch Woman of Valor award for her decades of commitment to civil rights and community service. Samford University named her Alumna of the Year in 2014.

In addition, Judge Lee was often called on to speak about her experiences in the civil rights movement and the role her family played in moving the country to a better place. I was fortunate to share the stage with her many times and always marveled at how she would share her story with grace, compassion, and a sense of justice, not hatred or bitterness.

My wife, Louise, and I extend our sincere and deep condolences to Judge Lee's family. The city of Birmingham and the State of Alabama are better for her having lived and served there and so am I.●

REMEMBERING JOHN M. RICHARDS

● Mr. RICH. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a great Idahoan, John M. Richards. John recently passed away, leaving a tremendous legacy for the timber industry and as a strong supporter of economic development and a champion for those in need.

John and his identical twin brother, Tom, were co-owners of Idaho Forest Industries, IFI, which had its headquarters in Coeur d'Alene and provided more than 450 jobs. It is said to be one of the largest forest products industries to make northern Idaho their home throughout the second half of the last century. The brothers were committed to forest stewardship, but in the early 1990s, timber industries faced falling prices, public challenges against timber harvesting, and less availability of local and Federal timber. IFI survived because of the ingenuity of the two brothers. They began testing the ability to long-haul timber from other regions of the country and Canada, as far away as Quebec.

Even in the hard times, IFI kept all of its employees on the payroll. Some have called IFI the "best employer in the area."

When John and his brother decided to retire about the year 2000, IFI was sold to Stimson Lumber Co. of Oregon. John and Tom thought Stimson would run their company in much the same way they had run it and would keep most of their workers.

John was raised in Kootenai County, ID, and cut his teeth working in his dad's lumber mill.

Even though he was the co-owner of IFI, John worked for 29 years at Potlatch Corp., another lumber company in northern Idaho. He became chairman and CEO and then retired from there in 1999. John, who went to Stanford University, where he earned a degree in economics and an MBA from Harvard Business School, was committed to the welfare of others. He was known to give jobs to anyone who wanted to work and to let the employees work in teams to consider how to best accomplish the work in their

areas. When some say people are our best asset, John believed it. He was a caring employer, and his workers respected him for it.

In 2014, John and Tom were inducted into the Idaho Hall of Fame in a family-only ceremony. The brothers were not known for wanting any kind of publicity or public recognition for their commitment to good business practices or for how they supported the community. John just did what he thought was the right thing to do: build an honest and beneficial business, make jobs available, give back to the community, and assist others—and so no boasting about it.

John was also a family man. He was married to Joy Elaine (Hanson) for 34 years. As a father, John's children say he was always there for them.

John was a great Idahoan, an exemplary businessman, a caring, charitable member of the community, and a timber man of excellence. He will be sorely missed by his family, his friends, "co-workers," and by many throughout northern Idaho.●

TRIBUTE TO DOLORES "DEE" NELSON

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the bold and groundbreaking service of Dolores "Dee" Nelson.

When Dee was only 20 years old, she longed to serve her country in World War II, just like her brothers. She joined the Women's Army Air Corps but, to her disappointment, was placed in an office job. That wasn't what Dee had in mind, and she told her superiors that that was not what she signed up for.

Because of Dee's boldness, she began to get special assignments and, before long, was promoted to special operator. She passionately tackled every challenge and task brought before her. Her service took her to the newly opened Pentagon in Washington, DC, where she helped with preparations for the Allied landing at Normandy. For this mission, she was personally sworn to secrecy by President Roosevelt. Decades later, Dee still feels the sacrifice of the Allied lives that were lost on the beaches of Normandy.

At every step of her career in the Women's Army Air Corps, Dee faced discrimination and disapproval from the men she worked alongside. Men would stand in front of her in line-ups when their superiors would walk by. Her superiors refused to put any of her special assignments or accomplishments into her record. After helping plan some of the most pivotal moments of the war, her military record unfairly downplayed her contributions to our Nation.

After her military service, she used her GI Bill benefits to get a college education. At school, she met her husband, Donald, a fellow veteran of the U.S. Navy. She continued to buck tradition by traveling and working along-

side her husband. As Donald continued his career in the military, Dee continued to serve her country in civil service.

Dee's passion and intelligence has taken her far in life. From working in a shipyard in Long Beach, to teaching children on the windy Aleutian Islands, Dee found joy and fulfillment in serving other people.

Dee is a miraculous woman who has not received enough recognition and appreciation for her service to our Nation in World War II. She didn't let anyone get in the way of her desire to serve, and our Nation is better off today because of her strength and determination. Women like Dee paved the way for generations of Montana and American women to take up the call to arms and serve our Nation.

I stand here today to say thank you to Dolores Nelson for her service, strength, and sacrifice, on behalf of myself, Montana, and a grateful nation.●

TRIBUTE TO KATHRYN ALBERT

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee intern Kathryn Albert. Kathryn hails from Ellicott City, MD. She is an economics major and a cadet in the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps at the University of Maryland, College Park.

While interning for the Commerce Committee, Kathryn assisted the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security. She is a dedicated worker who was always willing to take on new projects. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kathryn and wish her continued success in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK BINDER

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee intern Patrick Binder. Patrick hails from Yankton, SD. He is a rising senior history major at Yale University.

While interning for the Commerce Committee, Patrick assisted the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation and Merchant Marine Infrastructure, Safety, and Security. He is a dedicated worker who was always willing to tackle new projects. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Patrick and wish him continued success in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO FRANCIS SIMMONS

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee intern Francis Simmons. Francis hails from Charleston, SC. He is an international relations and economics major and rising sophomore at Tufts University.

While interning for the Commerce Committee, Francis assisted the Subcommittee on Communications, Technology, and the Internet. He is a dedicated worker who was always willing to tackle new projects. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Francis and wish him continued success in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO RYAN UDELL

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee intern Ryan Udell. Ryan hails from Ponte Verde Beach, FL. He is a rising sophomore mechanical engineering major at Rice University.

While interning for the Commerce Committee, Ryan assisted the Subcommittee on Space, Science, and Competitiveness, as well as the Subcommittee on Aviation Operations, Safety, and Security. He is a dedicated worker who got the most out of his internship. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Ryan and wish him continued success in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO CARSON ZUBKE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize the hard work of my Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee intern Carson Zubke. Carson hails from Waubay, SD. He is a rising sophomore finance major at the University of South Dakota.

While interning for the Commerce Committee, Carson assisted the Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security. He is a dedicated worker who was always willing to tackle new projects. I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Carson and wish him continued success in the future.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 10:28 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY) has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 2779. An act to amend the Zimbabwe Democracy and Economic Recovery Act of 2001.

H.R. 4528. An act to make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4645. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 5729. An act to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 2:27 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY) has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1182. An act to extend the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 31, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1182. An act to extend the National Flood Insurance Program, 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-6127. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Implementation and Assessment of a Training Curriculum for the Boards for Correction of Military Records"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6128. A communication from the Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act Report to Congress"; to the Committees on Finance; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6129. A communication from the Director, Office of Labor-Management Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Rescission of Rule Interpreting 'Advice' Exemption in Section 203(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act" (RIN1215-AA07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6130. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Employment and Training, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Senior Community Service Employment Program; Performance Accountability" (RIN1205-AB79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6131. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Adoption of the Methodology for the HHS-operated Permanent Risk Adjustment Program under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act for the 2017 Benefit Year" ((RIN0938-AT65) (CMS-9920-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 26, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6132. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2017 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

Report to accompany S. 930, A bill to require the Administrator of the Western Area Power Administration to establish a pilot project to provide increased transparency for customers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-309).

Report to accompany S. 1030, A bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to submit to Congress a report on certain hydropower projects (Rept. No. 115-310).

Report to accompany S. 1142, A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects (Rept. No. 115-311).

Report to accompany H.R. 2582, A bill to authorize the State of Utah to select certain lands that are available for disposal under the Pony Express Resource Management Plan to be used for the support and benefit of State institutions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-312).

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 2554. A bill to ensure that health insurance issuers and group health plans do not prohibit pharmacy providers from providing certain information to enrollees.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTS for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Dan Michael Berkovitz, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2023.

*James E. Hubbard, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

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

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Christopher P. Weggeman, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. John M. Murray, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Maryanne Miller, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Steven A. Schaick, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Ronald M. Harvell, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Charles L. Knowles, to be Brigadier General.

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

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

Air Force nominations beginning with Ilda Y. Isaza and ending with Yobanka E. Paez-Munoz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Air Force nomination of Samantha S. Rieger-Pinson, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Steven J. Nordeen and ending with Stephanie E. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2018.

Army nomination of Kenneth F. Klock, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Brandon C. Klink, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Burton C. Glover, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Manuel Reyes, Jr., to be Major.

Army nomination of Emmanuel D. Eisenstein, to be Major.

Army nomination of Marshall L. Bartee, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Ethan P. Carter and ending with Samuel R. Wetherill IV, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Patricia J. Rasmussen and ending with Kent J. Vince, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Jeremy W. Berndt and ending with Amy M. Ramer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Scott M. Everhart and ending with Albert Sohnen, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nomination of William Perez, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Robyn D. Bolgla and ending with Rhonda D. Wynder, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Michael C. Ampelas and ending with Kurt G. Zimmer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Michael S. Allain and ending with Carmen M. Tucker, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Donna M. Kentley and ending with David J. Skelley, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nomination of Kimberly D. Dejesus, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Royal M. Minor III and ending with Benito E. Rodriguez, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Edward L. Barron, Jr. and ending with Michele M. Rich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Lori J. Allert and ending with Lara K. Teran, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Carl W. Adams and ending with John H. Wu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Army nominations beginning with Dawud A. A. Agbere and ending with D010823, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2018.

Army nomination of Cynthia A. Hopkins, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael J. Loomis, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Latonia M. Mahnke, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Justin A. Evison, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nominations beginning with Kory A. Anglesey and ending with Benjamin C. Waite, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with David W. Alexander and ending with Harold B. Woodruff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jonathan D. Albano and ending with James P. Zakar, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Jane J. Abanes and ending with Michelle L. Westcott, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Matthew S. Bailey and ending with Adam B. Yost, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Lynda S. Amell and ending with Chadwick Y. Yasuda, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Laleh Abdolazadeh and ending with Christopher L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Navy nominations beginning with Lisa L. Abels and ending with Jerry Yuan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 18, 2018.

Navy nomination of Javier Lopezmartinez, to be Commander.

By Mr. BURR for the Select Committee on Intelligence.

Ellen E. McCarthy, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Intelligence and Research).

Joseph Maguire, of Florida, to be Director of the National Counterterrorism Center, Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and tes-

tify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3300. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to ensure that all firearms are traceable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3301. A bill to implement recommendations related to the safety of amphibious passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3302. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the non-applicability of non-Department of Veterans Affairs covenants not to compete to the appointment of physicians in the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. 3303. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to make changes with respect to water quality certification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COONS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 3304. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the publication of 3D printer plans for the printing of firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3305. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish rules for payment for graduate medical education (GME) costs for hospitals that establish a new medical residency training program after hosting resident rotators for short durations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 3306. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with regard to stalking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 3307. A bill to create a new Federal grant program that provides grants to State libraries to allow schools with summer lunch programs to keep their libraries open for student use during the summer months; to the

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 3308. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for teacher and school leader quality enhancement and to enhance institutional aid; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3309. A bill to authorize cyber incident response teams at the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 3310. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to award grants to organizations for the provision of transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces who are separated, retired, or discharged from the Armed Forces, and spouses of such members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 3311. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit interference with voting systems under the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 3312. A bill to suspend proposed rule-making signed by former Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency Scott Pruitt, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 3313. A bill to improve dental care provided to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3314. A bill to improve Federal data collection by requiring the collection of information on sexual orientation and gender identity in the decennial census and the American Community Survey; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 3315. A bill to allow for the taking of pinnipeds on the Columbia River and its tributaries to protect endangered and threatened species of salmon and other nonlisted fish species; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 600. A resolution recognizing July 28, 2018, as "World Hepatitis Day"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 220

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

(Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 220, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 294

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 294, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to clarify the Food and Drug Administration's jurisdiction over certain tobacco products, and to protect jobs and small businesses involved in the sale, manufacturing and distribution of traditional and premium cigars.

S. 351

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 351, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for comprehensive student achievement information.

S. 681

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 817

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 817, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 910, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 1023

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1023, a bill to reauthorize the Tropical Forest Conservation Act of 1998 through fiscal year 2021, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Indiana

(Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1084, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 1318

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1413

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 1413, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to establish teacher leader development programs.

S. 1509

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1509, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to authorize an extension of exclusivity periods for certain drugs that are approved for a new indication for a rare disease or condition, and for other purposes.

S. 1596

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1596, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain funeral benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2114

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2114, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

S. 2296

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2296, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2956

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

(Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2956, a bill to intensify stem cell research showing evidence of substantial clinical benefit to patients, and for other purposes.

S. 2957

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2957, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3029

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3029, a bill to revise and extend the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (PREEMIE Act).

S. 3057

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3057, a bill to provide for the processing by U.S. Customs and Border Protection of certain international mail shipments and to require the provision of advance electronic information on international mail shipments of mail.

S. 3113

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3113, a bill to promote dairy product innovation, including in specialty cheese, and value-added dairy product development for the economic benefit of United States dairy farmers and their communities.

S. 3143

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3143, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal program to accelerate quantum research and development for the economic and national security of the United States.

S. 3247

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3247, a bill to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes.

S. 3257

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3257, a bill to impose sanctions on foreign persons responsible for serious violations of international law regarding the protection of civilians during armed conflict, and for other purposes.

S. 3266

At the request of Mr. JONES, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3266, a bill to require a study of the well-being of the United States automotive industry and to stay the investigation into the national security effects of automotive imports until the study is completed, and for other purposes.

S. 3273

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3273, a bill to improve the safety, efficiency, and reliability of the movement of goods through ports and intermodal connections to ports, and for other purposes.

S. 3275

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3275, a bill to amend the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 to ensure appropriate congressional review and the continued applicability of sanctions under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012.

S. RES. 571

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 571, a resolution condemning the ongoing illegal occupation of Crimea by the Russian Federation.

S. RES. 572

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 572, a resolution supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

AMENDMENT NO. 3459

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3459 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3464

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3464 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3477

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3477 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment,

and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3524

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3524 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3532

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3532 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3600

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3600 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3608

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3608 proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3609

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3609 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3610

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr.

DURBIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3610 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3611

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3611 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3612

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3612 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3641

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3641 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3670

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3670 proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3676

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3676 proposed to H.R. 6147, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 3308. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for teacher and school leader quality enhancement and to enhance institutional aid; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President. As the skills students need to be successful in the 21st century evolve, so too must the type of instruction they receive. Educators must provide educational opportunities that teach to the challenging State academic standards that meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population. At the start of every school year we see the same news headlines about exploding class sizes and districts facing unfillable openings. Teacher and principal shortages plague the whole country, and are worst in our rural communities, but it's a problem we can solve.

In 2015-16, more than half of U.S. States reported shortages of educators in mathematics, science, career and technical education and for English learners. Further, 48 States identified special education as a shortage area in their reports to the U.S. Department of Education and half of all schools and 90% of high-poverty schools are struggling to find qualified special education teachers. If current trends continue, we would see as few as 200,000 available teacher hires each year by 2025, resulting in a gap of more than 100,000 teachers annually.

Additionally, in public schools today, the majority of the student population is comprised of students of color; however, teachers of color only comprised 20% of the teacher workforce in 2015-16. African American teachers made up more than 8% of teachers in 1987, but only made up 6.7% in 2015. It is critical for our teaching workforce to grow more reflective of the population of students it serves.

This is why I am pleased to introduce today the Preparing and Retaining Education Professionals Act, or PREP Act. The PREP Act aims to increase access to high-quality teacher and leader preparation, diversify the teacher workforce, and address the significant national teacher and school shortages. More specifically, this legislation would expand the definition of "high need" districts under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) to include those experiencing teacher shortages in rural communities and in areas such as special education, English language, science, technology, engineering, math, and CTE, to allow for access to additional support and improvement. It would also encourage school districts to create partnerships with local community colleges and universities to ensure their programs are educating future teachers in areas where there is a shortage of educators. It would increase access to teacher and school leader residency programs and prepara-

tion training and require States to identify areas of teacher or leader shortages by subject across public schools and use that data to target their efforts. Additionally, the PREP Act increases support for teacher preparation programs at Minority Serving Institutions (MSIs) or Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) to support a diverse and well-prepared educator workforce.

The improvement of our country's educational system lies in our ability to prepare, support, and retain quality educators. When teachers and school leaders are equipped with the knowledge and tools they need to succeed, they are more likely to stay in their roles and positively impact young people and their communities. As we move towards the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle see the PREP Act as a commonsense opportunity to help ensure that students in every zip code across the country have access to the well-prepared teachers and school leaders they deserve.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 600—RECOGNIZING JULY 28, 2018, AS "WORLD HEPATITIS DAY"

Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 600

Whereas hepatitis B, hepatitis C, and the incidence of liver disease caused by such viruses have become urgent problems of a global proportion;

Whereas, worldwide, an estimated—

- (1) 1,340,000 people die each year due to hepatitis;
- (2) 257,000,000 people live with chronic hepatitis B;
- (3) 887,000 people die each year mostly due to a liver-related illness caused by hepatitis B;
- (4) 71,000,000 people are chronically infected with hepatitis C; and
- (5) 399,000 people die each year due to a liver-related illness caused by hepatitis C;

Whereas, in the United States, an estimated—

- (1) 5,700,000 people are infected with hepatitis B or hepatitis C;
- (2) 2,200,000 people are chronically infected with hepatitis B; and
- (3) 3,500,000 people are chronically infected with hepatitis C;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (referred to in this preamble as the "CDC") estimates that, in 2016, there were 20,900 new acute hepatitis B infections and 41,200 new acute hepatitis C infections in the United States;

Whereas the CDC has found significant increases in the amount of new hepatitis cases in the United States since 2010, including a 3.5-fold increase between 2010 and 2016 in reported cases of acute hepatitis C infections;

Whereas chronic viral hepatitis claims thousands of lives each year in the United States, with an estimated 18,153 deaths due to hepatitis C in 2016;

Whereas, between 2015 and 2020, there is estimated to be \$136,000,000,000 in hepatitis C

drug spending from all payers, and government payers would fund \$61,000,000,000, an estimated 45 percent of such spending;

Whereas an estimated 80 percent of people with acute Hepatitis C do not have any symptoms;

Whereas African Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, Latinos, Native Americans, Alaska Natives, gay and bisexual men, and people who inject drugs intravenously have higher rates of chronic viral hepatitis infections in the United States than other groups of people;

Whereas Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders bear the greatest burden of hepatitis B-related deaths in the United States;

Whereas hepatitis C is 10 times more infectious than human immunodeficiency virus (referred to in this preamble as “HIV”);

Whereas hepatitis B is 50 to 100 times more infectious than HIV;

Whereas an estimated 25 percent of people who live in the United States and are infected with HIV are also infected with hepatitis C;

Whereas, while life expectancies for individuals infected with HIV have increased with antiretroviral treatment, liver disease, which is commonly related to hepatitis B and hepatitis C infections, has become the most common cause of death among HIV-infected individuals that is not related to acquired immune deficiency syndrome;

Whereas, despite the fact that chronic viral hepatitis is the most common blood-borne infection in the United States, more than half of the people living with hepatitis B and hepatitis C are unaware of their infections;

Whereas hepatitis B is preventable through vaccination, and both hepatitis B and hepatitis C are preventable with proper public health interventions, including programs that offer access to sterile injection equipment for people who inject drugs intravenously;

Whereas the goals of “World Hepatitis Day” on July 28, 2018, are to—

(1) highlight the global nature of chronic viral hepatitis epidemics;

(2) recognize that hepatitis can be prevented and eliminated, in part, through a comprehensive public education and awareness campaign designed to identify those at risk for, and living with, hepatitis;

(3) inform patients about new treatments that are available for hepatitis; and

(4) help increase the length and quality of life for people diagnosed with chronic hepatitis B and hepatitis C infections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes World Hepatitis Day;

(2) supports broad access to hepatitis B and hepatitis C treatments;

(3) supports raising awareness of the risks and consequences of undiagnosed chronic hepatitis B and hepatitis C infections; and

(4) calls for a robust governmental and public health response to protect the health of the approximately 5,700,000 people in the United States and 328,000,000 people worldwide who have hepatitis.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3683. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3666 proposed by Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CARPER) to the amendment SA 3399 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6147, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3684. Mr. MORAN (for Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CARPER)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3666 proposed by Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CARPER) to the amendment SA 3399 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6147, *supra*.

SA 3685. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3399 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6147, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3686. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3674 submitted by Mr. BENNET and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 3399 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6147, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3683. Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CARPER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3666 proposed by Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CARPER) to the amendment SA 3399 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6147, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 2, line 4, strike “*Provided*” and all that follows through “amount” on line 9 and insert the following: “*Provided further*, That after calculating the distribution of obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways for fiscal year 2019 under section 120(a), the obligation limitation shall be reduced by \$52,000,000 to a total of \$45,216,596,000; *Provided further*, That the reduction in the preceding proviso shall be applied to the obligation limitation determined under section 120(a)(4) for the TIFIA program (as defined in section 601(a) of title 23, United States Code); *Provided further*, That the 3 preceding provisos shall be applied as if in effect during fiscal year 2018”.

SA 3684. Mr. MORAN (for Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CARPER)) proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3666 proposed by Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. CARPER) to the amendment SA 3399 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6147, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 1, line 2, strike “That” and all that follows through “amount” on page 2, line 9, and insert the following: “That such sums provided for national infrastructure investments for passenger rail transportation projects under title I of division C of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012 (Public Law 112-55; 125 Stat. 641), shall remain available for expenditure through fiscal year 2019 for the liquidation of valid obligations of active grants incurred in fiscal year 2012; *Provided further*, That such sums provided for national infrastructure investments for port infrastructure projects under title VIII of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013 (Public Law 113-6; 127 Stat. 432) shall remain available through fiscal year 2020 for the liquidation of valid obligations of active grants incurred in fiscal year 2013; *Provided further*, That the 2 preceding provisos shall be applied as if they were in effect on September 30, 2018; *Provided*

further, That after calculating the distribution of obligation limitation for Federal-aid highways for fiscal year 2019 under section 120(a), the obligation limitation shall be reduced by \$52,000,000 to a total of \$45,216,596,000; *Provided further*, That the reduction in the preceding proviso shall be applied to the obligation limitation determined under section 120(a)(4) for the TIFIA program (as defined in section 601(a) of title 23, United States Code)”.

SA 3685. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3399 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6147, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ (a) In this section—

(1) the term “Association” means the International Development Association; and

(2) the term “Commission” means the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(b)(1) Subject to subsection (c), any security issued by the Association, including any guaranty by the Association (without regard to whether the guaranty is limited in scope), and any security guaranteed by the Association with respect to principal and interest shall be considered to be an exempted security under section 3(a)(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77c(a)(2)) and section 3(a)(12) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)(12)).

(2) The Association shall submit to the Commission any annual and other report with respect to the securities described in paragraph (1) as the Commission determines to be—

(A) appropriate considering the special character of the Association and the operations of the Association; and

(B) necessary in the public interest or for the protection of investors.

(c) The Commission, in consultation with the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, may suspend the application of subsection (a) at any time with respect to any security issued or guaranteed by the Association during the period of the suspension.

(d) The Commission shall submit to Congress an annual report that contains any information that the Commission determines to be appropriate with respect to the operation and effect of this section.

SA 3686. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3674 submitted by Mr. BENNET and intended to be proposed to the amendment SA 3399 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6147, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 2, strike line 6 and all that follows through page 3, line 11, and insert the following:

(b) In carrying out the study under subsection (a), the Secretary of Transportation shall consult with—

(1) the Intelligent Transportation Systems Joint Program Office of the Department of Transportation;

(2) the Vehicles Technologies Office of the Department of Energy;

(3) relevant National Laboratories (as defined in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801));

(4) the Office of Air and Radiation of the Environmental Protection Agency;

(5) relevant State, regional, and local planning commissions and governments; and

(6) relevant nonprofit organizations.

(c) In making the study under subsection (a) publicly

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. INOHFE. Mr. President, I have 7 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 31, 2018, to conduct a business meeting and hearing on the following nominations: Dan Michael Berkovitz, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and James E. Hubbard, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 31, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael A. Hammer, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kyle McCarter, of Illinois, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kenya, Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana, and Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to Jamaica, all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 31, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 31, 2018, 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, July 31, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed business meeting.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATION, TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND THE INTERNET

The Subcommittee on Communication, Technology, Innovation, and the Internet of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session

of the Senate on Tuesday, July 31, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT, AGENCY ACTION, FEDERAL RIGHTS AND FEDERAL COURTS

The Subcommittee on Oversight, Agency Action, Federal Rights and Federal Courts of the Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, July 31, 2018, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following individuals be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress: Shae McCulloch and Melissa Dickerson.

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

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 2018

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, August 1; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 6147 under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MORAN. 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 8:14 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, August 1, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

THOMAS F. GILMAN, OF ARIZONA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, VICE ELLEN C. HERBST, RESIGNED.

THOMAS F. GILMAN, OF ARIZONA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, VICE ELLEN C. HERBST, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

WILLIAM COOPER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE STEVEN CROLEY, RESIGNED.

NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION

HAROLD B. PARKER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, TO BE FEDERAL COCHAIRPERSON OF THE NORTHERN BORDER REGIONAL COMMISSION, VICE MARK SCARANO, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

RICHARD C. PARKER, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE T. CHARLES COOPER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JUDY RISING REINKE, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MONTENEGRO.

LUCY TAMLYN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC.

ADRIAN ZUCKERMAN, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ROMANIA.

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

ERHARD R. CHORLE, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING AUGUST 28, 2022, VICE MICHAEL SCHWARTZ, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

JAMES PAUL GFRERER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS (INFORMATION AND TECHNOLOGY), VICE LAVERNE HORTON COUNCIL.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 603B:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RICHARD W. SCOBEE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. ANTHONY H. ADRIAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES E. RAINEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS S. JAMES, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ADAM R. LIBERMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

JEFFREY A. BRUCE
EDWARD P. BUTLER
DOUGLAS D. CLAY II
MICHAEL W. DUPLCHAIN
JOHN D. FULK

JOSEPH A. HOPKINS III
GEORGE W. HORSLEY
WILLIAM C. HUMMER
KRIS J. MARSHALL
MURRY B. MCCULLOUGH
CHRISTOPHER S. MCKEE
JUSTIN W. OSBERG
DAVID M. PIDONE
STEVEN T. RIVERA
CHRISTOPHER J. WESKAMP
COREY L. WISE
CARL A. YOUNG
PATRICK A. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

TYLER Q. HEMMERICH
JOHN P. MCLAIN
ANTHONY J. STRUZIK

To be major

CATRINA M. BAKER
ELIAS B. GONZALEZ
FREDERIC M. PALLEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 4333(B) AND 4336(A):

To be colonel

DAVID M. BARNES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

BROOKE R. ADAMS
JUSTIN M. ADAMS
HEIDI M. ALFORD
JENNY E. ALLEN
ELLEEN BAISON
HEATHER S. BANGERTER
RYAN J. BAUTISTA
ERINN C. BENSON
ERICA L. BIANCHE
LATOYA G. BLADE
ASHLEY Y. BRADLEY
LOLA M. BUCHANAN
COLLEEN L. BYE
AMANDA N. CANADA
ANGELA M. CARLSON
SIDNEY CARROLL
NICOLE L. CASE
JAMIE K. CEDOLA
JASON C. CELESTINO
KATRINA J. CLARK
LONDON M. COLEMAN
DIANA M. COSTA
KEVIN F. COSTELLO
KRYSTAL DABON
JIMMY W. DAVIS, JR.
RICHARD J. DAVIS
ERNEST C. DELACRUZ
MARISOL DELAPENAREYES
DARIEN DIAZ
CAROLYN M. DILLON
AMY E. DIMMER
MARK E. DOHERTY
CHRISTINE R. DORSO
KENNETH C. DUNHAM, JR.
WAYNE L. EALEY
ALEXANDRO ESCONTRIAS
ALEXIS G. FAY
BRENDA M. FERNANDEZ
TIFFANY N. FIELDS
MAGGIE C. FITZPATRICK
KATIE L. FLATT
MERRY J. FONTENOT
LATISHA N. FOX
BARBARA S. FRANKS
PETER B. FRYE
JESUS C. GARZA
VONYA M. GIBBONS
ELEANOR J. GONZALEZ
XAVIER C. GREEN
HOLLY E. GRUENHAGEN
ANGELA L. HAWKINS
TALASHA S. HAYGOOD
LORRI L. HAYS
BRENT E. HEBER
KENNETH E. HEFFNER
KATIE HELMRICK
DANIEL J. HINES
KATHERYN C. HOUBOULIS
LAMERTIS IHENETU
CHRISTOPHER P. JOHNSON
SHANNAN L. JURINA
CRYSTAL A. KELLEY
YOUNG B. KIM
THOMAS R. KWOLEK
EMILY R. LACEY
KRISTINE D. LEE
NAKESHIA L. LEWIS
SHERYL E. LIZOTTE
ADAM W. LOWE
JASON R. MAAN
JERAMY J. MAHONEY
JESSICA S. MANN
LAURA L. MANZO
MARGARET G. MARTIN
GANG T. MARTINEZ
JANICE M. MARTINEZ
MALLORY A. MCCUIN
MARIO O. MEDINA
REBECCA L. MERCER
MEHANA MOORE
DAVID D. MORIN
CHRISTINA C. MORPHIS
ASHLEY D. MOUNT
EDWARD A. MURRAY, JR.
LORNA D. NEWMANHILL
OLA N. OBERMULLER
AARON Z. OLSEN
LEO L. PACHECO
ALISON L. PATTON
LAURA K. PAYTON
ALEX Z. PEREZ
URIAH D. PEREZ
JOAN PIERRELOUIS
MICHAEL D. RASMUSSEN
AMANDA M. REED
MATTHEW J. REGGIO
LINDSAY N. REIGRUT
SCOTT RICHARDSON
JONABETH T. RIVERA
JESSE Y. RIVERAROSARIO
JOHN P. ROBERTS
KARI L. RODDEN
JILL A. ROSE
VICTORIA M. SALAS
ANGELA B. SANDOSORN
DORMA D. SANDERS
AERI J. SANTOS
STEPHANIE M. SAPIENS
ARIEL R. SHAGORY
STACY L. SHEPPARD

JOSHUA D. SMITH
KRISTIE J. SMITH
TONITA C. SMITH
JADE N. SNADER
GABRIEL L. SOSA
OWEN T. STAILEY
LEAH R. STANLEY
JOHN C. M. TAGAVILLA
ALEX D. TATONE
DOROTHY G. TRIMMER
JAMES C. UREGEN
DEBRA A. VALDIVIESO
SANTWON WALKER
JAMES R. WATERS
WALTER A. WATSON, JR.
SHARON F. WEAVER
SARAH L. WEIR
DOUGLAS M. WESTBROOK, JR.
NATALIE L. WHITAKER
STEPHEN W. WILCOX
LISA S. WILLIAMS
CHRISTINA N. WILLIAMSON
NATHAN T. WITHERSPOON
THOMAS W. WOODROOF
LAURA A. WYATT
LAURA D. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JOSEPH B. AHLBORN
DENIS L. ALFIN
CRAIG L. AMAN
LATONYA S. ANDERSON
REUBEN A. ARUNASALEM
SANDRA L. G. BANNER
STACEY L. BATEMAN
MARCEL D. BATTIS
RENZO G. BEGAZOLEON
SALVATORE G. BITONDO
KUMALO A. BOGAN
SHAWN L. BOOKWALTER
JOSHUA K. BOSWELL
MICHAEL W. BOWDREN
TIFFANY N. BROWN
CLEVELAND S. BRYANT, JR.
SARAH A. BURLEE
MOLLY C. BYRNES
BRIAN T. CALDWELL
ERIC J. CALLENS
NATALIA H. CARDONA
JAMIE T. CARRENO
ADRIANA F. CASTRO
MICHEL J. CELSTIN
AMANDA B. CHARLTON
GARY J. CHEATWOOD, JR.
JULIA M. CLAYTON
WILLIAM C. COCHIOLO
DEAN T. COCOZZA
STERLING A. COLEMAN
COLLEEN M. COLEMATTSOON
RYAN C. COSTANTINO
JESSICA M. COWLES
JASON R. CROSS
PAUL A. DAANEN
JOEL F. DALY
ASHLEY N. DAVIS
DESIREE D. DIEBOLD
CHRISTOPHER M. DIMAIO
EDWARD J. DONNARUMMA
CARIE J. DONOHO
KELLY C. DRAKE
DANIEL J. DURTSCHI
KARMON D. DYCHES
KARIM ELYAMANI
BARAJIDE O. FAGBEMI
JOSHUA R. FANSLER
JENNIFER M. FARREY
SPENCER L. FARROW II
JASMIN I. FILPO
ROBBIE L. FLOWERS
DOUGLAS A. FOOTE
FRAY C. FOWLER
BRANDY GAINESLEY
HIPOLITO GARZA
DERESE GETNET
ANDREW H. GILKER
IVAN GONZALEZ
LUIS A. GONZALEZ
DANIEL A. GOOD
RYAN R. GREEN
TANISHA V. GREENE
BRIAN J. GUISE
GREGORY J. HABERMANN
BRANDON C. HALLIGAN
JACKIE HAMMELMAN
KENNETH W. HAMMOND
THOMAS L. HANSEN
HAMILTON H. HARRIS
DANIEL J. HARRISON
JEFFREY A. HAVENS
JUSTIN R. HELL
DUSTI R. HENRICHS
ANTONY A. HENSEL
DOUGLAS L. HILL II
BERNADINE S. HOLLOWAY
STEPHEN A. HOLWERDA
PETER N. HOUBOULIS
RACHEL N. IBRAHIMOVIC
JENNIFER L. IVELAND
SHELLIE M. JERVIS
AMANDA M. JONES
JEREMIAH S. JONES
MONIQUE C. JONES
RHIANNON E. JONES
JESSICA L. KAMINSKI
CALVIN R. KING
WILLIAM R. KIRBY
JUDY S. KIRNON
NATHAN A. KISER
JOSEPH M. KOENNECKE
DOUGLAS P. KUHLMAN
BRITTANY D. LATIMER
ELIZABETH F. LAZZARI
ZACHARY M. LEFTWICH
EDER LEMUS
PARTSON MARADZIKA
JOHN P. MARTIN
DONTTEAU M. MAZONE
AMANDA E. L. MCCABE
JENNIFER E. MCCALL
NEKKEYA N. MCGEE
KELLY E. MCMANUS
STERLING B. MEYERS
GARY E. MILLER
ROBERT E. MODLIN
JASON R. MOODY
RICH A. MOORE
SUZANNAH E. MORRISON
PAVEL B. MUNERMAN
RYAN D. MURPHY
THOMAS A. MUSICH
FERNANDO NAJERA
FERNANDO NEGRONLOPEZ
STEPHANIE N. NELSON
JEREMY J. NOBLE
AYUB M. ODERA
SARAH E. ODONAGHUE
MICHAEL L. OIEN
ONISSA R. ORTIZ
MATHANRAJ PACKIAM
BRYAN O. PAMINTUAN
GREGORY F. PARKER
JOSHUAH D. PARNELL
JAMIE M. PECHA
JOSEPH C. PECKO
ROMAN H. PIETRIS
JUSTIN H. POOL
BETTY K. POOLESMITH
JAIME PORRAS
AMY L. POTTER
DAVID J. PRECZEWSKI
LORRAINE J. PUGH
CARRIE M. QUINN
RHEA L. RACAZA
STEVEN J. RAIDON
HANUMANTH M. RAVINDRANATH
LASHAWNNA N. RAY
LILESHWARAN REDDY
SAMANTHA A. REID
KARINA RESTO
JASON T. RICE
URSULA S. RILEY
DIEGO A. RINCON
JEANETTE N. RIVERA
DAVID M. RODRIGUEZ
DIANA M. ROMMELFANGERKONKOL
RICARDO ROMO
AMANDA L. ROTH
GREGORY S. RUTETH
TYLER G. RUSSELL
SARAH E. SANDELMEL
JEREMY A. SCHIEL
ALLYSON M. SCHMIDT
REBECCA L. SHANAHAN
PATRICK G. SHAW
AARON M. SHRAMEK
TIMOTHY J. SOH
BRYAN L. SPEAR
JONATHAN R. SPIEGEL
ELIZABETH A. STPETER
MICAH STURGEON
TAMARYN L. SWICKHEIMER
RODRIGUEZ M. L. SYKES
JAMMIE J. TAYLOR
BRIAN N. THIELMANN
BRIAN G. THORSON
DANIEL S. TIERNY
NORMAN G. TIPPENS III
NICHOLAS S. TUCKER
ALEXANDRA A. VANE
WILLIAM B. VASS
MICHELLE O. VELEZLANDRON
LEIF E. VESTERMARK
BRANDI M. WALKER
ROBERT S. WALKER
MONICA E. WALROND
DANIELLE K. WALTON
TIARA N. WALZ
GIFTY N. WEEFUR
WENDESIA A. WHITE
DEENA M. WILLIS
TENNILLE A. WITHERSPOON
MATTHEW P. YOUNG
LASHELLE M. ZELLNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

RUSSELL A. BURNHAM
BRYAN C. CHRISTIANSEN
GEORGE K. CLEVENGER
FRANCIS E. CRISS, JR.
ROLANDS J. DALE
CHRISTINA E. DEEHL
JORDAN O. DEMAY
DUSTIN F. DONOFRTY
BRETT F. DOUGHERTY

MATTHEW T. FORD
DONALD R. FRAZEE
LAURIE B. FREEMAN
EVA M. FREMAINT
ANDREA N. GONZALEZ
JAMES E. HUANG
DAVID K. HULSIZER
STEVEN K. HUNTER
MATTHEW P. KURMAN
RODERICK S. LAIRD
GARRETT W. LARSON
GARRETT S. LATHAM
SHAW T. LOCKE
MICHELLE L. LUKE
ANDREA R. MARSHALL
MIKAELA D. MCMANUS
CHAD M. MERFELD
WILLIAM B. MORRIS
NATHAN A. PARSONS
NICHOLAS P. PELLETTIER
KATHLEEN H. ROBINS
SHAY M. ROGERS
JASON N. SHARP
CECIL J. SIMMONS
CHRISTOPHER R. SOLTAS
DENISE H. SOUZA
MICHELLE L. STONE
DAVID H. TAYLOR
BENJAMIN E. THOMPSON
BERNARD TONEY, JR.
ERIC M. WAGNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U. S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

JERAMIE ABEL
ALISON V. ABOUDAUD
WILLIAM A. BASKERVILLE, JR.
CASTAGNETO N. C. BENTON
DANIEL J. BLAND
MATTHEW W. CLARK
KENYON J. CONKLIN
CRYSTAL R. DOYLE
MELISSA A. DUGAN
ROBERT V. HAINLINE
DREW B. HENSCHEN
LEVI D. HOFFMAN
MONIKA P. JONES
DAVID R. MARQUEZ
ROBERT A. MESSENGER
BRITTANI L. ROGERS
NICOLE L. ROWLEY
MAKENSE L. SANTIAGO
CHARLES F. SCHWARTEN
BRIANNA M. SHAVER
SARAHANNE S. SIMPSON
ANNAMARIA TRAVIS
WHITNEY A. WALDSMITH

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KATHERINE L. MEADOWS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER S. ANDERSON
KRISTOFER W. BAIR
ERIC M. BEALL
ROBERT C. BIRCH
BRETT A. BONDS
JAMISON K. BURKS
JUSTIN S. CARTER
BRADLEY S. CASTEEL
JAMES E. DAVIS
GEORGE L. DAY II
CHRISTOPHER J. DEMATTEO
JUSTIN A. DEVIILLAR
DOUGLAS R. DUCKERT
CHRISTOPHER J. FACKRELL
KELLY W. FRY
WILLIAM A. GORUM
DANIEL S. GRAY
THOMAS D. GROARK
CHRISTOPHER J. HALL
RONALD E. HARRISON
SEAN M. HEBAN
CHRISTOPHER A. JONES
HANNAH M. KIM
KIPP K. KRAUSE
EMMA K. MCCARTHY
MITCHEL R. NORMAND
KENT W. NYGREN
MATTHEW S. OLOUGHLIN
JOSHUA M. PAINE
AARON A. PARK
LEE A. PATTERSON
CHRISTOPHER L. PRING
NICHOLAS R. RADZIOW
TYRONE RICHARDSON
JONATHAN SERRELL
STEPHEN C. SHOEN
TODD J. SIMPSON
PETER G. SLYE
MICHELLE P. SMITH
MATTHEW R. SWEET
STEVEN TERJESEN

GEORGE T. THOMPSON III
AUSTIN R. VANOLST
JOSHUA M. VUKELICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be commander

JAMES K. SHORT

To be lieutenant commander

JERRY L. COTTRELL
GINA R. CROW
TRENT T. METLEN
NICHOLAS A. MIDZAK

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

DANIEL MARK SMOLKA, OF ARIZONA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JAMES ROBERT ADAMS, OF IOWA
LEONORE KATHRYN ADAMS, OF MICHIGAN
JESSICA EDITH AKPAN, OF VIRGINIA
LINDSEY LUCIA ALEXANDER-PRINCIPATO, OF VIRGINIA
JUSTIN HUNTER ALLEN, OF VIRGINIA
KARIS KAMITA AMANDO, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH BRITTANY ANCAS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
LAURA JULIA ARRAZA-ROHT, OF CALIFORNIA
KEITH LAWRENCE BABB, OF VIRGINIA
LANCE EVERETT BALDERSON, OF VIRGINIA
JULIE ANN BALLARD, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAELA MORGAN BEANE, OF VIRGINIA
LARA ELLEN BELL, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID THOMAS BERG, OF VIRGINIA
JUDITH A. BLACKWELL, OF VIRGINIA
JUSTIN P. BOSHERS, OF VIRGINIA
ARIE YANKEL BRAZIBLOT, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM DALTON BRANTLEY, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTINA H. BROOKS, OF VIRGINIA
DERRICK EUGENE BULLOCK, OF MARYLAND
PAUL BRYAN BUTKI, OF CALIFORNIA
CAMILO ANDRES CABALLERO, OF GEORGIA
WILSON DAVID CAIBACAS, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH CAMPHOUSE, OF VIRGINIA
ELISE JOELLE CARDOSO, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH NICHOLE TENNYSON CARR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

VIRGINIA AIGAE CHANG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JASON ALLEN CHILDRESS, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN DAVID COMICK, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER JOSEPH COMINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

KELLY COVNE CONLEY, OF NEW JERSEY
MATTHEW SCOTT COULSON, OF TEXAS
EVAN ANDREW COUTTS, OF VIRGINIA
MARCO PATRICIO CRUZ, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN ZACHARIAH DAKE, OF VIRGINIA
MARC DAVIDSON, OF VIRGINIA
ENRIQUE DE LA TORRE, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC CHRISTOPHER DEL MORONE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

WILLIAM ERNEST DENHAM IV, OF TEXAS
RONALD DICKEY, OF VIRGINIA
KATA SADEQ DIEFENBACH, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN WALTER DOUGHERTY, OF VIRGINIA
CLEVELAND DAVID DOWNE, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH D. DUFOUR, OF VIRGINIA
MARC EMI DUPALO, OF VIRGINIA
PETER DUTA, OF VIRGINIA
PAULY EAPEN, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA ELYSE ELKINS, OF MARYLAND
JEREMY MICHAEL ELLIS, OF VIRGINIA
OMAR BASIL FARID, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KATE MARIE FELDMAN, OF VIRGINIA
EUGENE BRASSER FORD, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE A. FOX, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT DALE FRESE, OF MARYLAND
HARRIS LAPIS GARCIA, OF TEXAS
FAIZA SABBAGH GEORGE, OF VIRGINIA
CLAUDE LOUIS GIAMPIETRO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MATTHEW EDWARD GILLWALD, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA KRISTEN GILMORE, OF VIRGINIA
MARI GJURASHAJ, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA CAROL GOLSON, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN ALEXANDER GORDON, OF MASSACHUSETTS
CHRISTIAN D. GRAFF, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRA MYERS GREENE, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD GUARDINO, OF VIRGINIA
EMILY L. HADLEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ZACHARY BILL HALL, OF VIRGINIA
NICHOLAS SCOTT HARNIK, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN ALEXANDER ORVAL HARPER, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN JOHN HENSKER, OF VIRGINIA
PAUL ANDREW HERMAN, OF VIRGINIA
SARA LOUISE HIMES, OF VIRGINIA
REDFORD HONG, OF VIRGINIA
HALEY ANNE HORKEY, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW S. HORNER, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS MICHAEL HYDE, OF VIRGINIA
CALEB EVERETT HYRE, OF VIRGINIA
LEE ROTH IRWIN, OF VIRGINIA
NICHOLAS JOHN JAGER, OF WISCONSIN
JANIE JAMES-HIGH, OF ARIZONA
NAIMA T. KELLEY, OF VIRGINIA
ALLEN WILSON KIM, OF VIRGINIA

AMBER R. KINCAID, OF VIRGINIA
KATHERINE ELIZABETH KLINEFELTER, OF VIRGINIA
NICKOLAS S. KOOP, OF VIRGINIA
MORGAN ELIZABETH LAIL, OF VIRGINIA
BRIAN CHRISTOPHER LAMBERT, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM B LANGAN, OF FLORIDA
DAVID WILSON LARMORE, JR., OF VIRGINIA
JERRY M. LAURIENTI, OF COLORADO
CHRISTOPHER MARSHALL LEGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LEONARD HOOVER LEID, OF PENNSYLVANIA
FRANCIS XAVIER LILLY, JR., OF VIRGINIA
KIRSTIE RAE LINCOLN, OF VIRGINIA
BRADLEY ROBERT LINDQUIST, OF VIRGINIA
CYD E. LITTLE, OF VIRGINIA
DANIELLE KALLETTA LOVE, OF VIRGINIA
NICOLE TRAM LUNDY, OF VIRGINIA
KELLY L. MACHINCHICK, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL SIDNEY MANDELL, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW ROBERT MARCHSTEINER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

STUART FRANCIS MARTIN, OF MARYLAND
ROBIN MASSIMI, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINE JANE MASSOWD, OF VIRGINIA
CARY LINDEN MATTHEWS, OF VIRGINIA
MEGHAN ANNE MCCARTHY, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW WAYNE MCCUE, OF MARYLAND
MICHAEL S. MCGEEHAN, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDER MERCHO, OF VIRGINIA
BRADLEY J. MESH, OF VIRGINIA
MARGUERITE ELLEN SIMON MEYER, OF VIRGINIA
BEVERLY BEASLEY MILLER, OF VIRGINIA
NIDHI S. MISTRY, OF VIRGINIA
SALLY ANN NACCARATO, OF VIRGINIA
RAMI OUSAMA NASER, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA LUCILLE NELSON-DUAC, OF FLORIDA
JESSICA KATE NIEMEYER, OF VIRGINIA
HENRY TYLER NUNLEY, OF OKLAHOMA
KATHLEEN MARSH O'BRIEN, OF MISSOURI
CHRISTOPHER GANTT O'LEARY, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK D. OMASTA, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER KATHLEEN OSBORN, OF VIRGINIA
MARI KATHERINE MICHEEN OYE, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ANNA VICTORIA PALLADINO, OF VIRGINIA
NICHOLAS LEE PARKER, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW DAVID PLUMSER, OF MARYLAND
EMILY RIIS RECTOR, OF VIRGINIA
NATALIE J. REEVES, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY ALAN RHODES, OF VIRGINIA
MARIWYN GRACE RING, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY THOMAS RHODE, OF MARYLAND
TYLER ADAM RUBE, OF VIRGINIA
SCOTT ALLYN SANDNESS, OF VIRGINIA
PETER JAMES SAVAGE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DANIEL JOSEPH SCHMID, OF NEW JERSEY
CHRISTIAN ROBERT SCHMIDLE, OF VIRGINIA
JOSEPH ALBERT SCOTT, OF UTAH
CHARLES VINTON SELBY III, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOHN ANDREW SHEEHAN, JR., OF VIRGINIA
BRYAN CHRISTOPHER SHIPP, OF VIRGINIA
MONICA A. SICKLES, OF VIRGINIA
JEREMY LANE SIMMONS, OF VIRGINIA
ANTOINE SIMS, OF VIRGINIA
RAYMOND ANTHONY SLANINA, OF CALIFORNIA
JEFFREY DAN SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
SOPHIA T. SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
KATHRYN BOILES SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
HEATHER S. SOMERFORD, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH STEADLAND, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINA MARIE STEGURA, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ALICIA LORAIN STEWART, OF VIRGINIA
WENDY C. SUITER, OF VIRGINIA
TYE CASEY SUNDLEE, OF WASHINGTON
JOSHUA ELAM SVENDSEN, OF VIRGINIA
EDWARD IAN SWALLOW, OF VIRGINIA
GEORGE A. TARNOW, OF VIRGINIA
DRAGANA TATIC, OF FLORIDA
DAGMARA KARLA TCHALAKOV, OF INDIANA
PETER CHRISTOPHER TIERNEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

NALANTHIEL RAETEASE TUCK, OF VIRGINIA
RAHUL Y. UPADHYAYA, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS ALLYN VAN BUREN, OF VIRGINIA
CLINT VICKERY, OF VIRGINIA
JEREMIAH WHISENHUNT, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS L. WILSON, OF WASHINGTON
PHILIP JAMES WOLFE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JEFFREY ALEXANDER WOOD, OF VIRGINIA
KENAN ZEKAI YAYBOKE, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER JONGPIL YUN, OF VIRGINIA
HOLLY ALYSE ZANVILLE, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTOPHER M. ZVEARE, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

AMI J. ABOU-BAKR, OF IDAHO
MARVIN E. ALFARO, OF NEW YORK
ERNESTO L. ALFONSO, OF FLORIDA
NICOLE ROYCHELLE BADEN, OF MARYLAND
AGNES NAOM BAUM, OF TEXAS
KRISTINA E. BEARD, OF FLORIDA
ELIZABETH D. BERRETT, OF TEXAS
NORA S. BRITO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRYAN S. CARROLL, OF WASHINGTON
ELIZAN CARROLL, OF TEXAS
AMIT S. CHANDA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GARY K. CHOW, OF CALIFORNIA
GRACE E. CHUNG, OF WASHINGTON
JAMES PATRICK CLARKSON, OF UTAH
JULLION M. COOPER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JORGE A. ORDOVA, OF FLORIDA
COLBY MALLOY CRAM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
EMILY C. DIGNAN, OF FLORIDA
SHANNA L. DURKIN, OF VIRGINIA

CHRISTINE M. EICHINGER, OF FLORIDA
 MICHAEL B. ELKIN, OF FLORIDA
 NEIL P. FINNEGAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 OLIVER W. GAINES, OF TEXAS
 DAVID A. GALLES, OF MARYLAND
 KALI DEWITT GASTEIGER, OF TEXAS
 KATHRYN C. GLUCKMAN, OF FLORIDA
 JACOB L. GOODMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ROBERT D. GREENE, OF TEXAS
 CHARLES N. HALL, OF VIRGINIA
 RYAN M. HANLON, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
 PATRICK J. HEALEY, OF VIRGINIA
 EMILY ELIZABETH HENNELL, OF OHIO
 GRANT H. HUNTER, OF MISSISSIPPI
 KATE E. HUSBAND, OF MICHIGAN
 ESTHER B. JOE, OF CALIFORNIA
 STEVEN G. JONES, OF FLORIDA
 KEVIN P. KETCHUM, OF TEXAS
 KYLE J. LISTON, OF OHIO
 JOSHUA A. MARKS, OF MARYLAND
 ERICA M. MARRERO, OF VIRGINIA
 KELLY M. MCCRAY, OF TENNESSEE
 KATHLEEN E. MCDONALD, OF WASHINGTON
 BRADLEY W. MEACHAM, OF WASHINGTON
 ADNAN A. MIRZA, OF NEW YORK
 ALISA M. MODICA, OF GEORGIA
 AMBER N. MOORE, OF TEXAS
 NAUREEN M. NALIA, OF CALIFORNIA
 MARY E. NAMETH, OF MICHIGAN
 PATRICK H. NEELEY, OF WASHINGTON
 JAKE R. NELSON, OF VIRGINIA
 CHUKWUDI J. NWADIBIA, OF CALIFORNIA
 MIRANDA S. PATTERSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA
 KATHERINE F. PETTERSON, OF NEW YORK
 THERESE M. POSTEL, OF NEW YORK
 MELISSA F. RANN, OF OREGON
 ANTHONY M. READ, OF NEW YORK
 ALLISON J. REDDY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 MICHAEL R. RIEB, OF FLORIDA
 STEPHEN WU SANDERS, OF CALIFORNIA
 JESSE A. SHAW, OF CALIFORNIA
 BRIAN D. SHERIDAN, OF TEXAS
 STEPHANIE A. SHOEMAKER, OF CALIFORNIA
 STEPHANIE R. SOBEK, OF OHIO
 BRYAN M. STRAUB, OF OHIO
 JACOB D. SURFACE, OF INDIANA
 RONALD D. THOMPSON, OF FLORIDA
 SEVAK TSATURYAN, OF FLORIDA
 MICHAEL A. VASLOFF, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL C. WESTENDORP, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 CHRISTINE N. YARNG, OF VIRGINIA
 EMILY YU, OF CALIFORNIA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 31, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

BRITT CAGLE GRANT, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN R. LYONS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BRIAN T. KELLY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. MARK D. KELLY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12208 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. MADDEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JEFFREY L. HARRIGAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS A. BUSSIÈRE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH S. WILSBACH

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN M. TWITTY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS ASSISTANT COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS, AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 604:

To be general

LT. GEN. GARY L. THOMAS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. SUSAN J. PIETRYKOWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JON T. THOMAS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. GREGORY K. ANDERSON
 COL. CHRISTINE A. BEELER
 COL. PETER N. BENCHOFF
 COL. MARK S. BENNETT
 COL. GREGORY J. BRADY
 COL. MICHELE H. BREDEKAMP
 COL. EDMOND M. BROWN
 COL. ROBERT M. COLLINS
 COL. KIMBERLY M. COLLOTON
 COL. DAVID S. DOYLE
 COL. THOMAS J. EDWARDS, JR.
 COL. MARCUS S. EVANS
 COL. BRETT T. FUNCK
 COL. JAMES J. GALLIVAN
 COL. BRIAN W. GIBSON
 COL. AMY E. HANNAH
 COL. JERED P. HELWIG
 COL. DONN H. HILL
 COL. SCOTT A. JACKSON
 COL. JOHN D. KLINE
 COL. GAVIN A. LAWRENCE
 COL. KEVIN C. LEAHY
 COL. MICHELLE M. LETCHER
 COL. CHARLES J. MASARACCHIA
 COL. MICHAEL C. MCCURRY II
 COL. JOHN V. MEYER III
 COL. DUANE R. MILLER
 COL. SCOTT M. NAUMANN
 COL. CHRISTOPHER R. NORRIE
 COL. ALLAN M. PEPIN
 COL. ANDREW D. PRESTON
 COL. MARK C. QUANDER
 COL. JOHN L. RAFFERTY, JR.
 COL. JETH B. REY
 COL. JOSEPH A. RYAN
 COL. JAMES M. SMITH
 COL. BRETT G. SYLVIA
 COL. JOEL B. VOWELL
 COL. TODD R. WASMUND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JAMES F. PASQUARETTE

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JACQUELINE E. BERRY AND ENDING WITH CONNIE L. WINK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON FEBRUARY 6, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY J. ACETO AND ENDING WITH REGIS C. ZOZO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 18, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. BASSO-WILLIAMS AND ENDING WITH IRSHAD A. SHAKIR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE

AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 25, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF VIKHYAT S. BEBARTA, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY F. STUEVER AND ENDING WITH LAVANYA VISWANATHAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 25, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KATHLEEN E. AALDERINK AND ENDING WITH ISALAH S. ZYDUCK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 28, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF NISHA R. BAUR, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JAY T. FLOTTMANN, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER P. WHERTHEY, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ISSA M. ALVAREZ, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF NATHANIEL P. LISENBEE, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF SEAN P. MALANOWSKI, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES W. BARNES AND ENDING WITH BRADLEY A. WISLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADAM D. AASEN AND ENDING WITH GEORGE E. QUINT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ILDA Y. ISAZA AND ENDING WITH YOBANKA E. PAEZ-MUNOZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA S. RIEGER-PINSON, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN J. NORDEEN AND ENDING WITH STEPHANIE E. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2018.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF ALEXIS N. MENDOZAJESUS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SAMUEL B. ALBAHARI AND ENDING WITH RICCARDO C. PAGGETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHNMARK R. ARDIENTE AND ENDING WITH NATHAN A. GUNTER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RYAN J. BERGLIN AND ENDING WITH JAMES A. NARDELLI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. BURRIER AND ENDING WITH WILLIAM T. CIGICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSHUA V. ARNDT, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER Z. FARRINGTON AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL P. THOMAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RODERICK W. SUMPSTER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DANIEL TORRES, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL P. ANTECKI, JR. AND ENDING WITH D014175, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LISA M. ABEL AND ENDING WITH D014651, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DREW Q. ABELL AND ENDING WITH G010393, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELI S. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH D014147, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 20, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ROCHELL A. MAIER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ROBERT C. SOPER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VINCENTE G. ALCIVAR AND ENDING WITH EDWARD W. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 25, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN E. SOLOMON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM J. NELS AND ENDING WITH KELLIE A. WHITTLINGER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 28, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VENDECK M. DAVIS AND ENDING WITH RYAN G. LAVOIE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 28, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HARRY A. HORNBUCKLE AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. KIMBALL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 28, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW W. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH FRANCIS E. SANFORD, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 9, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIAN C. MORGAN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KENNETH F. KLOCK, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRANDON C. KLINK, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BURTON C. GLOVER, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MANUEL REYES, JR., TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF EMMANUEL D. EISENSTEIN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARSHALL L. BARTEE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ETHAN P. CARTER AND ENDING WITH SAMUEL R. WETHERILL IV, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PATRICIA J. RASMUSSEN AND ENDING WITH KENT J. VINCE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEREMY W. BERNDT AND ENDING WITH AMY M. RAMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT M. EVERHART AND ENDING WITH ALBERT SOHNEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM PEREZ, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBYN D. BOLGLA AND ENDING WITH RHONDA D. WYNDR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL C. AMPELAS AND ENDING WITH KURT G. ZIMMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL S. ALLAIN AND ENDING WITH CARMEN M. TUCKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DONNA M. KENTLEY AND ENDING WITH DAVID J. SKELLEY, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KIMBERLY D. DEJESUS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROYAL M. MINOR III AND ENDING WITH BENITO E. RODRIGUEZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDWARD L. BARON, JR. AND ENDING WITH MICHELE M. RICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LORI J. ALLERT AND ENDING WITH LARA K. TERAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CARL W. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH JOHN H. WU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAWUD A. A. AGBERE AND ENDING WITH D010823, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2018.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CYNTHIA A. HOPKINS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL J. LOOMIS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LATONIA M. MAHNKE, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN A. EVISON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF TRAVIS A. MONTPLAISIR, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ARIANA P. BENSUSAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRUCE S. KIMBRELL, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF SAMANTHA C. DUGAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRIAN L. LEES, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KORY A. ANGLESEY AND ENDING WITH BENJAMIN C. WAITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID W. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH HAROLD B. WOODRUFF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN D. ALBANO AND ENDING WITH JAMES P. ZAKAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JANE J. ABANES AND ENDING WITH MICHELLE L. WESTCOTT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW S. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH ADAM B. YOST, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LYNDA S. AMELL AND ENDING WITH CHADWICK Y. YASUDA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LALEH ABDOLAZADEH AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LISA L. ABELS AND ENDING WITH JERRY YUAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 18, 2018.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JAVIER LOPEZMARTINEZ, TO BE COMMANDER.