



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 25, 2019

No. 126

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.

Almighty God, the author and finisher of our faith, we rejoice in the privileges You have strewn on our path. Give us the courage to use our opportunities to serve You and country. May our lawmakers strive to stand for right though the heavens fall. Remind them that evil prospers when good people do nothing. May our Senators also use the gift of intercessory prayer to unlock Your storehouse of blessings so desperately needed in our Nation and world. In hours of hardship, provide them with Your peace. Lord, give our legislators the wisdom that enables them to hasten the coming of Your Kingdom of justice and peace.

We pray in Your sovereign 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. GRASSLEY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2019.

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.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, today we expect the House of Representatives will pass the 2-year government funding agreement the Trump administration and Speaker PELOSI announced earlier this week. I stand with the President, who has publicly expressed his support for the agreement on several occasions. I am grateful to the members of his administration who led the negotiations: Secretary Mnuchin, Acting Chief of Staff Mulvaney, and Acting OMB Director Vought.

Considering the circumstances of divided government, this is a good deal. After the House approves it today with bipartisan support, I expect the Senate to do the same next week. Here is why it is a good deal: It achieves the No. 1 goal on the Republican side of the aisle of providing for the common defense and continuing our progress in rebuilding the Armed Forces of the United States and modernizing them so they can continue to keep Americans safe and project power for years to come. This has been a top shared priority for this Republican Senate and this Republican White House for 2½ years.

Pentagon leaders need stable, reliable, and sufficient resources. The greatest military on Earth should not drift in uncertainty. Our servicemem-

bers deserve better than a string of funding crises and continuing resolutions. Our commanders need predictable resources and sufficient resources to lay the foundations for the future of our national defense.

Servicemembers deserve to deploy armed with state-of-the-art training and cutting-edge equipment; their families deserve the best support services the Nation can offer; and the Nation as a whole deserves the global presence that is up to snuff and competitive with the leaps forward in which our adversaries have invested heavily.

That is why we have delivered historic increases in resources for modernization and DOD reforms—to ensure the U.S. military is strong and agile enough to confront a growing number of threats to America and our interests. That is why just a few months ago we authorized the largest year-on-year increase in defense funding in more than a decade. This funding agreement is the next step forward in that process.

Every Member of this body knows the threats we face are serious and getting more serious: the resurgence of great power competition with nations like Russia and China; the destabilization of influence of state-sponsored terror and regional aggression from bad actors such as Iran; and the testing of historic alliances.

Amidst the growing international chaos, the preeminent obligation of the U.S. government is to provide for the common defense. This agreement prioritizes that commitment to the safety and the security of the American people.

A nation that understands these threats and takes them seriously makes serious investments in the readiness of its own defenses today and the modernization that will preserve their strength into the future.

For years, we have seen China extend its strategic reach, testing the waters of the Indo-Pacific region and beyond.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5073

We have watched its Communist leadership nearly double military spending in the last decade and push the boundaries in everything from offshore territorial claims to 5G technology.

America's edge is in jeopardy. Our allies in the Pacific are uneasy. The administration's budget agreement with the Speaker will allow America to ensure that our own foot stays on the gas pedal as well.

Meanwhile, in the Middle East, we are confronted daily with escalating threats to our allies and interests. State-sponsored terror and proxy actions are becoming bolder. Gray zone activity in places like the Straits of Hormuz is raising the economic and geopolitical stakes of Iran's meddling.

From Syria to Crimea, Russia continues to stretch its legs. Not since the height of the Soviet Union have we seen Moscow this focused on extending influence beyond its borders. All over the world, historic alliances and partnerships like NATO need to be strengthened and renewed for this new landscape.

Fortunately, in the coming days, we will have the opportunity to address all these areas—Europe, the Middle East, the Indo-Pacific, and beyond. That opportunity is this bipartisan spending agreement. So I am grateful to the administration for ensuring that such robust funding for our national security is included in this package. It will make us safer worldwide and make needed investments in our own facilities right here at home, like Fort Knox, Fort Campbell, and the Blue Grass Army Depo, which Kentucky is proud to host.

What is more, I commend the President's team for firmly holding the line on the laundry list of leftwing policy riders that some House Democrats had sought to push throughout their partisan appropriations process over there on the other side.

We are talking about far-left wish list items, things like reversing the Trump administration's decision and getting title X taxpayer dollars flowing back into the pocket of Planned Parenthood, weakening the conscience rights of healthcare professionals, removing protections for the Second Amendment, and efforts that would have weakened ICE and defunded the President's efforts to secure our border.

These are just some of the policy riders the far left had hoped to smuggle into the appropriations process—perhaps using the full faith and credit of the United States as leverage, but the administration froze all of them out. They are not in this deal. They shepherded an agreement that delivers on our most basic responsibility to the American people. They set the stage to provide for the common defense. Today it is the House's turn to follow through, and then, in the near future, it will be ours.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2258

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the title of the bill for a second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2258) to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers.

Mr. MCCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we all know that yesterday former Special Counsel Mueller testified before two House committees. I believe it was crucial for the American people to hear straight from Robert Mueller's mouth that the President was not—underline “not”—exonerated by his report, despite what the President claims. It is utterly amazing. Mueller says something, and the President says the exact opposite to the media. We have never had a President who has lied so often. He knows what Mueller said, but he thinks he can dupe people when he says it, and I hope it is not true.

It is important for the American people to hear straight from Robert Mueller's mouth that the President is not telling the truth when he claims that Mueller found no obstruction. Mueller did not. Anyone who watched the hearing saw it. It was as plain as could be, but that is not the subject of my remarks today.

My remarks are about election security. Above all, it was important for all of us to hear straight from Robert Mueller's mouth that the threat from Russia and other foreign adversaries seeking to meddle in our elections was very real and still very much ongoing.

When asked about Russian interference in our democracy, Mr. Mueller responded:

It wasn't a single attempt. They're doing it as we sit here. And they expect to do it during the next campaign.

Leader MCCONNELL, let me read you those sentences, if you care about America. Mueller said about Russian interference:

It wasn't a single attempt. They're doing it as we sit here. And they expect to do it during the next campaign.

He went on to say that many more countries were developing capabilities similar to what Russia has. He reminded members of the House Intelligence Committee that Russian fake images reached nearly 126 million people on Facebook alone.

As if it even needed to be spelled out, Mr. Mueller added: “Much more needs to be done in order to protect against these intrusions, not just by the Russians but by others as well.”

Mueller's testimony was a clarion call for election security. Mueller's testimony should be a wake-up call to every American—Democrat, Republican, liberal, and conservative—that the integrity of our elections is at stake and to be manipulated by a foreign power.

This is all about the future of this country. If we lose faith in our electoral process, democracy begins to walk away from us, and we will be a different country than the glorious country we have been since 1789. Yet our Republican colleagues put their heads in the sand.

Donald Trump, as usual, with his enormous self-ego, doesn't want to admit the Russians interfered—even though he encouraged it publicly—because he feels it will cast some illegitimacy on his election. The election is over. He is President. I wish he weren't. But that is not the issue here.

The issue is the future of our democracy. And our Republican colleagues, who, once again, either are afraid of President Trump or, even worse, seeking advantage from Russian interference, are keeping their heads in the sand.

We have tried. We have worked with our Republican colleagues to craft several bipartisan bills—Democrats and Republicans alike—to safeguard our election infrastructure and deter any foreign adversary from targeting our democracy in 2020. We have asked the Republican majority on the Appropriations Committee to devote more resources to harden their election systems but to no avail.

Leader MCCONNELL has refused to bring these bills to the floor. Republicans have rebuffed our request for additional appropriations this year. Election security goes into MCCONNELL's legislative graveyard, even though it should be the most nonpartisan of issues.

He has refused—refused—to let us consider anything, using his power as majority leader. And he is backed up by every single Republican who is complicit in not stopping the Russians, as Putin seeks to stretch his long arm and delve into the sacred process of how we elect our officials.

What could possibly be the downside of ensuring our elections are fair and

free from foreign interference? Why would Leader MCCONNELL and every one of our Republican colleagues, who now have failed to step up to the plate even though some of them work with our colleagues on bills, ignore the admonitions of the Founding Fathers, who said that foreign interference is a grave danger to democracy? What could be the downside of ensuring our elections are fair and free? I ask that question of Leader MCCONNELL.

The only excuse I have heard is he says that additional action isn't necessary. Well, Mr. Mueller, who has done far more investigative work on this than just about anybody else, cleared up all of that yesterday. He didn't say we have done enough already. He didn't say we are on top of it. He said that much more needs to be done.

Leader MCCONNELL, do you disagree? Is Mueller wrong? Are all the experts wrong—the FBI, appointed by President Trump; the NSA, appointed by President Trump; and all those leaders who say we need to do more? We have heard them.

We are going to continue our fight for election security. We are not going to let Leader MCCONNELL put the bills passed by the House into his legislative graveyard without a fight. You are going to hear from us on this issue over and over again.

The legislative graveyard of Leader MCCONNELL is known from one end of the country to the other. Americans know he doesn't want to help them. He doesn't want to help middle-class Americans.

The graveyard of our Republican colleagues, in obeisance to powerful and special interests, gets larger, more stunning, and more debilitating to this country every day.

Yesterday, Democratic Senators requested unanimous consent to pass some election security legislation that they have worked on, much of which was bipartisan. The Republican majority blocked them. Soon—I believe in about an hour—I will be asking unanimous consent on the House-passed election security bill. It is sitting here. It is in the leader's drawer. Is he going to let this go to the legislative graveyard? We will see in an hour. I hope at least one of my Republican colleagues will come to the floor and urge that we vote on this or at least debate it and amend it—one.

The Republican leader's intransigent resistance to this effort is inexplicable. Why he wants to put election security in his legislative graveyard is impossible to explain on a logical basis. I believe his intransigence and his resistance are untenable.

When I move in about an hour for unanimous consent to bring the House bill to the floor, maybe something will be chirping in some of the brains of some of my colleagues here and say: We can't allow the Russians to interfere, and we have to do something.

If they don't agree with what the House passed, let them propose amend-

ments or let them propose an alternative, but let us debate. This is a national security issue of paramount importance.

I urge my friend the leader to stand down and let election security come to the floor. If he doesn't, all of America will know, when Russia interferes, why.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on another matter—this is on deficits. I am not in the habit of commenting on every opinion issued by newspapers I don't typically agree with, but this week, the Wall Street Journal wrote such a howler of an editorial that I feel compelled to.

The Wall Street Journal editorial board criticized the latest budget agreement for its increase in domestic spending, wringing its hands over the effect on deficits, while simultaneously praising defense spending, which the editorial board believes, for some reason, has nothing to do with deficits.

This, by the way, is the same editorial board that played head cheerleader for the Republican tax bill, which contained such mammoth tax cuts for the biggest corporations and the already wealthy that it will add \$2 trillion to our deficits—\$2 trillion. Huge tax cuts contributed more to the deficit than all of these spending programs put together, but the Wall Street Journal cheered on the tax cuts and now says: Don't spend for the middle class on things like education and infrastructure that have broad support in America and helping kids go to college. Don't spend on that because it increases the deficit, but it is OK to pass massive tax cuts for the rich and the big corporations that are already profitable.

So, for the sake of the record, the Wall Street Journal editorial board believes deficits are really bad but only if they are caused by investments in Americans' healthcare or education or infrastructure. When deficits are caused by defense spending and when deficits are caused by tax cuts for the wealthy, they are peachy.

The truth is, so many of my Republican friends have engaged in the same egregious bit of hypocrisy. So I have a few words this morning for my deficit-scolding friends Mick Mulvaney and the Wall Street Journal editorial board: A deficit is a deficit is a deficit. They try to make the argument that massive tax cuts won't create a deficit, but all the numbers that are coming in now and are projected in the future say that is just not true. If the Wall Street Journal really cared about deficits above all, they wouldn't have supported the tax bill.

When the Senate debated these tax cuts in 2017, there were several proposals on the table—many Democrats and Republicans supported them—that would have reduced taxes on corporations while remaining deficit-neutral.

Many would have changed the Tax Code in ways I didn't support, but nonetheless they would have held revenues and expenditures in line. We didn't hear a peep out of the Journal to support those proposals—oh, no. Democrats even put together a deficit-neutral middle-class tax cut at the time, but Republicans ignored it and pushed through Congress a bill that lined the pockets of the wealthy—blowing a \$2 trillion hole in our deficit. The Wall Street Journal could have said something then. They didn't. They were asleep at the switch. They were asleep at the switch then, and they are crying now.

The fact is, Republican tax cuts for the wealthy and endless wars in the Middle East, championed by George Bush and the Republican Party, are the big drivers of the Nation's debt and deficit, not nondefense domestic spending.

President Obama, to his credit, cut the budget deficit in half during his term. The last time we had a surplus was under a Democratic President, Bill Clinton. In fact, every single Republican administration has added to the deficit, while every single Democratic administration has shrunk it since 1981—Reagan, deficit increased; H. W., deficit increased; Bill Clinton, deficit goes down; George Bush, deficit increased; Obama, deficit goes down; Donald Trump, deficit going up. What does that say?

So, to the Wall Street Journal editorial board and my Republican friends who are silent about Trump-era deficits but rail against domestic spending, I say: Spare us. Enough. Enough with this deficit hypocrisy.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, on climate, I want to congratulate my dear friend, one of the most intelligent, hard-working, articulate Senators we have, SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, on reaching a rhetorical milestone. Usually "rhetoric" and "milestone" don't go together, but in his strong eloquence on the environment, they do.

Yesterday, Senator WHITEHOUSE gave his 250th speech on the subject of climate change. Many Members of this Chamber have yet to speak 250 times on the floor in total, much less on a single topic. Senator WHITEHOUSE's speeches have covered everything from sea level rise to polar cap ice melting and the effect of climate change on our economic security and our national security. He has diligently shone a light on the impediments to legislative progress on climate change, and he waxes fervent and poetic, condemning the web of dark money that funds fraudulent climate research and lobbies against climate action.

Much more important than Senator WHITEHOUSE's milestone, of course, is the issue he is talking about. Each passing week brings another proof point that climate change is happening

right now and reshaping our planet for the worse, moving so quickly that, at some point, we will not be able to recover no matter what we do.

The world will be so much worse for our children and grandchildren. I think of my 8-month-old—just turned 8 months on the 24th—my little grandson. Will his world be the same as ours? Will it be just as beautiful, or will it be flooding and fires and changes that make his life and the lives of his whole generation far more difficult? If we do nothing, that will happen.

Carbon levels in the atmosphere are at the highest point ever in human history. Just days ago, NBC reported that this will be the hottest July on record. Last month, June, was the hottest June on record.

We all know the consequences will be devastating, just devastating to our planet if we fail to take action soon. It is time for the Senate to debate serious, significant policies to address climate change. And, parenthetically, it is another place McCONNELL's legislative graveyard unfortunately gains—gains more and more. He will not do anything on climate change, as important as it is.

Let me thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on this issue. Maybe Leader McCONNELL will read his 250 speeches and have a change of heart. I doubt it, but who knows? I wish that all of my colleagues on the other side would listen to him and join Democrats in our efforts to pass legislation to combat climate change.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, one more point on Puerto Rico. Last night, the Governor of Puerto Rico, Ricardo Rossello, announced he will resign on August 2. I am glad that the Governor has listened to the voices of the people of Puerto Rico. It is clear he lost their trust, their respect, and certainly the mandate to govern. The most important thing now is a quick and orderly transition of power so that our fellow citizens on the island can turn the page on this difficult chapter and move forward.

No matter what, we have to stand with the people of Puerto Rico. The island is still a far way off from recovery after the devastation of recent hurricanes. It is essential that the local Puerto Rican economy continue to recover and that basic services performed by the government continue undisturbed as that process continues.

As a new Governor enters office, we pledge to do whatever we can to ensure the people of Puerto Rico receive the aid and the support they need. We fought incredibly hard on the disaster bill to make sure the people of Puerto Rico are not treated worse than any other U.S. citizens. The events of the past 2 weeks should in no way inhibit that aid from reaching the island quickly and efficiently. It is so badly needed. I will be watching and doing

everything in my power to guarantee that is the case.

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.

Mrs. MURRAY. 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I come to the floor today to sound once again the alarm against Republicans' efforts to throw the lives of millions of families into chaos and uncertainty and to urge my colleagues to reverse course and join Democrats to protect people's healthcare before it is too late.

A few weeks ago, President Trump and Republican attorneys general argued in court to create a healthcare crisis for families in our country. If Republicans win their blatantly partisan lawsuit, the consequences could be sweeping and devastating. Tens of millions of people who have healthcare coverage through Medicaid Expansion or the exchanges could lose it, as could many young adults who are on their parents' insurance.

Over 100 million people with pre-existing conditions could lose protections that stop insurance companies from charging them more, excluding benefits they need or denying them coverage entirely. Patients could lose protections that require insurers to cover essential health benefits like prescription drug costs, maternity care, emergency care, or mental healthcare and more. Limits on how much patients have to pay out of pocket could go away, while lifetime and annual caps on patients' benefits could come back even to those insured through their employers.

Republicans have refused to acknowledge what is actually at stake now for the patients and families whose health they are putting at risk, and they have made it all too clear that despite the horrible consequences they are setting up, despite the lives they are throwing needlessly into jeopardy, Republicans are going to go full steam ahead with this reckless lawsuit to strike down healthcare for millions and without any plan to do anything if they win.

Some Republicans have tried to dodge this fact by saying they will fig-

ure it out after they win. That is an incredibly telling and incredibly alarming position. It is about as comforting as an arsonist telling you he will rebuild your house after he burns it down.

Let's be clear. Republicans have no plans for the patients who lose their coverage, no plans for the families who will see their healthcare costs go up, and no plans for people nationwide who rely on these protections for pre-existing conditions that could be taken away. They have no plan for all the people who will be hurt by the damage they are fighting to cause, and families expect better. They deserve better.

This is not rocket science. People want us to protect their healthcare, not take it away. They want us to bring healthcare costs down, not send them certainly higher. They want us to fight for them, not against them.

Republicans have made the wrong choice time and again. So I call on my Republican colleagues to stop this chaos and work with us. Let's fight for patients before it is too late. The clock is ticking, and patients and families are watching closely. If Republicans in the Trump administration refuse to end this partisan lawsuit, families and patients will be the ones who suffer the consequences, and they will not forget the Republicans who stood by and cheered and let it happen.

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

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

MOON-MARS DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, those of us who have had a chance over some time now to work with the former Speaker of the House, Newt Gingrich, know that he is a man of ideas and is often thinking well beyond the moment. I had a chance the other day to read a paper that he prepared on President Trump's Moon-Mars Development Project, and I want to borrow heavily from his thinking as I talk about this project today.

It is an important time. We just spent significant time remembering, appreciating, and looking back at the 50th anniversary of American astronauts landing on the Moon and returning safely. Fifty years goes more quickly than you might think.

But for the first time in that 50 years, we are really at a point where there is a chance that we could cease to be the leading power in space. We decided we were going to become the leading power in space; we became the leading power in space; we have been the leading power in space. But that is

not necessarily a given, and you can last only so long living on your past accomplishments.

President Trump, on the Fourth of July, made this comment: “I want you to know that we are going to be back on the moon very soon, and someday soon we will plant an American flag on Mars.”

My guess is that was received with sort of the same amount of skepticism as President Kennedy’s challenge was more than 50 years ago. There is no question that the Artemis Project that President Trump is talking about is not the Apollo Project 50 years later. This is no longer an effort just to go somewhere and get back. We know we can do that. It is an effort to look at where we might go next and why we might benefit from that.

In May of 1961, President Kennedy challenged the Congress by saying we “should commit [ourselves] to achieving the goal”—talking about the goal of getting to the Moon—we “should commit [ourselves] to achieving the goal, before this decade is out, of landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth.”

There was pretty heavy skepticism. I think 58 percent of the American people polled said they were opposed to doing that. Why would we send somebody to the Moon and worry about whether we could get them there? Of course, if we got them there, we would want to get them back. There was great skepticism.

So a little over a year later at Rice University, President Kennedy tried again. He said: “We choose to go to the Moon in this decade and do the other things, not because they are easy, but because they are hard.”

That is one of his famous quotes. If you look back at President Kennedy’s challenge to the country, you hear it: We are going not because it is easy, but because it is hard.

He went on to say “because that goal will serve to organize and measure the best of our energies and skills, because that challenge is one that we are willing to accept, one we are unwilling to postpone, and one we intend to win.”

There is nothing wrong with an America that wants to win. There is nothing wrong with an America that doesn’t want to take second place. There is nothing wrong with an America that wants to set a standard that everybody else can hope to achieve.

We had been caught a little flat-footed in the midfifties when the Russians put a satellite in space—Sputnik. Americans would go out and see if they could measure when it was passing over because they had put something up there that appeared to be there perpetually.

Then there was a cosmonaut in space. President Kennedy said that we don’t want to accept anything more than the opportunity to meet big challenges and show what we can do to test ourselves.

The Vice President of the United States, Vice President PENCE, said at

the National Space Council in Huntsville, AL, on March 26 of this year that “50 years ago, ‘one small step for man’ became ‘one giant leap for mankind.’”

You really had to be trying to avoid it not to hear that quote last week as it was being repeated over and over again. The Vice President said that now it’s come time for us to “make the next ‘giant leap’ and return American astronauts to the Moon, establish a permanent base there, and develop the technologies to take American astronauts to Mars and beyond.”

That’s the next “giant leap.”

You will note here that the direct connection between Moon development and going to Mars, as the President put it, is there. It is the reason to go back to the Moon. It is the reason to do what we can to understand the Moon. Our goal is not just getting to the Moon. Of course, we have already done that. Our goal is to be there and to do that in a way that works for us.

John Marburger, President George W. Bush’s science adviser, said in 2006: “The Moon is the closest source of material that lies far up Earth’s gravity well.”

This is the closest place we can go and get material that can be used with 3D printing and all sorts of things that are possible to construct on the Moon that weren’t possible to construct anywhere in that same way just a few years ago.

The first phase of science on the Moon would be a lot like exploring Antarctica. I haven’t been to Antarctica. I would like to go sometime. We don’t have people on Antarctica because Antarctica is an easy place to live; we have people staying all the time on Antarctica to see what we could learn by being on the continent of Antarctica all the time. The next phase of the Moon would be like that, with people going to the Moon, staying on the Moon, and looking at opportunities on the parts of the Moon where we believe there is ice. I know the formula for this. If you have ice, you probably have some form of water. If you have water, lots of things can happen that might not happen otherwise.

This is a project that will inspire others to want to be part of it, whether it is Jeff Bezos or Elon Musk or Richard Branson or Paul Allen—who has passed on, but was intrigued by the Moon. They are all people who have great private resources.

America was founded on a public-private model. Jamestown, Plimouth Plantation, and the East India Company all had private individuals with government sponsorship trying to make something happen that wouldn’t happen otherwise. That, I suggest, can happen on the Moon.

In Newt Gingrich’s telling of the challenge on the Moon, he repeated that great story of what happened at Wollman Rink and how it might relate to what could happen on the Moon if you are not bound by the normal things that bind a lot of people. Every

person thinking about the Moon-Mars project, according to former Speaker Gingrich, should look at what Donald Trump did at the Wollman Rink. The Wollman Rink was a very popular site for ice skating in New York City in 1980 when it broke down. It totally broke down. The city of New York spent 6 years and \$13 million trying to fix the ice rink. Fortunately, I guess, for the city of New York and ice skaters who go there, the abandoned ice rink happened to be within sight of President Trump’s apartment. He kept complaining about the ice rink and the failure of the city to do anything about the ice rink. Finally, Mayor Koch said to Donald Trump: Why don’t you fix it if you think this is so easily done? And he did. He fixed the ice rink in 4 months for \$2.25 million. I remember the city had already spent \$13 million and failed to fix the ice rink.

The first year after the ice rink was fixed, 225,000 people skated on the ice rink. One reason the President was able to do that as a private citizen was that he wasn’t bound by the things that bind most people. He wasn’t bound by the things that bind the government. The historic project to fix the Wollman Rink achieved the goal at 1/5 the cost and 1/18 the time that the city had used and did not get it done, and ice skaters flourished.

The same kinds of things could happen if we looked beyond the normal boundaries of what could happen in this project that the President has talked about.

Remember, on the effort to get to the Moon, President Kennedy turned that project over to Vice President Johnson and said: You are going to be in charge of NASA, and you are going to be the point person on the Moon project. So there is a little history there that may be repeating itself when, in March this year in Huntsville, AL, the Vice President outlined the principles we could use to meet the goals that the President had established for our efforts in space.

Principle No. 1 was to establish a big goal and then stick to it. Remember, we went to the Moon to start with, not because it was easy, but because it was hard. Establish a big goal, then stick to it. “Failure to achieve our goal to return an American astronaut to the Moon in the next 5 years is not an option,” according to the Vice President.

Principle No. 2, Be prepared to reach outside the traditional bureaucracy to new, entrepreneurial, private companies if it is necessary to get the job done. He went on to say:

[W]e’re not committed to any one contractor. If our current contractors can’t meet this objective, then we’ll find ones that will. If American industry can provide critical commercial services without government development, then we’ll buy them.

We will buy into that project and share it with them. If commercial rockets are the only way to get American astronauts to the Moon in the next 5 years, then commercial rockets will be the way we return to the Moon.

Principle No. 3, Be willing to change the bureaucracy rather than abandon the goal.

[We will call on NASA not just to adopt new policies but to embrace a new mindset. That begins with setting bold goals and staying on schedule.

A new mindset matters. Failure is not an option. The willingness to postpone our goal, as President Kennedy said almost 60 years ago, is not an option.

Principle No. 4, Be determined to change the bureaucracy in fundamental ways.

NASA must transform itself into a leaner, more accountable, and more agile organization. If NASA is not currently capable of landing American astronauts [men and women] on the Moon in five years, we need to change the organization, not the mission.

By the way, as for principle No. 5, I know, in the Presiding Officer's case, it is coming from private business and might be his most important principle.

Principle No. 5, Urgency must replace complacency.

The hardest thing to achieve in government is just to drive to a result. The fifth principle that the Vice President set out is exactly that. It is not just competition against our adversaries; it is, frankly, competition against our worst enemy—complacency. It is competition against our own willingness to believe that things aren't going to happen that clearly can happen.

This is a great goal. It is a step to the Moon and beyond. It is a step outside our solar system to other solar systems. In our lifetimes, we may not see much of that, but this is not about our lifetimes; this is about a step into the future.

I applaud the President and the Vice President for their leadership here. I look forward to applying those five principles. By the way, I think almost all of those principles are five principles we could apply to government every day, and we would have a more effective government if we would.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

ELECTION SECURITY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request. I know my colleague from Connecticut has one as well. In deference to the leader's schedule, I will speak for a few minutes on mine, and then I will yield to Senator BLUMENTHAL. He will speak for a few minutes on his, and then we will wait for the leader, who is supposed to come out in about 5 minutes, to object, if he so chooses. We will make the request after that.

Now, yesterday, everybody heard Special Counsel Mueller, and there was a lot of dispute about obstruction of justice and things like that. There was virtually no dispute about two facts that Mueller said. One, the Russians interfered in our elections in 2016, and, two, they plan to do it in 2020.

We rise on the floor because, when Russia or any foreign power seeks to interfere in our elections, it eats at the wellsprings of our democracy.

The Founding Fathers, in their wisdom, said that one of the greatest threats to our democracy was foreign interference. Now we are faced with the specter of it, and we are asking our Republican colleagues to join with us in doing everything we can to stop it. This is serious stuff.

Mr. Mueller said yesterday:

Russian interference wasn't a single attempt. They are doing it as we sit here, and they expect to do it in the next campaign.

That is Robert Mueller, one of the most authoritative voices on this issue.

Mueller warned that "much more needs to be done" to fortify against future attacks, not just from Russia but from others looking to interfere in our elections as well.

Mr. Mueller is not the only one calling for action on election security. FBI Director Wray, appointed by President Trump, has said the same. Director of National Intelligence Coats, also appointed by President Trump, has stressed that foreign actors "will add new tactics as they learn from 2016."

So we must do more. This is not a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. This is not a liberal issue or a moderate issue or conservative issue. This is an issue of patriotism, of national security, of protecting the very integrity of American democracy—something so many of our forebears died for.

And what do we hear from the Republican side? Nothing. There is no credence to the claim made by the leader that we have already done enough in this Chamber. Mueller, Wray, and Coats all said that we need to do more—all of them.

Here in the Senate, the Senate Intelligence Committee, led by Senator BARR of North Carolina, a Republican, has recommended we do more. They too say otherwise. Yet Leader MCCONNELL and the Republican majority refuse to do anything.

So in a moment I am going to ask unanimous consent to pass legislation that safeguards our election. This legislation passed the House nearly a month ago. It would provide immediate resources for the States to modernize their election infrastructure and establish a consistent funding stream to maintain it.

The States say they need more money. It will require the use of paper ballots. Almost every expert agrees that that is needed to protect elections from manipulation, because if they manipulate the machines, the paper ballots will be a safeguard.

It would require States to conduct postelection risk-limiting audits, and it would shore up the cyber security of voting systems and ensure that election technology vendors are held to the highest standards so the Russians or no one else can hack into these machines and interfere.

These are not revolutionary changes. They are basic commonsense steps to greatly improve the security of our elections after President Putin conducted a systemic attack on our democracy and intends to do it again.

The House has passed this bill already. We could deliver it to the President today.

Now, the Republican leader has already indicated his intention to bury this bill in the legislative graveyard. That is a disgrace. That would be as if we said: We don't need a military. We don't need ships off our shores or planes in the air.

Attacks on our elections are as great a threat to our national security as any other, and yet, for reasons inexplicable, the Republican leader refuses to bring legislation to the floor, legislation that has been crafted in a bipartisan way.

Many of the bills that are before us have Democratic and Republican sponsors, and if the rumors are true, the leader urged the Republicans to back off.

There are only two inferences, neither good. One is that the Republican side doesn't care about interference in our elections, and the other is that they want it because maybe they think it will benefit them.

I know that President Trump doesn't like to talk about this. He childishly thinks this will cast aspersions on the legitimacy of his election. That is sort of a very babyish, selfish thing to think when our security is at risk.

But where are our Republican colleagues when our national security is threatened? Where are our Republican colleagues? If we invite the Russians to interfere by not doing enough and they do and Americans lose faith in the fundamental wellspring of America, our grand democracy, this is the beginning of the end of democracy in this country.

As George Washington, James Madison, and Benjamin Franklin warned us, we must do all we can to prevent foreign interference in our elections. By allowing this UC request to go through, we will be taking a giant first step. I hope the leader goes along.

And, again, if he says the States don't need it, the States say they do. They are the judge.

I will be asking my request in a minute, but first let me yield to Senator BLUMENTHAL, who will also have a UC request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from New York, our distinguished leader, for his very powerful and compelling remarks and for his steadfast leadership on this issue of election security.

The issue of election security goes to the core of our national security. In the last Presidential election, this Nation was attacked. It was an attack as pernicious and insidious as any in this country's history, although it was less

visible than bombs dropped at Pearl Harbor and less dramatic than the attacks on our troops elsewhere, whether in Iraq and Afghanistan. It was an attack on this Nation, and some of us have called it, in fact, an act of war on both sides of the aisle.

On both sides of the aisle there has been unanimity, in fact, that the attack was by the Russians through social media and through other means and tools of misinformation and disinformation to interfere with our election. That unanimity comes not only from Robert Mueller, a distinguished public servant and dedicated American, but also from our entire intelligence community.

There is only one person in a position of authority who disagrees, and that is the President of the United States, who finds Vladimir Putin more credible than our intelligence community and has said so publicly.

In a few moments, I will ask for unanimous consent for the passage of S. 1247, the Duty to Report Act, which would address the President's saying very explicitly that he would accept outside help from a foreign power, again, in the course of an election.

The proof is overwhelming that the Trump campaign accepted it in the last election. But even disputing those facts, even putting aside the President's contention that there was never an attack from the Russians, the opinion is overwhelming that we must act on a very simple idea: If you see something, say something.

The Duty to Report Act that I have offered would require companies, candidates, and family members to immediately report to the FBI and to the Federal Election Commission any offers of Federal assistance.

It codifies into law what is already—I think we all agree—a moral duty, a patriotic duty, a matter of common sense. It is already illegal to accept foreign assistance during a campaign. It is already illegal to solicit foreign assistance during a campaign.

All this bill does is require campaigns and individuals to report such illegal foreign assistance directly to the FBI.

Yesterday, Robert Mueller came before Congress to answer questions about his sweeping investigation and 448-page report. This report documents compellingly and convincingly the most serious attack on our democracy by a foreign power in our history. It tells the story of 140 contacts between the Trump campaign and Russian agents. It proves Russian covert and overt efforts to influence the outcome of our election by helping one candidate and hurting another. It shows powerfully the Trump campaign's knowledge of that effort and willingness to accept that help.

Mueller testified yesterday:

Over the course of my career, I've seen a number of challenges to our democracy. The Russian government's effort to interfere in our election is among the most serious. As I

said on May 29, this deserves the attention of every American.

The legislation Senator SCHUMER is offering through unanimous consent now, the legislation that I am offering by unanimous consent now, is necessary as a matter of urgent national security. We have no choice but to defend our Nation and our democracy. Given the sweeping, sophisticated attack by the Russians outlined in the Mueller report and confirmed by his testimony yesterday, we have an obligation to act now, as we would against any impending attack in our history.

Just the day before yesterday, FBI Director Christopher Wray came before the Judiciary Committee and warned that the Russians are actively trying to interfere in our elections right now, in real time, as we speak here. He has told this body that if a foreign agent or government tries to help a campaign, the FBI would want to know about it. That also is a matter of simple moral duty, patriotic duty, and common sense.

When asked if he would accept foreign help in 2020, the President said, "I'd take it." This is much like when his son, Don Junior, said "I love it" in response to Russia's offer of assistance to the Trump campaign in the June 9th meeting now infamous in these Halls and in the country.

When Mueller was asked about this yesterday, he said, "I hope this is not the new normal, but I fear it is." Well, it doesn't have to be the new normal if Congress passes the Duty to Report Act. This legislation would ensure that if any campaign—literally any campaign—were offered any assistance from any foreign government in any future election, the FBI would learn of it.

Mr. President, 2016 was just a dress rehearsal. We can expect that the same will happen with greater intensity and sophistication in the election to come. We have a duty to act against it—taking the measure sent to us by the House of Representatives, introduced for unanimous consent by Senator SCHUMER now, and the Duty to Report Act now—so that we protect our democracy going forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from 21 attorneys general saying they need more election assistance to protect against foreign interference.

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

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
St. Paul, MN, June 18, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD SHELBY,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ROY BLUNT,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Washington, DC.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Vice Chair, Senate Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.

Hon. AMY KLOBUCHAR,
Ranking Member, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, Washington, DC.

DEAR HONORABLE COMMITTEE MEMBERS: The undersigned Attorneys General write to express our significant concern regarding the persistent threats to our election systems and to urge Congress to take action to protect the integrity of our election infrastructure.

Intelligence officials and the Department of Justice continue to warn that our election systems have been a target for foreign adversaries and that those same adversaries are currently working to undermine the upcoming elections. The Special Counsel's Report concludes that Russia interfered in our elections in a "sweeping and systematic fashion." New reports confirm that Russia successfully breached election systems in Florida and the Department of Homeland Security is reviewing computers used in North Carolina after the state experienced irregularities on Election Day. In addition, documents leaked by the National Security Agency show that hackers working for Russian military intelligence installed malware on a voting systems software company used in eight states, including North Carolina. Russia's military intelligence service also broadly performed reconnaissance on state and local election boards, researched—and in some cases targeted—the election infrastructure of all 50 states, successfully invaded state election websites to steal sensitive information from tens of thousands of American voters, and hacked into a company that supplies voting software to states across the U.S.

In the wake of these attacks on our democracy, the Congress and Federal Government have taken some important steps to address the threats facing our democracy. The Department of Homeland Security is working with states to improve election security, and in the 2018 Omnibus, Congress provided \$380 million in grant funding to help states secure their election systems. The Election Assistance Commission, the federal agency charged with disseminating and auditing the election security grants, projects that states will spend approximately \$324 million, or 85 percent of the grant funds, prior to the 2020 elections. This funding was an important first step in helping to secure our election infrastructure, however more must be done. Our state and local election officials are on the front-lines of the fight to protect our election infrastructure, but they lack the resources necessary to combat a sophisticated foreign adversary like Russia. Therefore, we respectfully request that you provide additional assistance to states seeking to modernize their elections systems and take the following actions to protect our elections from future attacks:

Provide additional election security grants to states and localities. Today, more than at any other time in our nation's history, election officials face unique challenges that require access to federal financial support. Additional funding for voting infrastructure will not only allow states to upgrade election equipment and voter registration systems and databases, it will allow them to further fortify their election systems from

future cyberattacks. Sustained federal funding is necessary to pay for continued training, equipment replacements, software upgrades and implementation of security controls. This funding is vital if we are to adequately equip our states with the resources we need to safeguard our democracy.

Support the establishment of cybersecurity and audit standards for election systems. It is critical that the federal government work with elections officials and technical experts to establish guidelines and best practices for election security. We believe that the U.S. Election Assistance Commission should update its standards for voting machines and take a stronger regulatory role in testing voting equipment before it is sold to states. The federal government should also keep state elections officials closely informed about suspected breaches, alerts, and related intelligence. There should be clear channels of communication so that local and state officials can share information with federal authorities.

Pass election-security legislation. Last year, a group of state attorneys general voiced support for the Secure Elections Act, bipartisan legislation that would improve information sharing and strengthen election security. We reiterate our support for action on election security reform. The National Association of Secretaries of State and our state elections officials can be a valuable resource as Congress considers specific proposals.

The nature of the threat against our election systems requires the federal government to provide increased assistance to the states. Securing our election systems is a matter of national security and we hope that you will take immediate action to protect our election infrastructure and restore Americans' trust in our election systems.

Keith Ellison, Attorney General of Minnesota; Philip Weiser, Attorney General of Colorado; Kathleen Jennings, Attorney General of Delaware; Kwame Raoul, Attorney General of Illinois; Brian Frosh, Attorney General of Maryland; Dana Nessel, Attorney General of Michigan; Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of California; William Tong, Attorney General of Connecticut; Clare E. Connors, Attorney General of Hawaii; Tom Miller, Attorney General of Iowa; Maura Healey, Attorney General of Massachusetts; Jim Hood, Attorney General of Mississippi; Aaron D. Ford, Attorney General of Nevada; Letitia James, Attorney General of New York State; Ellen Rosenblum, Attorney General of Oregon; Peter Neronha, Attorney General of Rhode Island; Mark R. Herring, Attorney General of Virginia; Hector Balderas, Attorney General of New Mexico; Josh Stein, Attorney General of North Carolina; Josh Shapiro, Attorney General of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; T.J. Donovan, Attorney General of Vermont; Bob Ferguson, Attorney General of Washington State.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2722

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2722, the SAFE Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that 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 majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what my friend the Democratic leader is asking unanimous consent to pass is partisan legislation from the Democratic House of Representatives relating to American elections. This is the same Democratic House that made its first big priority in this Congress a sweeping partisan effort to rewrite all kinds of the rules of American politics—not to achieve greater fairness but to give themselves a one-sided political benefit.

The particular bill the Democratic leader is asking to move by unanimous consent is so partisan that it received one—just one—Republican vote over in the House. Clearly, this request is not a serious effort to make a law. Clearly, something so partisan that it only received one single solitary Republican vote in the House is not going to travel through the Senate by unanimous consent.

It is very important that we maintain the integrity and security of our elections in our country. Any Washington involvement in that task needs to be undertaken with extreme care and on a thoroughly bipartisan basis. Obviously, this legislation is not that. It is just a highly partisan bill from the same folks who spent 2 years hyping up a conspiracy theory about President Trump and Russia and who continue to ignore this administration's progress in correcting the Obama administration's failures on this subject in the 2018 election; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, just for a moment, there are bipartisan bills on this issue which the Republican majority has objected to. I suggest to my friend the majority leader, if he doesn't like this bill, let's put another bill on the floor and debate it. So far, we have done nothing—absolutely nothing in this Chamber to protect our country and its election security.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1247

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I have a separate bill. It has not come to us from the House, but it should have bipartisan support.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1247; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, for the information of all of our colleagues, I want to provide an update on the remaining items the Senate needs to complete before we adjourn for the August State work period.

Here is what we need to accomplish before Members depart next week: We need to confirm well-qualified nominees to two open positions of utmost importance—the Deputy Secretary of Defense and our Ambassador to the U.N. These jobs are important, the nominees are impressive, and we need to confirm David Norquist and Kelly Craft next week.

Obviously, we need to pass the bipartisan funding agreement that President Trump's negotiating team worked out with Speaker PELOSI. The House will pass it today. The President is strongly in support of it. The Senate needs to pass it and put it on the President's desk next week.

We need to make more headway on the backlog of qualified judicial nominees who are waiting for confirmation, so next week we will also need to process a significant, bipartisan package of district court nominees.

That is our to-do list for next week—the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the U.N. Ambassador, the bipartisan government funding agreement, and a significant group of well-qualified judges. Not bad for a week's work. That is what the Senate will accomplish before we adjourn for August.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 119.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Michael T. Liburdi, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Michael T. Liburdi, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

James Inhofe, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, Joni Ernst, Kevin Cramer, Ben Sasse, Pat Roberts, John Boozman, Mike Crapo, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker,

Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt,
Mitch McConnell.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 120.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Peter D. Welte, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Peter D. Welte, of North Dakota, to be United States District Judge for the District of North Dakota.

Mitch McConnell, Kevin Cramer, Mike Crapo, John Kennedy, Thom Tillis, Richard C. Shelby, James M. Inhofe, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 203.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of James Wesley Hendrix, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of James Wesley Hendrix, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Kevin Cramer, Mike Crapo, Marco Rubio, John Kennedy, Thom Tillis, James M. Inhofe, Rob Portman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Boozman, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Lindsey Graham, John Hoeven.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 204.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Sean D. Jordan, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Sean D. Jordan, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 205.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Mark T. Pittman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark T. Pittman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 231.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey Vincent Brown, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jeffrey Vincent Brown, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 232.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Brantley Starr, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Brantley Starr, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 233.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Stephanie L. Haines, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Stephanie L. Haines, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 326.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Ada E. Brown, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ada E. Brown, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 327.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Steven D. Grimberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Steven D. Grimberg, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 345.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jason K. Pulliam, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jason K. Pulliam, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 350.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Martha Maria Pacold, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Martha Maria Pacold, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike

Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 352.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Steven C. Seeger, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Steven C. Seeger, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 364.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of William Shaw Stickman IV, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of William Shaw Stickman IV, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 48.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Karin J. Immergut, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Karin J. Immergut, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

Mitch McConnell, David Perdue, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, Mike Braun, Bill Cassidy, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, John Boozman, Marco Rubio, Kevin Cramer, James E. Risch, Pat Roberts.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John Milton Younge, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John Milton Younge, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 344.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Mary S. McElroy, of Rhode Island, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mary S. McElroy, of Rhode Island, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 346.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Stephanie A. Gallagher, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Stephanie A. Gallagher, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 351.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The bill clerk read the nomination of Mary M. Rowland, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mary M. Rowland, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Pat Roberts, Mike Rounds, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Kevin Cramer, John Hoeven, Rob Portman, Dan Sullivan, Chuck Grassley, Richard Burr, John Thune, Roy Blunt.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

The Senator from Massachusetts.

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, yesterday the American people finally heard at length directly from Special Counsel Robert Mueller. In his testimony before the House Judiciary Committee and the Intelligence Committee, the special counsel gave voice to his report on Russian interference in our 2016 Presidential election and President Trump's obstruction of the investigation into it.

What the American people and I heard from Special Counsel Mueller was an explanation and confirmation of the deeply troubling findings and conclusions of his investigation and his written report. He told us that the Trump campaign welcomed the help of a hostile foreign power, Russia, to influence our 2016 election, accepted that help, lied repeatedly about it, and benefited from it.

He confirmed that there was voluminous evidence that President Trump had obstructed justice through his efforts to interfere with and impede the special counsel's investigation. Most importantly, contrary to the President's claims, the special counsel confirmed that his investigation had not exonerated the President of the crime of obstruction of justice. When asked, Robert Mueller made this crystal clear,

testifying that “the President was not exculpated for the acts that he allegedly committed.”

In his testimony yesterday, Special Counsel Mueller did not back away from any of his written report’s findings. The American people saw and heard him emphatically defend them.

Special Counsel Mueller, a decorated war hero, gave every single American cause for deep alarm when he called Russian interference in support of the Trump campaign “among the most serious challenges” to American democracy that he had ever seen.

He agreed that it was “unpatriotic” and “wrong” to seek campaign help from a foreign power, and he decried President Trump’s failure to acknowledge or respond to the systematic and sweeping Russian interference, warning: “They’re doing it as we sit here.”

Yesterday, Donald Trump tried to defend himself in tweets while Robert Mueller defended our democracy with his testimony.

The special counsel’s testimony and events of the past few weeks have led to the undeniable conclusion that it is time for the House of Representatives to begin a formal impeachment proceeding against President Trump.

I stand here today on the Senate floor, the place where an unprecedented trial would occur, understanding the gravity of this moment in our Nation’s history. I stand here today because I believe we have reached the moment where we must stand up for the survival of our democracy.

Before I came to this decision, I said that I needed to hear directly from Special Counsel Mueller and other witnesses, that Congress needed to obtain documents, and that we needed to gather all the facts and evidence.

I had hoped that the House Judiciary Committee’s investigation would get us answers to the questions about the President’s obstructive conduct that remained after Special Counsel Mueller issued his report. I had hoped that the President, who continues to insist that he did nothing wrong, would cooperate and that the House Judiciary Committee would receive testimony and other evidence from the Trump campaign and Trump administration witnesses. That has not happened, and that is because of continued and deliberate Presidential obstruction.

Just listen to the numerous roadblocks that the President has put in Congress’s way since Special Counsel Mueller issued his report in March. President Trump has denied the entire Congress access to the full and unredacted version of the Mueller report and its underlying materials.

President Trump has claimed that key witnesses, like former White House Counsel Donald McGahn and former White House Communications Director Hope Hicks, are immune from testifying or simply don’t have to comply with congressional subpoenas.

President Trump has opposed testimony from two of the special counsel’s

top deputies and restricted the scope of the Mueller testimony, and President Trump has vowed to fight any future congressional subpoenas.

What we have seen from President Trump is a pattern of repeated and baseless defiance of the House’s constitutional authority to investigate, especially subpoenas seeking evidence that the President obstructed justice and abused his power.

The President has engaged in stonewalling that shows an unprecedented disregard and contempt for a coequal branch of government under our Constitution—disregard and contempt that would make Richard Nixon blush with envy.

Taken together, Special Counsel Robert Mueller’s testimony and the President’s obstruction of the congressional investigation compel us to immediately begin a formal impeachment inquiry.

I do not come to this decision lightly. An impeachment proceeding against the President of the United States is a matter of the highest constitutional magnitude, but when the evidence demonstrates that the President of the United States obstructed the special counsel’s investigation and when the facts and the evidence demonstrate that the President of the United States is continuing to obstruct justice, seeking to derail a legitimate congressional investigation into the lawfulness of his conduct while in office, then Congress must do its constitutional duty and act.

The acts of obstruction that Special Counsel Mueller described in his report and in his testimony yesterday to Congress are impeachable offenses—a view shared by myriad constitutional scholars, attorneys, and prosecutors.

The President improperly pressed then-FBI Director James Comey to drop the investigation of former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn and, subsequently, fired Comey because of the Russia investigation—confirmed yesterday by the special counsel’s testimony.

The President unlawfully demanded that then-Attorney General Jeff Sessions reverse his recusal from the Russia investigation and take over the investigation—confirmed yesterday by the special counsel’s testimony.

The President engaged in witness tampering and falsification of government records when he directed White House Counsel Don McGahn to fire Robert Mueller and later pressured McGahn to deny that it had happened—confirmed yesterday by the special counsel’s testimony.

The President engaged in a coverup when he sought to prevent public disclosure of evidence about the infamous June 9, 2016, Trump Tower meeting—confirmed yesterday by the special counsel’s testimony.

The President abused his constitutional authority by holding out the prospect of pardons in exchange for witnesses’ silence—confirmed yesterday by the special counsel’s testimony.

That Robert Mueller found so much evidence that this President committed impeachable offenses might be shocking, but it should not be surprising. After all, look at what we have learned about this President during his 2½ years in office, what he is willing to say and what he is willing to do.

Did an American President put family members in high-level White House policy positions—positions requiring security clearances that should never have been issued? Yes, he did.

Did an American President repeatedly show infatuation with and express sympathy for authoritarian figures around the globe, most notably Vladimir Putin, the man who interfered with the 2016 election to President Trump’s benefit? Yes, he did.

Did an American President face multiple, repeated, and credible allegations of sexual assault by more than a dozen women—sexual assault that he bragged about on tape? Yes, he did.

Did an American President become known as individual No. 1, in effect an unindicted coconspirator on charges of Federal campaign finance law violations that were brought against his lawyer, Michael Cohen, in New York? Yes, he did.

Did an American President seek to divide Americans based on race, religion, and ethnicity, directing racist language at elected Members of Congress and urging others to celebrate that hate? Sadly, yes, he did.

We have watched as Donald Trump has given the Constitution a stress test, the likes of which we haven’t seen in 230 years. We have watched him attack judges and seek to intimidate the judiciary.

We have watched him disregard Congress’s coequal role in government under article I of the Constitution, whether by spending unappropriated money on his border wall, relying on “acting” government officials to eviscerate the Senate’s advice and consent function, or ignoring legitimate oversight requests.

We have watched the President sue Congress in order to block release of his tax returns and refuse to disclose any meaningful information about his business operations, especially sources of foreign investment and loans, raising alarming questions about violations of the Constitution’s emoluments clause.

This President relishes attacking the freedom of the press and has incited violence against journalists for exercising their First Amendment rights.

Donald Trump is tearing at the fabric of our democracy, literally, every single day. And yesterday, the Congress and the American people heard the facts and evidence that Congress can and should act to hold him accountable.

In the face of impeachable offenses, it is the Constitution that entrusts the Congress with the responsibility of deciding whether to remove a President of the United States from office for

high crimes and misdemeanors. Indeed, in the face of evidence of serious and persistent misconduct that is harmful to the Nation, Congress would be abusing its constitutional discretion and setting a dangerous precedent if it did not begin an impeachment inquiry.

If the evidence of obstruction of justice and other wrongdoing that Robert Mueller explained yesterday is not evidence of impeachable offenses, what is? What damage would a future President have to inflict in order to trigger an impeachment inquiry?

I have no illusions about where an impeachment inquiry will lead. My Republican colleagues have thus far shown themselves unwilling to hold this President accountable. They believe that everything is “all over.” But the evidence in the Mueller report and the special counsel’s testimony yesterday explaining it, defending it, and reaffirming it compel us to do what is right and what is necessary, and that is to exercise our authority and begin an impeachment proceeding against Donald Trump. Nothing less than our democracy is at stake. I call upon my colleagues in the House of Representatives to do so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BUDGET AGREEMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, I have one message for my colleagues in the Senate and those who might be watching. It is about this chart, which is very simple. This is the line of what we call discretionary spending. This is about 31 percent of the budget. That is the budget agreement you have read about in the newspapers the last couple of days. That is what we are talking about.

It is a blue line. It has to do with paying for our national defense, so it is about half of the dollars; then for our national parks, America’s best idea; then for the National Institutes of Health, the source of medical miracles ranging from restoring your heart to curing Zika to the National Laboratories, which are the sources of our competition with the rest of the world. That is what this money is for.

What the blue line recognizes is that for the last 10 years, the growth in spending for national defense, national parks, the National Institutes of Health, and National Labs has gone up at about the rate of inflation, and for the next 10 years, including the budget agreement that the President and the congressional leaders recommended this week, it will go at about the rate of inflation.

The point is, for 20 years—2008 to 2029—the increase in spending for the amount of money we are talking about and for the type of spending in the budget agreement is not the source of the Federal deficit. What is? Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest—that is the red line that 10 years ago was \$1.8 trillion. At the rate we are going, it will be \$5.4 trillion in 10 years.

That is not the type of spending we are talking about in the budget agreement.

My message today is in support of properly funding national defense, national parks, National Institutes of Health, and National Labs and not beating our chest and pretending that we are balancing the budget on the backs of our soldiers, our medical miracles, and our national parks when, in fact, it is the entitlements that the President and the Democrats and the Republicans in Congress need to address.

I will talk about the blue line today. I have talked about the red line plenty before. Former Senator Corker and I introduced legislation a few years ago that would have reduced the growth of this red line by \$1 trillion over 10 years. The only problem was, we were the only two cosponsors of the legislation.

The budget deficit is vitally damaging to our country, but the budget agreement that President Trump recommended is not the source of the budget deficit. That part of the budget is under control. That is 31 percent of all the dollars we spend in the United States. Just add to that, if this continues for another 10 years, this blue line—national defense, national parks, National Institutes of Health, National Laboratories—is going to go from 31 percent of the budget to 22 percent of the budget, and mandatory spending is going up to 78 percent. This is the budget deficit. This is the budget agreement we are going to be voting on next week. That part of the budget is under control.

Here is what the budget agreement, which the President recommended and our Democratic and Republican leaders in the House and Senate have recommended and which I strongly support, does. The first thing it does is suspend the debt limit—the amount we can borrow. If we don’t do that, we have a global fiscal crisis. We all know that, so we need to do it.

Second, it raises the defense and non-defense discretionary budget caps. That is this blue line down here. That is the amount of money we can spend, as I said, on national defense. That is about half of the spending—and then our veterans, National Labs, biomedical research, and national parks.

Let’s talk about the military for just a minute. Former Secretary of Defense James Mattis, who had enormous respect here in Congress, said that “no enemy in the field has done as much harm to the readiness of the U.S. military than the combined impact of the Budget Control Act’s defense spending caps, worsened by operating for 10 of the last 11 years under continuing resolutions of varied and unpredictable duration.”

In plain English, what that means is that because of the President’s leadership and the recommendations of our bipartisan leaders, we will avoid what Secretary Mattis said has been so damaging to our military.

Here is what happened. Back in 2011, we passed the Budget Control Act to try to limit this part of the budget. That came after a special committee was appointed, which everyone hoped would deal with this part of the budget—the problem part, the part that is causing the deficit.

The Budget Control Act came up with a formula that everybody thought would work. They said: Well, if we put in there that we will have dramatic reductions in military spending, Congress will never do that, so they will be forced to finally do something we all should have had the courage to do a long time ago, and that is deal with entitlements.

What happened? We didn’t deal with the red line, and we cut the military. We cut the military badly over the last 10 years, and we are just now beginning to catch up. Last year, Congress avoided sequestration and increased discretionary spending for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

Let me say it again, because I am going to repeat it over and over and over: We increased spending last year at about the rate of inflation. That is not the cause of the Federal deficit. Reaching that agreement, though, meant that for the first time in nearly a decade the Department of Defense received its budget on time, and it received a record funding level for research and development.

This new 2-year budget agreement that the President has recommended will rebuild our military by providing \$738 billion for defense discretionary spending for 2020 and \$740 billion for 2021.

It will also allow us to fulfill the commitment we made as a part of the New START Treaty in 2010 in December. I voted for that, and part of the deal with President Obama was that if we passed the treaty limiting nuclear weapons, we would make sure that ours worked. President Trump said the other day that Russia has 1,111 nuclear weapons, and they all work. We don’t want them to use them, and the best way to keep them from using them is to make sure ours work.

We have reached a budget agreement so that we can get to work on the appropriations bills and hopefully get many of them done before the end of the fiscal year, which is the 30th of September. That is important to the military especially.

When I met with Secretary of the Army Mark Esper, who was approved by a big vote yesterday as Secretary of Defense, we talked about what it meant to have an appropriations bill passed into law on time, instead of a so-called continuing resolution, which is just a lazy way to go. It just says to spend next year what you spent last year, which means we don’t spend for the things we need to spend, and we don’t stop spending on the things we shouldn’t spend.

Here are some of the benefits of passing the appropriations bill on time,

which would mean October 1. It keeps large projects on time and on budget. That is true in the Defense Department, and it is also true other places. We have a big project called the Uranium Processing Facility at Oak Ridge, TN, which comes through the Energy and Water Appropriations Committee, which I chair, and Senator FEINSTEIN is the ranking member. We made sure that is on time and on budget—\$6.5 billion by 2025. But if we don't appropriate the money on time and on budget, we can't finish the project on time and on budget, and who is hurt by that? Our national defense and our taxpayers or the Chickamauga Lock in Tennessee.

All of the Army Corps of Engineers leaders have told me: Don't start these projects and then stop them. Don't stop and start and stop and start. That wastes money and slows things down.

So, for the last several years, we have continued steady reconstruction. We need to pass these on time and on budget.

Also, it keeps equipment maintenance at the Department of Defense on schedule. That saves money. There is more research and development for new technologies. It speeds up modernization of current equipment and keeps military training on schedule. That means soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are properly prepared for prompt combat, and it prevents accidents.

This new 2-year agreement also helps our veterans. In 2018, President Trump signed the VA MISSION Act, which the Senate passed by a vote of 92 to 5. The MISSION Act gave veterans the ability to seek medical care outside the Department of Veterans Affairs and see a private doctor closer to home. So if you are 60 miles away in the State of Nebraska or Kansas or Tennessee and you need medical care and you can't be seen at a VA facility, you can see a private doctor close to home. This budget agreement makes sure we have enough money to support that, and I will ask the staff here how much that is.

Senator PERDUE said yesterday that 40 percent of the increase in the spending in this budget agreement, on the discretionary side, is to help veterans with the Choice Program. So it is not even in the national defense part of the budget; it is in the nondefense part of the budget. It helps veterans. So 40 percent of this increase is helping veterans on top of what we spend for defense, and we still keep the spending at about the rate of inflation. That is not the source of our budget deficit.

It is important for the American people to know that the Republican majority in Congress has worked together with Democrats to provide record levels of funding for science, research, and technology. In the Senate, Senator BLUNT from Missouri and Senator MURRAY from Washington State have provided the leadership for that in the Appropriations Committee.

In April 2016, Francis Collins, Director of the National Institutes of

Health, told our Appropriations Committee—I am a member of that, as are Senator DURBIN and others; we worked on this together—that with adequate and consistent funding, he can make 10 bold predictions about some of the medical miracles he expects over the next several years. He talked about regenerative medicine that would replace heart transplants by restoring your heart from your own cells. He talked about vaccines for Zika, for HIV/AIDS, and for the universal flu, which kills tens of thousands. He talked about an artificial pancreas. He talked about cures for Alzheimer's or at least medicines that would identify the symptoms—that would identify Alzheimer's before the symptoms and do something about it.

Since fiscal year 2015, the Appropriations Committee has increased funding for the National Institutes of Health by \$9 billion, or 30 percent. From \$30.3 billion in 2015 to \$39.34 billion in fiscal year 2019, Senator BLUNT and Senator MURRAY did that by cutting some programs and increasing the National Institutes of Health. They did it all down here in the blue line that stays within the rate of inflation—not up here in the red line. That is called good government.

I can't tell you the number of leaders of academic and research institutions I meet who say that the young investigators in our country are so encouraged by this new funding for biomedical research, and they are busy working on the next miracles. That is what consistent funding will do.

Dr. Collins came back to the committee this year, and I asked him if he was ready to update those bold predictions. He said: We are close to a cure for sickle cell anemia—sickle cell disease—and a new, nonaddictive painkiller which in my view would be the holy grail in our fight against opioids. With this new budget agreement, Congress could increase funding for the National Institutes of Health for the sixth consecutive year to continue this life-saving research and do it all within the blue line, which is not the cause of the Federal budget deficit.

Let's go to the Office of Science. Last year, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee that I chair with the Senator from California, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the ranking Democrat, agreed, along with Congress, for the fourth consecutive year—and President Trump signed it—to provide record funding for the Department of Energy's Office of Science. With this new budget, we can do it for 5 years. What does this mean? This means funding for the 17 National Laboratories, including the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, which are America's secret weapon. No other country has anything like our National Laboratories. Many Americans worry about competition from China and other parts of the world. How do we meet that competition? Through innovation.

Where does that innovation come from? It is hard to think of a major ini-

tiative that has not come since World War II without some federally sponsored research funding. Funding our Labs is important and helps keep us first in the world in supercomputing. Why is supercomputing important? Because it keeps our standard of living high and keeps our national defense on its toes.

China knows that. Two years ago, China had the two top supercomputers, but today the United States has the two fastest supercomputers in the world and the Exascale computing project will deliver the next generation system starting in 2021. This accomplishment is not the result of 1 year of funding or one political party but 10 years of bipartisan effort through the Bush, Obama, and Trump administrations, Democratic and Republican, to try to make sure America is first in the world of supercomputing. We did it all under the blue line over the last 10 years. The funding went up at the rate of inflation, not through the Moon like in entitlements which is the source of the Federal budget deficit, not the money we spend to keep ahead of China and Japan in supercomputing.

On national parks, Ken Burns and others say America's national parks are our best idea. There are 417 of them. They have a badly deferred maintenance backlog. Senators PORTMAN, WARNER, KING, myself, and others are working with President Trump, who supports our legislation, to try to cut half of the deferred maintenance in the national park backlogs in the next 5 years. We are going to use money from energy on Federal lands to do that.

Americans are often shocked to find when they go to Federal parks that bathrooms don't work, roofs leak, and campgrounds are closed because there is not enough money for maintenance. This budget helps make sure our national parks are something Americans can continue to enjoy—all 418 of those parks—and we do that under the blue line that goes up at the rate of inflation, not at the budget-busting rate of the entitlements line.

I have said this over and over, and it needs to be said over and over. The red line is mandatory spending. The blue line is discretionary spending. The blue line will be \$1.6 trillion at the end of 10 more years. The red line will be \$5.4 trillion at the end of 10 more years. Ten years ago, the blue line was 1.1 and the red line was 1.8. What do you think the problem is for the source of the Federal budget? You don't need a Ph.D. in mathematics to figure this out. It is not this line. It is not national defense; it is not biomedical research; it is not supercomputing; it is not the Army Corps of Engineers. It is this one line—entitlements. It is our fault for not having dealt with it, but we shouldn't beat our chest and pretend to balance the budget by decimating the work on that blue line. Discretionary spending is only 31 percent of the money. Mandatory spending is the rest of the funding. It will increase from 69 percent of

total spending to 78 percent in 2029. The spending on national parks, national defense, National Institutes of Health, and National Labs will be reduced to 22 percent. I don't believe we can properly defend our country, properly keep up our parks, stay first in the world in supercomputing, and expect to continue biomedical research that produces lifesaving miracles if we squeeze all the money out of the blue line and let it go up in the air on the red line.

The United States is experiencing robust economic growth, and there is a lot of political talk in this Chamber but no one really disputes that. Our economy is growing and growing. We have not seen anything like it in a long time. There have been 6 million new jobs created just since President Trump was elected, with the lowest unemployment rate in 50 years, at 3.7 percent.

Before Congress passed the major tax reform in 31 years, our gross domestic product was projected to be a little less than 2 percent over the next 10 years. For the first quarter of 2019 this year, actual gross domestic product was a little over 3 percent. Higher GDP and lower unemployment leads to higher family incomes and more revenue for the Federal Government. More revenue for the Federal Government reduces the debt.

I urge my colleagues to support this 2-year budget agreement. To those who are worried about the Federal debt, I am worried about it too. That is why Senator Corker and I put our bill in to reduce by a growth of \$1 trillion over 10 years what is happening with this red line. If we want to talk about the Federal budget deficit, let's talk about where it really is. Let's talk about the red line, which has gone from \$1.8 trillion 10 years ago and is projected by the Congressional Budget Office to go to \$5.4 trillion 10 years from now.

Let's not pretend we are balancing the Federal budget by focusing on the part of the Federal budget that is under control, the part that funds our military, national parks, biomedical research, and National Labs. For the last 10 years, it has gone up at about the rate of inflation, and for the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office—including this 2-year budget agreement which only affects the blue line, not the red line—it goes up at the rate of inflation. So I am proud to support it. I believe it is the right thing to do, and when the House sends us a chance to vote for it next week, I hope it gets a big vote from the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, let me just take a few minutes here to share an idea that when we come back next week, we will be talking about the budget. We are going to be talking about making really difficult, very difficult decisions.

I would state that we on the Senate Armed Services Committee have an ad-

vantage over some of the other people because one of the critical areas in the budget coming up is how we treat the military. I think it is important for people to understand that if you are a member of the Armed Services Committee, you are in a position to know something the other Members don't know. It may sound like someone is not doing their job, but that is not true at all.

When you are on the Senate Armed Services Committee, there are hearings that take place. Starting in January, there are posture hearings. Posture hearings normally take about 6 hours a week. In posture hearings, we find out about matters that others just don't have time to find out about unless you are a member of the committee. If you are a member, you are sitting there for 3 hours a week.

I don't say this critically of the previous administration because—I would say, in the Obama administration, the top priority was not defending America. In fact, he established something called parity. Parity meant that for every one dollar put into the military budget, we have to put one dollar into the nonmilitary budget. That had never happened before, at least it had not happened since World War II. At that time, it was established that national defense would be our priority. Every Democrat and every Republican President at that time all the way up until the Obama administration had defending America as the top priority.

What happened during that administration was that we actually had a dramatic reduction. If you use constant dollars, that reduction took place between 2010 and 2015, using constant dollars. For this description, we used 2018 dollars. Going into 2010, it was about \$794 billion. Going into 2015, it was \$586 billion or something like that. So there was about a 25-percent reduction in the defense budget in a 5-year period. That had never happened before in the history of this country. Yet we suffered through, and we paid dearly for it.

A lot of people are not aware of it, unless you are on the Armed Services Committee because we see it. When the current President came in, President Trump, his budget boosted that back up. Now we are talking about real dollars, and it was \$700 billion in fiscal year 2018. Then for fiscal year 2019 it was \$716 billion.

Now we are getting into where we are today in the current budget. We passed a defense authorization bill, and in it we actually came out agreeing that we had to get to \$750 billion. Someone might ask why. We had something called the National Defense Commission report. It was a document that was a good document that talked about how we were going to need to appropriate because during the Obama administration we saw China and Russia become peer competitors in many areas. In fact, they ended up with some things better than ours. Let me give an example. Artillery during that period

of time for both China and Russia had us outranged and outgunned. How many people know that? People assume America has the best of everything. Well, that was true up until this time.

Air and defense, there were only two Active-Duty battalions with no new technological advancements. Nothing happened during that time. That allowed China and Russia to start creeping up and getting ahead of us.

On nuclear triad modernization, we had no modernization increases at that time, but Russia and China did. In fact, China actually has today a nuclear triad, and Russia is actually building one. The U.S. defense against electronic warfare—we didn't have that kind of a defense. With Russia, you can remember what happened in Ukraine.

Hypersonic weapons is the newest thing that people talk about. It is a type of weapon system that moves five times the speed of sound. It is the weapon system of the future. Prior to the past administration, prior to the Obama administration, we were ahead in our research on hypersonic weapons, but by the end of that time and up until this new administration came in, we were actually behind Russia and China. I only say that because we really took a hit.

The only time—we have had three opportunities, one in fiscal year 2018, one in fiscal year 2019, and then another on the budget we are going to be voting on this coming week. That was our opportunity to catch up.

I would just say this: If you are on the Armed Services Committee, you have an obligation because you are in a unique position of knowing the efficiencies that we have. Others don't have that. Many of the Members take the time and they find out that they can get this done.

But we are in a position where—General Dunford, as an example, said that we have lost our qualitative and our quantitative edge in artillery. We are actually outnumbered 5 to 1 by China and 10 to 1 by Russia. In air and missile defense, China and Russia have weapons that prevent access—we call them SAMs, surface-to-air missiles. Nuclear modernization—no real U.S. modernization took place during that time. We had some of our top people admitting that we had deficiencies, and we quickly tried to correct them.

Along came fiscal year 2018. In fiscal year 2018, we got back up to a \$700 billion budget, and we started working on things. We had the manual. It is a manual I normally bring down with me to the floor when we talk about this because this is something that everyone agreed on as the manual was put together. It was the NDS Commission report. It was put together by 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans—all experts in national defense—and everyone agreed that would be our blueprint to pull us out of where we were at that time, and it was working. We were on schedule to do it. We are currently on schedule with this budget.

It says that while we are rebuilding our military, we should be anticipating that we have to increase our military spending by between 3 percent and 5 percent over this period of time. That is a net increase. Well, the budget we came out with in the defense authorization bill was \$750 billion, and it was a budget that almost gets us there but not quite.

The President's budget agreement that came out the other day has a figure of \$738 billion. That is very close to where we are supposed to be. It is a 2-year budget, and that is a good thing for the military. Those of us on the Defense Committee understand that. So that brings that \$738 up to \$740.5 billion for 2021, so it is very close to the \$750 billion defense authorization.

I only say that because that makes it more important for anyone who is serving on the Senate Armed Services Committee to be in a position to know what I just said. And that is something that most people don't know, and I don't believe that most of the Members of this body know, but those who are on the committee do know it. We have to keep in mind that this budget is going to be the only way that we are going to be able to do what needs to be done.

This is the short version. I will come back and talk more this coming Monday and give a lot more details than I gave now. I will say this: I would encourage any member of the Senate Armed Services Committee to understand that they are in a position to know what the problem is, and a lot of other people do not know this. I would anticipate that members of the committee would be in that unique position to know and would be supporting a budget that gives us enough room to get back into position to recover from the losses that we took from the previous administration. That is what is at stake. That is what we are anticipating. I would anticipate that our members from the committee should be doing that.

I yield the floor.

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

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am on the floor this afternoon to talk about an issue that I have come to this floor other times to speak about, and that is the drug crisis we face in this country. In fact, I am told that over the last 3 years, I have now come to the floor 58 times to address this topic—to talk about the opioid crisis, talk about the new resurgence of crystal meth, and talk about what we can do about it.

I will tell you, during those 3 years, we made a lot of progress, not just in talking about this issue but doing something about it. We put new policies in place at the Federal level for better prevention, better treatment, better longer term recovery, and to also help our first responders—specifically, to give them access to this mir-

acle drug naloxone, which reverses the effect of overdose.

Congress passed legislation, like the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, the Cures legislation, and the STOP Act. We have provided actually more than \$4 billion of additional funding for these programs—particularly for treatment—over just the last few years. In Ohio alone, we have received \$140 million through CARA and Cures since they were signed into law. That money has gone toward innovative, evidence-based programs that are actually making a difference. We had to do this because this crisis has gripped our country in the worst drug epidemic ever. More people are now dying every year from overdoses from these drugs than died in the entire Vietnam conflict, as an example. We have never seen anything quite this bad, so we responded, as we should have, at the national level to a national crisis.

Working with States, localities, nonprofits, people out there in the trenches doing the hard work, we are beginning to make a difference. Last week, the Centers for Disease Control—CDC—issued a report with their latest statistics on overdose deaths. While drug overdose deaths are still way too high, they show we are actually seeing a reduction.

By the way, this is the first time we have seen a reduction in opioid overdose deaths in more than 8 years. Think about that. Every year for 8 years, we have seen increases in deaths, to the point that we had over 70,000 people a year dying of overdoses in 2017. In 2018—we now have the numbers in from CDC—it went from roughly 71,000 to roughly 68,000. Again, that is way too high. No one should be satisfied with that. But after increases every year, to have a 4-percent decrease nationally shows that we are beginning to turn the tide. Let's keep doing what we are doing. We cannot pull back now. If we do, it will just go back up again. Actually, it is the first time since 1990, I am told, that nationwide overdoses from any kind of drugs—opioids and other things—have decreased in a calendar year. That is the first time since 1990.

In Ohio, we did even better from 2017 to 2018. We had more than a 4-percent drop; we actually had a 22-percent drop in Ohio. That is partly because my home State has been ground zero for this. Like West Virginia, Kentucky, and other States, we have been hit really hard. To go 22 percent below where we were the previous year is progress, and we should be proud of that. Still, we are seeing overdose rates that are way too high. Overall, around the country, 33 States had reductions.

As I said earlier, the area where we made the most progress is in combating opioids, partly because of legislation we passed here. Particularly, we tried to address this issue of prescription drugs, heroin, and fentanyl.

The Washington Post recently published a stunning analysis showing why

it is so important that we continue to push back and how we got here. They showed that for the 6 years between 2006 and 2012, there was an absolutely unbelievably high number of shipments of prescription pain medications. Oxycodone and hydrocodone were the ones they focused on, which account for three-quarters of the total opioid pill shipments to pharmacies.

In a single CVS pharmacy right outside of Cleveland, OH, more than 6.4 million pills were delivered during that 6-year period. Think about that. In one small pharmacy, there were over 6 million pills. Overall, the Post found that over that period, more than 3.6 billion prescription pain pills were supplied to Ohio. That is "billion" with a "b." That is an astounding number. That means that during those 6 years, there were approximately 313 opioid prescription pain pills prescribed for every single man, woman, and child in Ohio. That is what we are talking about here.

Obviously, this was used as a way for people to take these pills and spread them, not just in Ohio but in other places, causing immense harm because people got addicted to these pills and turned to heroin and fentanyl. Many of these people are people who not just have an addiction but end up having overdoses, and many of them died.

This week, the largest civil trial in U.S. history will begin in my home State of Ohio. I think it is appropriate that it is in Ohio. This will consolidate cases from around the country. More than 2,000 cities, counties, Native American Tribes, and others will sue some of the biggest pharmaceutical companies and major distributors for their role in this drug crisis. The pharmaceutical companies and the distributors are going to be sued in court in Ohio through a consolidated case. This is the biggest civil trial, they say, in the history of our country.

Two of the Ohio plaintiff counties—Cuyahoga and Summit—have been among the areas in my State that were hardest hit by opioids. No wonder they are part of this lawsuit. In 2016, the death rate from pharmaceuticals—opioids, painkillers—in Cuyahoga County was 3.26 times the national average. In Summit County, so many people died from overdoses that a mobile morgue had to be created in order to help process the bodies. I was there in Summit County during that time period. They actually had to bring in a mobile unit to be able to deal with all the overdose deaths.

The more we find out about the sheer number of pills these drug companies pumped into the United States—more than 76 billion overall during that period—the more it is clear that lawsuits like this are going to be necessary to get to the bottom of what happened and require these entities to help those who were affected by these pain pills. A lot of these people turned to other substances that were more accessible and less expensive, like heroin, but had

started with an addiction to pain medication. We are pushing back against the opioid pill industry that flourished for too long within our borders. That is a positive sign.

While the CDC showed an overall decrease in overdose deaths, as I talked about earlier, there are some troubling trends that have continued.

First, while the number of opioid overdose deaths fell, the number of overdose deaths fell related to synthetic opioids—specifically, cheap and dangerous fentanyl—actually rose. Heroin and prescription drugs went down, but actually, for the synthetic opioid—which is 50 times more powerful than heroin and unfortunately produced overseas and shipped into our country—those numbers actually rose. Fentanyl deaths actually rose. In fact, last year, more deaths were attributed to fentanyl than to heroin and prescription drugs combined.

Fentanyl is the big new danger. There is overall progress, but fentanyl is getting worse. We had a report last week of a single kilo of fentanyl being seized in Middletown, OH, which is enough of the drug to kill more than half a million people. This was in our community, Middletown, OH. That is enough of the drug to kill more than half a million people.

We are beginning to push back on fentanyl, as some of you know, through legislation, including the STOP Act, which got passed in this Chamber and in the House. This is doing a better job with keeping this poison from coming through our U.S. mail system, which is where most of it has been coming from. Our own postal system has been the conduit for this poison. Most of it is coming from one country—China. It is produced in chemical labs there by unscrupulous scientists and chemists and then sent through the mail.

The 2019 audit by the inspector general of the Postal Service found that the Postal Service identified and pulled a package requested by Customs and Border Protection 88 percent of the time. This was an improvement from only 79 percent of the time the year before, in 2017, and only 67 percent of the time in 2016, but it is still not complying with the STOP Act. The STOP Act says 100 percent, not 88 percent.

Again, why is that important?

This stuff is getting in through the mail. If the U.S. Customs and Border Protection can identify these packages and screen them and pull them offline, less of that poison will come into our neighborhoods. It also raises the price of this product, which is part of the problem right now—that it is not just powerful and deadly but also inexpensive.

Overall, it was said that the Postal Service missed a number of packages—12 percent—due to operational errors. We can't afford these operational errors. It is too important.

We need to ensure that all packages that enter the United States have the kind of information we need to be able

to track potentially harmful packages once they get inside our border. This is advance electronic data. It is not required everywhere, but it needs to be.

The STOP Act requires the Postal Service to do that, including with 100 percent of the packages coming in from China. It required it, by the way, by December 31 of last year. Yet the Postal Service just informed us on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, on which we did this work—where we investigated this over many, many months—that it has only received data on 52.8 percent of all of our international packages and only 70.7 percent on those from China for 2018. In March of this year, 2019, it was up to 57 percent and 78 percent. Let's get to 100 percent from China. This legislation requires 70 percent from other countries. There is no excuse for not meeting this. Again, it is the law of the land. So, while it is improving, the process is taking too long, and it has failed to meet the requirements in the STOP Act.

The next big milestone, by the way, in the implementation of the law requires the Postal Service to begin refusing foreign shipments without there being the required advance electronic data that reads where it is from, what is in it, and where it is going. This is to apply to any package to be received after December 31, 2020. At the end of next year, if it is not providing the data, we will refuse the package.

A lot of people have expressed concern about that to me. "My gosh. This is going to stop international freight back and forth." No. It is going to require the Postal Service to do what it should be doing already, which is to require these shippers to do what they should be doing, and that is to provide the data. It is not hard, and it is not expensive. Again, most people are doing it. By the way, FedEx, DHL, and UPS—the private carriers—have done it for years. They have done it based on the law that passed after the 9/11 attacks. It is our post office that has not. Sometimes it has viewed this, apparently, as its having a competitive advantage in its not having to require that. Do you know what? It is too important to us and to the deaths that are occurring from fentanyl not to require that.

We have to improve the screening in the mail, and we are, and we will continue to make progress on that. Of course, that is not all we have to do. More fentanyl is now coming from other places, particularly from across our southern border. This is very concerning because we have gaps on our southern border right now. They say that between 40 and 60 percent of the Border Patrol agents are being pulled off the border to deal with the very real humanitarian crisis on the border.

I was there a week ago last Friday, and I had an opportunity to speak to a number of Border Patrol agents who were processing individuals and dealing with the humanitarian needs of a surge

of families and children, including those who were claiming asylum. We need to have these people attending to the humanitarian needs and processing these individuals. Yet I will tell you, when I talked to the Border Patrol agents about it, that was not where they wanted to be. They want to be doing their jobs because they know these drugs are coming in when they are not out there with a watchful eye on our border.

Unfortunately, we are in a situation right now where we need more humanitarian aid, which we have finally provided, thank goodness. We also need more help on the border itself to be able to close some of these gaps. I want to be sure that we are, indeed, dealing with both issues. We can and should.

The drug smugglers who are affiliated with Mexican cartels are pretty smart. They know where there are gaps. They take advantage of them and bring in more fentanyl. Last year, Customs and Border Protection seized about 1,800 pounds of fentanyl at the border. In the first half of this year alone, it seized more than 2,000 pounds of fentanyl. This year, we are headed toward apprehending double the fentanyl at the border. I will tell you we don't know how much is coming in. Nobody does.

Because of these gaps and because of the Border Patrol's having been pulled off the border to deal with the very real crisis down there with regard to the humanitarian issue and the flux of people coming in, there are more gaps. The numbers of those shipments that have been apprehended have been bad enough—more than double this year. It has been enough fentanyl to kill millions of people, and it is probably worse than that.

This fentanyl is increasingly being laced into other drugs by the cartels. The fentanyl makes you so likely to become addicted that they put it in other things, including crystal meth, including cocaine, including heroin. Individuals who consume anything right now that is a street drug might be unknowingly ingesting this incredibly toxic drug fentanyl also and risking their lives because of the overdose deaths that are associated with it.

In Ohio, the number of overdose deaths attributed to fentanyl-laced cocaine and methamphetamines has increased dramatically. As an example, Columbus Public Health actually released a public alert just this week that urged anyone who uses drugs or knows someone who uses drugs to have naloxone, a miracle drug—some people call it Narcan—that reverses the effects of the overdose from opioids. They say you have to have this miracle drug on hand because of the fentanyl poisoning that is going on in Columbus. Already in 2019, 740 doses of Narcan have been issued in response to overdoses in one town alone, Toledo, OH.

This issue of fentanyl is very real. It is affecting our communities in new ways, and we have to be able to respond flexibly to what is happening. It remains a dangerous threat.

Also complicating the recovery process is the continued resurgence of psychostimulants, particularly crystal meth. Again, crystal meth is coming from—where?—across the border, from Mexico. You will probably remember that at one time in your communities, there was talk about meth labs. You may have seen some coverage of that, and you may have had some meth labs in your neighborhood. There are horrible environmental issues, obviously, in the producing of methamphetamines, which are so dangerous. Guess what. There are no more meth labs in your neighborhood. That is the good news. The bad news is, there are no meth labs because this stuff that comes in from Mexico is cheaper and more powerful, more devastating, and more damaging to our communities. So it is a concern.

The latest CDC data on overdose deaths—particularly with regard to opioids—is very hopeful, but the overdose deaths by psychostimulants and cocaine continue to increase. That is because, again, fentanyl is being mixed into these psychostimulants. Methamphetamine deaths increased by nearly 30 percent, and 42 percent of all overdose deaths last year were directly attributable to cocaine, psychostimulants like meth, or both mixed together. That is the new problem, and we have to address it.

As we have continued to fight opioid abuse, I recently introduced a bill, entitled “Combating Meth and Cocaine Act,” in order to address this resurgence and to be sure that here in Congress we are being flexible in responding to it and not waiting until we have another huge drug crisis here of a new way to mix drugs or a new resurgence of crystal meth. To date, grants provided by the 21st Century Cures Act, which is now called the State opioid response grants, have been used to increase access to naloxone—again, a very important drug—as well as to long-term addiction treatment and support services. Yet, for all the good these grants have done, they can’t be used to address the crisis beyond opioids, which ignores the underground reality, at least in my State and in so many other States.

Earlier this year, for example, I participated in a roundtable discussion with leaders in Knox County, and I do this around the State on a regular basis. In Knox County, the prosecutor’s office estimated that 80 to 90 percent of all drug incidents now involve crystal meth—methamphetamines. They told me they have been able to use the State opioid response grants to help with the treatment and recovery services but that they are not effective with regard to meth because there is not an effective way to treat meth with drugs, as there is with opioids. There is

not an effective way to use the Narcan with meth, as there is with opioids. So we need to be more flexible in providing these communities with the help they need to combat this new resurgence. Our legislation will allow the State opioid response grants to be used for programs that focus on methamphetamines and on cocaine usage. More flexibility is important.

We know these funds are making a difference, so the bill will also reauthorize the State opioid response grants for 5 years, which will give some certainty by providing the \$500 million annually that will be needed to ensure there will be a stable funding stream to go to these innovative programs in the States. This is a simple, commonsense change. It will allow State and local organizations the flexibility they need to fight what is quickly becoming a two-front war on addiction—opioids but also psychostimulants that are coming back with a vengeance.

The latest data from the CDC is a promising sign that we can and will recover from the drug crisis if we continue to work to give those in need the help they need to get back on their feet. We also need to ensure that we don’t rest on our laurels as cartels continue to innovate themselves and try different angles.

There is so much money in this that these deadly drugs will continue to come unless we show the same kind of flexibility when responding. If they can, they are going to continue to send drugs through the postal system. They are going to continue to send them across the southern border. Fentanyl, cocaine, and meth have shown themselves to be continuing public health threats, and we have to keep working—all of us here on a bipartisan basis—to ensure that State and local governments get the resources they need to help stem the tide.

The Federal Government has been a better partner over the past few years with our States, with our localities, and with our nonprofits that are there in the trenches, doing the hard work. We can’t give up now. The numbers from the CDC are hopeful with regard to opioids, but that just means we need to redouble our efforts to ensure that we do not now back off. We cannot take our eye off the ball. We have to continue to focus on what we are doing and then add to that more flexible responses to the new resurgence of fentanyl being mixed with meth and crystal meth coming in directly from Mexico. This new drug reality is one that must be met with the same kind of innovative response we have responded with here in the last few years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I rise after 10 years of being in the Senate and after having endured speech after speech after speech on this floor that has claimed the Republican Party is

the party of fiscal discipline. It was politics that created something during the depths of the worst recession, called the tea party, which rallied all over America to stop what it said was runaway spending.

When I arrived here, I actually believed that the Republican Party was a fiscally responsible party, that there was some principle behind it. I know better today. I was naive. It is all about politics.

There have been five budget deals since 2013 between Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL and whoever has happened to be in the White House. These deals were meant to overcome the idiocy of the across-the-board cuts that were created by the sequestration—which nobody in America understands but which are basically across-the-board cuts on spending—that otherwise would have been investments in your family, maybe, or investments in our military. They were agreed to as part of a fiscal cliff deal in the dark of night, at 2 o’clock in the morning, by nobody—literally nobody—who had actually read the bill. Ever since then, politicians in Washington have been making deals to try to overcome it.

When President Obama was President, this is how much money he was allowed to spend. Since Donald Trump has been President, this is the money that the Republicans have spent. This red is defense, and the blue is non-defense.

Under President Obama the deals increased by an average of \$33 billion above the sequester. The two deals under Donald Trump increased spending by \$154 billion, four times as much—four times as much—at a moment when the President is saying our economy is the best it has ever been in American history.

The result of this is that under Donald Trump the deficit has increased by 15 percent each year. The deficit just between last year and this year is up by 23 percent as a result of the Republican majority in the Senate and Donald Trump.

We are on track to run \$1 trillion deficits every year as far as the eye can see. That is after 10 years of economic growth and unemployment below 4 percent.

At no time in our history have deficits been this large outside of a major war or a recession, which brings me to my second slide.

This is the annual spending growth around here. This is the annual spending growth around here of defense and nondefense. They are both in here.

Under President Obama, in his first term, the spending went up by 3 percent. We were in the worst recession since the Great Depression. He had to pass the Recovery Act. That is in this number. That is in this number. It was at the depths of the worst recession since the Great Depression. Three million Americans lost their homes, and 9 million Americans lost their jobs. We had a 10-percent unemployment rate—

not a 4-percent rate, not a 3 and change, but a 10-percent rate. In the name of fiscal responsibility, Republicans did nothing except berate the President for trying to save the economy and for what he was trying to do.

I will come to that in a moment.

This includes the Recovery Act. Overall growth—annual spending growth—grew by 3 percent during President Obama's first term. It fell by 2 percent during President Obama's second term.

It has gone up by 4 percent during Trump's first term. It has increased more under this Republican President. Admittedly, he is not a conservative. It has grown more under this Republican President than it did when President Obama was trying to save the economy during the worst recession since the Great Depression. This 3 percent number includes the Recovery Act. The Republicans are now growing government spending by more than that—by more than that.

Here is what they said when they wouldn't lift a finger during the depths of the worst recession. Congressman MIKE PENCE, before he was Vice President, said:

We the people do not consent to runaway Federal spending. We the people do not consent to the notion that we can borrow and spend and bail our way back to a growing America.

He said that to a tea party rally here in Washington, DC, that was here to stop runaway spending.

Where are they today? It is worse today than it ever was under President Obama. It is far worse, not a little bit worse, because not included on this slide are the tax cuts that have never paid for themselves and are not paying for themselves here.

Donald Trump and the Republicans have created \$2 trillion of deficit spending because of the tax cuts and \$2 trillion of deficit spending because of the spending.

By the way, they are not actually spending this money, in a sense. They are borrowing all of it from our children. They have not paid for a dollar of it—not one dollar. They are borrowing it from the pages who are here. They are borrowing it from the children of cops, teachers, and firefighters—that is who they are borrowing it from—to give tax cuts to rich people, to make our economic inequality greater.

Congressman Mick Mulvaney, now the President's Chief of Staff, talking about the Obama administration's budget at the time, said:

It's hard to explain how detached from reality that is, to think that the country can spend another \$1.6 trillion when it doesn't have the means. It means either you haven't been paying attention or you don't care.

He is the President's Chief of Staff. He is the President's Budget Director.

If that was runaway spending, how is this not runaway spending?

The junior Senator from Texas said:

The debt is out of control. And, it is jeopardizing the future for our kids. I have got two little kids who are 4 and 2.

He lectured the President.

And, the idea of handing them a \$16 trillion debt, I think is immoral.

Really? What about \$24 trillion? What about \$30 trillion? Is that more moral than \$16 trillion? Really?

Now, former Speaker Paul Ryan said: "We will end up with a Greece-like situation on our hands."

"A debt crisis is coming to the country."

That is what he said here.

Admittedly, he left in the middle of a government shutdown, never to come back to Washington, DC—a fitting end to a decade of fiscal fights and shutdowns and government closures, all done in the name of fiscal responsibility, never actually achieving it and—never, ever actually achieving it—only for the opportunity to spend like this.

I can't tell you the number of times I have heard about this on this floor:

The debt and the deficit are just getting out of control, and the administration is still pumping through billions and trillions of new spending.

Paul Ryan said:

Our debt is out of control. What was a fiscal challenge is now a fiscal crisis. We cannot deny it; instead we must, as Americans confront it responsibly. And that is exactly what the Republicans pledged to do.

That is exactly what the Republicans pledged to do. They immobilized our government. They shut it down over and over and over in the name of fiscal responsibility—no help to the economy or the next generation. That is the farthest thought from their mind.

After years of obstruction in the name of fiscal responsibility, they nominated Donald Trump, who promised during the campaign to deliver a giant, beautiful, massive tax cut and borrowed all of the money for it from working people in this country.

There was a mayor in Indiana who wrote a piece about that in the paper that I thought was so instructive.

He said: That tax plan would be tantamount to my going to my city council and saying that I want to go borrow more money than we have ever borrowed before in the history of our town, and I am not going to use it to invest in roads or bridges or the sewers or anything else, and I am just going to take the money we borrowed that our kids are going to have to give back, and I am going to give it to the richest neighborhood in my town.

He said they would have asked: What have you been smoking?

He promised to pass "one of the largest increases in national defense spending in American history" and "not touch Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid."

He said he would eliminate not only the deficit. This is Donald Trump, the candidate whom the Republicans voted for, whom FOX News, which is in theory the conservative channel, has supported like an organ of the State, with hosts who claim they are fiscally responsible. But he promised to elimi-

nate not only the deficit but the entire national debt—that immoral debt of \$16 trillion that is now climbing to \$30 trillion.

And the way he was going to do that was by "vigorously eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse in the federal government, ending redundant government programs, and growing the economy," as well as by "renegotiating all of our [debt] deals."

He hasn't renegotiated one. He spent more time failing to get a deal with the leader of North Korea than trying to address this challenge.

Donald Trump said:

It can be done. . . . it will take place and it will go relatively quickly. If you have the right people, like in the agencies and the various people that do the balancing . . . you can cut the numbers by two pennies and three pennies and balance a budget quickly and have a stronger and better country.

This is the President of the United States of America.

That is ridiculous. That is ridiculous, but it is no more ridiculous than the history of the Republican Party, the supposedly fiscally conservative party—what a joke.

Going back to 2001, the last time we had a surplus in America, Bill Clinton was President. He was a Democrat. He had a \$5 trillion projected surplus over the decade—unimaginable today. It is unimaginable today, but politicians like us were having discussions about what to do with the surplus, what to do with abundance, how to make Social Security solvent, how to give the middle class a real tax cut, not a fake tax cut that is masquerading and covering up the tax cut for rich people.

But we did none of that, and, instead, George Bush, who followed Bill Clinton, cut taxes in 2001. Almost all of the benefit went to wealthy people. He cut taxes in 2003, and both times it was just like Donald Trump said and the Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL said both times. They said: Oh, don't worry about it. They will pay for themselves.

A lie, a lie, and the number is in the math. It is not about philosophy. This isn't about ideology. This is about the math, and everybody in America could see it because that is what produced the \$16 trillion that Paul Ryan said was so immoral, \$8 trillion ago and on the way to \$30 trillion in debt.

By the way, it is important to know that when this Congress voted for those tax cuts in 2003 that were not paid for, the money was all borrowed by the sons and daughters of working people in America. We had troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. So we didn't even have the decency while we had people at war to pay for those wars or to say to the American people: We need to pay for those wars. No, we are not going to pay for those wars, and we are going to borrow the money from America to give tax cuts to rich people.

Then, President Bush, on top of that, seeking reelection, passed Medicare Part D, the drug program for seniors, and paid for none of that either. All

that money is from our children—all of it—and there has never been an effort to pay for it since.

Then, because of their lax regulatory oversight of the housing market, the economy collapsed. The economy collapsed, and Barack Obama was handed not a \$5 trillion surplus but a \$1.2 trillion deficit from the Republicans, from George Bush. During the course of his Presidency, we had to weather the worst recession since the Great Depression. The worst it ever got around here was \$1.5 trillion on the deficit, and the other side called him a Bolshevik and a Socialist. Well-meaning people from all over Wall Street and other places came down here and said: Fix the debt. Fix the debt.

Where are they today? Where are they today?

By the time he left, President Obama had cut the deficit by more than half—by more than half.

Every one of these deals has been cut by MITCH MCCONNELL, every single one. So it didn't surprise me at all this week that he was reported in the Washington Post to have said to the President that no politician has ever lost an election spending more money. No politician has ever lost an election spending more money, said the Republican majority leader to the President. I can't think of a more Bolshevik statement than that, to use terms that the other side has been using for 10 years. I can't think of a more irresponsible position than that when we are not in the depths of a recession, when 10 million people haven't lost their jobs, when the economy, according to the President, is the best economy we have ever had.

This is the moment we should be securing our future. This is the moment we should be preparing for another foreign engagement. Because of these deals that have been led by MITCH MCCONNELL, the Republican leader from Kentucky, when you add it all up, not only do we have this extraordinary deficit that we have never seen in the country's history—

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.
Mr. BENNET. But since 2001, we have cut taxes by \$5 trillion. We borrowed all of that money from our children, and almost all of the benefit went to the wealthiest people in America. We spent \$5.6 trillion on wars in the Middle East. We didn't pay for a single dollar of it. That is \$11 trillion, \$12 trillion that we could have spent to fix every road and bridge in America, that could have fixed every single airport in America that needs it, that could have made Social Security solvent for my children's generation and for the other children of the people who came out here and said: We are here to immobilize the Democratic President in the name of fiscal responsibility. But now we know the level of their fiscal hypocrisy. It knows no end.

If there is one benefit of this—if there is one benefit of this, the American people are—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BENNET. I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of the following named officer for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and 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., sections 152 and 601 to be General: GEN Mark A. Milley.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Milley nomination?

Mr. JOHNSON. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 230 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Alexander	Duckworth	McSally
Baldwin	Durbin	Menendez
Barrasso	Enzi	Murkowski
Bennet	Ernst	Murphy
Blackburn	Feinstein	Murray
Blumenthal	Fischer	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Peters
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Braun	Grassley	Reed
Brown	Hassan	Risch
Burr	Hawley	Roberts
Cantwell	Heinrich	Romney
Capito	Hirono	Rosen
Cardin	Hoeven	Rounds
Carper	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Casey	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Schatz
Collins	Jones	Schumer
Coons	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cortez Masto	King	Shaheen
Cotton	Lankford	Shelby
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Manchin	Smith
Cruz	Markey	Stabenow
Daines	McConnell	Sullivan

Tester	Udall	Wicker
Thune	Van Hollen	Wyden
Tillis	Warner	Young
Toomey	Whitehouse	

NAYS—1

Merkley

NOT VOTING—10

Booker	Klobuchar	Sanders
Gillibrand	Leahy	Warren
Harris	Moran	
Isakson	Perdue	

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. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The majority whip.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, yesterday we confirmed two more excellent judges in the Senate. Despite Democratic obstruction, we continue to move forward on confirming nominees to the Federal bench.

Some of our Democratic colleagues have criticized the amount of time the Senate spends on judges. We have spent a substantial amount of time on judges because we have had to.

Back in the day, most of the judicial nominees we are considering would have been confirmed without the time-consuming cloture vote process. By this point in President Obama's first term, Republicans had required cloture votes on just three—three—of President Obama's judicial nominees. Let's compare that to today.

As of yesterday, July 24, Democrats had required cloture votes on a staggering 94 judicial nominees—94—to 3 at this same point under President Obama.

It is not because they are fiercely opposed to all of these nominees. In fact, again and again, Democrats have turned around and voted for the very same judges they delayed.

Just a couple of weeks ago in the Senate, we confirmed three district court judges by huge bipartisan margins: 78 to 15, 80 to 14, and 85 to 10. Clearly, these were not nominees that Democrats bitterly opposed. Yet Democrats insisted on the same old delaying cloture vote tactic they have used with so many judicial nominees.

I, too, am frustrated that we have had to spend a lot of time on judges. I

miss the days when uncontroversial nominees regularly passed without cloture votes, but if my Democratic colleagues are going to insist on delaying the vast majority of nominations, we are going to have to keep spending time on judges because, let's remember, we are not doing these nominations for fun. This is part of our job. We are working to fill a substantial number of vacancies on the Federal bench.

Despite the Senate's efforts, the vacancy rate currently stands at 13.8 percent—higher than the rates faced by President Obama, President George W. Bush, and President Clinton at this point in their first terms.

Vacancies on the Federal bench have consequences. Primarily, they result in long waits to get cases heard, which serves nobody.

It would be nice if my colleagues across the aisle would abandon their delaying tactics on noncontroversial nominees and speed up the process of filling these vacancies, but, regardless, Republicans will continue moving forward with judicial nominees.

I am very proud of the judges we are confirming. We are putting excellent Federal judges on the bench who are committed to upholding the law. That sounds like a pretty obvious requirement for a judge—a commitment to upholding the law—but too often it seems like many on the left would prefer activist judges who act as superlegislators, rewriting laws they disagree with when the law doesn't reach a result that fits with Democrats' political opinions. Those kinds of judges—judges who move beyond the law when the law doesn't line up with their political agenda—are not a good thing for anybody.

Sure, it might seem nice when an activist judge who shares your political opinions reaches outside the plain meaning of the statute and rules for your preferred outcome, but what happens when that same judge reaches beyond the law to your detriment? What protections do you have if the law is no longer the highest authority? The answer is none. You don't have any protection because at that point the judge, not the law, has become the supreme authority, and you are at the mercy of his or her personal opinions.

Security, justice, equality under law, these principles can only be maintained as long as we have judges who are committed to upholding the law as it is written and not as they would like it to be.

If we have bad laws, we can and should change them, but any changes should be made by the people's elected representatives, as our Constitution dictates. They should not be made by unelected judges. Judges are meant to interpret the law, not make it. I am proud we have been putting judges on the bench who will uphold the rule of law in this country by interpreting the law as it is written, regardless of their personal opinions.

As I said earlier, we confirmed two excellent judicial nominees this week. Unfortunately, one ran into some Democratic opposition during the confirmation process because he was Catholic. That is right. Apparently, the fact that he takes his faith seriously enough—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend.

The Senate will be in order. Take your conversations outside of the Chamber.

The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Apparently, the fact that he takes his faith seriously enough to participate in a Catholic charitable group, the Knights of Columbus, is enough to make him suspect as a judge.

I had hoped we were done with Democrats' flirtation with religious tests for public office when they questioned the fitness of Judge Amy Coney Barrett because she takes her Catholic faith seriously, but apparently Democrats think it is perfectly legitimate to suggest that you can't be both a person of faith and a nominee for the U.S. judiciary.

Let me just remind my colleagues what article VI of the Constitution has to say about that. Article VI states: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." I repeat: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States."

It is deeply troubling that we have Democrats in the U.S. Senate suggesting that religious faith disqualifies you from public office. If Democrats are using their objections to these candidates' religious faith as cover for the fact that Democrats don't want to confirm anyone who doesn't share their most extreme political opinions, that is deeply troubling too.

Religious freedom is a bedrock principle of this Nation. Our Founders considered it so important that it is the very first freedom mentioned in the Bill of Rights. By freedom of religion, they didn't mean it is OK to pray or have religious beliefs if you do it quietly inside your home; they meant freedom to practice your faith in the public square, even if that means having different political opinions from Democrats.

I hope Judge Buescher is the last nominee who will have his fitness for public office questioned simply because he chooses to live out his faith. I was glad to vote to confirm him yesterday, and I look forward to confirming more qualified judicial nominees in the near future.

I hope the Democrats will drop their delaying tactics and join us as we work to fill these important vacancies on the Federal bench.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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. BRAUN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, this morning, the Senate Finance Committee marked up a legislative package that was designed to address the high prescription drug costs, which have become a burden to Americans of all ages. This is part of a bipartisan effort to make targeted reforms to our healthcare system in order to lower costs for patients and taxpayers without interfering with the free market or the beneficial innovation that comes from it.

Last month, the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Judiciary Committee passed legislative packages that were designed to support this goal. This morning, the Finance Committee passed a package called the Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act. This legislation looks specifically at reducing prescription drug prices, particularly out-of-pocket costs, for seniors and children through Medicare and Medicaid reforms.

I have heard a lot from my constituents in Texas about the impact of these high costs.

Bob from San Angelo told me that both he and his wife have Medicare Part D and are struggling to stretch their retirement incomes far enough to cover the expenses for their prescription drugs. He told me, each month, they pay nearly \$800 for Medicare and Medicare supplements. On top of that, they are strapped with high prescription drug costs. In the first 4½ months of this year, Bob said they spent more than \$1,600 on his wife's medication alone. For seniors who live on fixed incomes, these high costs can simply be untenable.

Then there is Michael, another one of my constituents, who told me about his continued struggle to cover the cost of his medication. He said: "It feels like we are being taken advantage of because they know we have to take these drugs."

These individuals have been paying into this system for decades, and it is high time we look at ways to reduce the financial strain and provide some relief.

Now, coming up with policies that will lower out-of-pocket costs is not easy. The whole drug pricing regime is enormously complex—frankly, it is opaque—particularly the relationships between pharmacy benefit managers and drug manufacturers, but we need to work hard at this effort to lower costs in Medicare and Medicaid and to decrease the high cost of prescription drugs even in the commercial markets.

I appreciate the commitment of Chairman GRASSLEY and Ranking Member WYDEN to identify potential reforms, and I believe the package that was voted out of the Finance Committee this morning is a step in the

right direction. This is not a statement of endorsement of the legislation as it has come out of the committee. A lot of work needs to be done, particularly a lot of work in order to reconcile the different approaches of the different committees—the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the Judiciary Committee—because the last thing we want to do is to go through this arduous, complex legislative exercise only to find out that we have failed to lower out-of-pocket costs for American consumers or that we have introduced some other unintended consequence that makes things worse and not better.

The journey a drug takes from research and development to manufacturing, to pharmacy shelves, and eventually into our medicine cabinets is enormously complicated.

As I said, once a consumer has purchased a drug, figuring out who gets what part of each dollar requires—well, I was going to say it requires a Ph.D. It requires even more than that because you may need to hire an ex-FBI agent to try to track down what percentage of each dollar each of the players in the prescription drug field actually gets. As a consumer, this is particularly alarming because we don't really have any idea of whether we are paying a fair price or who is profiting and at what point or whether people are doing things that benefit their bottom lines. They don't actually add value to the system. Ultimately, they end up costing consumers more out of pocket.

When it comes to Medicare and Medicaid, it is doubly concerning because, in most cases, these prescriptions are being at least partially subsidized by taxpayer dollars. So we need to shine a bright light on the reasons behind these high costs and price increases to make sure patients aren't being gouged and to make sure the government—in other words, the taxpayer—isn't being overcharged. That is one of the primary goals of this legislation. It would require manufacturers to report information about price increases to the Department of Health and Human Services as part of that transparency effort.

As I suggested a moment ago, it also looks at the role of pharmacy benefit managers who are the intermediaries who link manufacturers to consumers. They negotiate with the manufacturers to secure rebates, which create a net price, but it doesn't appear that, by and large, this actually flows to the consumer or to the patient. Frequently, it is used, we are told, to keep premiums lower by the health plans. Yet we don't know that for sure because trying to get access to the information is really challenging, and the size of the rebate could mean the difference between a drug's being covered by insurance or not. Oh, by the way, rebates don't help you at all for your copay or for your deductible.

These days, we know, for example, for many Americans, the Affordable Care Act has resulted in sky-high

deductibles and high premiums. That means consumers have to pick up more of the cost at the list price, not at the net price, which is negotiated by the pharmacy benefit managers who work together with the healthcare plans.

I find it very strange, with as big a role as the pharmacy benefit managers play, that we know very little about how they operate or whether they all operate exactly the same or differently. This legislation would require pharmacy benefit managers to disclose details of the discounts of rebates they receive and finally pull back that cloak of secrecy.

I do have concerns about one portion of the bill that was voted out of the Finance Committee this morning, which would require manufacturers to pay a rebate on drug price increases that are higher than the rate of inflation. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated the inflation rebate will save \$50 billion for Medicare. It claims it will lower out-of-pocket costs for beneficiaries by \$7 billion and lower premiums by \$4 billion.

I asked the head of the CBO this morning: Well, if everybody saves money, who ends up paying more money? It basically comes out of the manufacturer's hide.

This really speaks to my other major concern, and that is that the Federal Government not get into a position in which it is setting prices. We know that when you institute price controls on a commodity—particularly if you are the Federal Government—and when you try to negotiate with somebody, it is not a level playing field. When you negotiate with somebody as the Federal Government, you are literally doing it with a gun to one's head or figuratively doing it with a gun to one's head. It is not a normal give-and-take negotiation. Ultimately, what happens with price controls is it creates scarcity because, at some point, the manufacturer or the producer of that commodity will say: I am not going to produce that at that controlled price by the government. So this is a serious concern.

The CBO also estimates that this rebate would reduce costs for prescription drug benefits offered by commercial insurance plans. Although we don't have a final score by the CBO—this is just a preliminary plan—I will share with you an observation made years ago by Senator Bob Bennett, of Utah, when I first came to the Senate.

He said: The one thing I can tell you about CBO scores is that they are always wrong. I can't tell you if they are too high or too low, but this is part of the complexity of trying to predict the future and how human behavior will affect their calculations and analyses. Sometimes they get it right, and sometimes they get it wrong.

Despite the encouraging estimates, many members of the committee had significant concerns that this policy could lead to higher launch prices or higher out-of-pocket spending. So this

morning in the markup, I supported an amendment by our friend from Pennsylvania, Senator TOOMEY, that would have removed this inflation rebate penalty. Unfortunately, it failed on a tie vote. It is something I don't think I have seen before, in which 14 Senators voted for it and 14 voted against it, but it means the amendment failed.

Here is the problem. There is a delicate balance between preventing price increases, which is something we would all like to do, and still preserving the market-based approach that has made Part D such an overwhelming success. It actually is a government program that works better than we thought it would when it was passed.

I think we need more input before this bill comes to the floor, for there is a lot of work yet to do. As the old adage goes, anything worth doing is worth doing right, and we had better get this right. I think there will be quite a price to pay if we undertake this huge exercise and end up failing to reduce consumers' out-of-pocket costs or creating more problems as a result of unintended consequences. Providing our seniors peace of mind when it comes to their healthcare costs is certainly worth doing right.

So I believe we need to continue refining this proposal to strike a better balance and effectively deliver on our promises. It is important that we not rush this process. There is no artificial deadline. There shouldn't be. That is why the Senate was created, to force deliberation in a body of 100 Senators with challenging rules to actually get things to the President's desk for his signature. But what it should do is force deliberation and force us to do our due diligence to make sure that we are not creating more problems or failing to accomplish our goal.

I told members of the committee this morning that I don't think this bill, as written, is anywhere near ready to be considered on the floor. I asked the chairman and the ranking member to commit to continue working with Members before this does come to the floor, and I was glad that both of them agreed to do so.

While I believe we are making some progress, we better be very careful, and we shouldn't impose on ourselves any artificial deadlines in order to get this thing done and perhaps get it done badly.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, there is a quote that has long been attributed to St. Augustine, who, during his conversion to Christianity, famously uttered a prayer: Lord, help me be chaste. Grant me chastity, but not yet.

The idea behind this is as old as human nature itself, which is that it is easier to have a thought of doing something later than to do that thing now, especially when it is a difficult task.

It is one of the reasons New Year's resolutions often result in a spike, an abrupt increase in gym enrollments and memberships. People develop New Year's resolutions; they decide they are going to lose weight; they are going to exercise more; they are going to eat less. Then it becomes more difficult as time goes by, and perhaps over time, some of them might find it easier to say: Well, I will lose weight later in the year.

After starting the new year off to a good start, they might say: Well, I will lose more weight in the last half of the year. Later in the year it might occur to them that they will lose more weight in the last 2 months of the year. Regardless, as they continue to delay that moment, the task doesn't get easier; it often gets harder.

The budget and spending and debt limit deal that was announced earlier this week reminds me a little bit of this aspect of human nature. It is understandable why this happens. It is especially understandable why it happens in a place where people are elected and where people want to be liked, where supporting greater government spending often results in praise, and calling for even a mild tapping on the brakes often results in rather severe criticism in the press, even by one's own constituents. But that doesn't mean that we can pretend things are different than they really are.

So, yes, you can suspend the debt ceiling, and you can waive budget rules, but you can't suspend or waive or ignore the laws of mathematics.

We have to remember that at a time when we are talking about a significant expansion of the role of the Federal Government, when we are talking about suspending the debt ceiling for an additional 2 years, we are talking about paving the way for us to spend a whole lot more money through the Federal Government than we would otherwise spend.

This is occurring at a time when Americans are already required to work many weeks and, in some cases, many months out of every year just to pay their Federal taxes. In addition to this, after that they are told: By the way, that is not enough.

It is not nearly enough because, for a long time, the Federal Government has been spending a lot more money than it takes in. Lately, it has been to the tune of many hundreds of billions of dollars a year.

We have never in our history brought in more money or as much money into the Federal Government's coffers as we are bringing in right now. We are at the very top of the business cycle. We have nearly record-low unemployment, in the range of roughly 4 percent or a little below, which is, we are told by economists, basically full employment in America. At a time when all of these things seem to be going our way and we are enjoying a period of relative peace in the world and in our country, we have record-breaking deficits, and

this budget and debt ceiling deal would expand the path, would pave the path for even more of that.

That begs the question: If we can't control spending now, when the economy is performing about as well as it possibly can, then when can we?

To borrow a phrase from John F. Kennedy, "If not us, who? If not now, when?"

Let's talk for a minute about America's history with expanding its debt limit, expanding its debt footprint.

What we see through this chart that I have to my right is that during a number of periods of crisis in American history, we have accumulated more debt—that is, a more-than-average amount of debt—as a percentage of our gross domestic product.

We see various peaks, most of them following and brought about as a result of a major war and, in some cases, some other type of crisis.

We have the Revolutionary War. The Revolutionary War was fought and, mercifully, won, and our debt as a percentage of GDP went down.

It peaked a little bit a few years later when we had to fight the War of 1812. We won that war, too, and then debt as a percentage of our GDP went down. It remained low for many decades.

When we fought the Civil War, it peaked again. It went back to close to 40 percent of our gross domestic product. The Civil War ended, and it went back down.

It peaked again at World War I and then went back down. It peaked to a very significant degree at World War II and then promptly went back down.

See, through this period of time following World War II—the late forties into the fifties—we had a whole lot of revenue coming in. We weren't accumulating new debt, and we were paying off our debt at the same time that our economy was expanding.

Consequently, even though every year didn't result in a balanced budget, our debt held by the public as a Federal Government went down as a percentage of our gross domestic product.

But in each of these instances that I described, there was a reason; there was a distinct, unmistakable, finite reason why these things happened. Once those reasons went away, once we had won the wars in question, our debt as a percentage of our gross domestic product—that is, the volume of economic activity in America—went back down.

We saw a couple of other peaks. We had the Gulf war and a recession in roughly the same period. It resulted in an increase of debt as a percentage of GDP. That war ended, and that recession went away, and it went back down.

Something interesting has been happening. In the last few years, as we came out of the great recession, as we have enjoyed a very significant, historic recovery in our economy, the economy has been expanding, and jobs abound. The economy in which we now

live has more people employed in basically every demographic than we would have considered likely a few years ago. Yet, notwithstanding that fact, our debt as a percentage of our gross domestic product continues to go up.

This graph in some ways even understates the matter relative to where we were at World War II. We hit the peak during World War II at, I believe, 106, 107 percent of gross domestic product. We are not quite at that level yet today by standard metrics, but if you include in this figure not only the debt held by the public—that is, the debt held by those who purchase U.S. security bonds and U.S. Treasury instruments generally—if you add to that the so-called intragovernmental debt, the IOUs the Federal Government has written to Social Security and Medicare to try to make up for funds that Congress wants access to but doesn't have, we are actually well over 100 percent in terms of our debt-to-GDP ratio. In other words, we are about where we were at the peak of the crisis we were addressing during World War II.

That begs the questions: When does this end? How does this end?

There is not a world war in which we are involved right now. We are experiencing relative peace. There is not a recession. We are in the middle of one of the greatest peacetime economic recoveries this land has ever seen.

So if not us, then who? And if not now, then when?

Why is it that we now have to suspend our debt ceiling in order to essentially transfer to younger Americans, to subsequent generations the responsibility of financing the government that we have today?

One can easily defend those things when talking about the survival of a nation or about a world war or about a war in which our Nation's survival is at stake. We are not involved in any such effort right now.

We are involved in some conflicts around the world, but those are not really what is driving this. What is driving this is that we have a government that is too big and too expensive.

This means a lot of things to a lot of people. It is something that should weigh on every American seriously. I believe it weighs especially heavily on younger Americans, not just younger Americans themselves, but people who have children and grandchildren.

I represent a State with the lowest median age in the entire country, the State of Utah. We are also the State with the largest percentage of people under the age of 18.

I would like to speak to some of those people right now—those people under the age of 18, especially in my State where they are disproportionately represented.

Young Americans, those who have not yet attained the age of 18, have had all this debt accumulate—some \$22 trillion now by the Federal Government—that they are going to be responsible for, notwithstanding the fact that all

of that debt has been accumulated at periods in their life either before they were born or before they were old enough to vote.

It amounts to, in a sense, a really pernicious form of taxation without representation. We fought a war over that principle, and we won that war.

We shouldn't be doing this defiantly without a plan for turning it around, without a reason to have to do that—a reason that has to do with our very survival—without some sort of plan for getting out of it. But instead of getting out it, we are accelerating into it, and that is troubling.

Some might argue, and, in fact, some within this body and in the House of Representatives have argued that so-called discretionary spending is not worth worrying about. Discretionary spending, for those of you not familiar with the term, refers to that part of the government that Congress decides on each and every year that isn't predecided the way our entitlement programs are.

In other words, mandatory or entitlement spending, spending on things like Social Security and Medicare that are already set aside—those are things we don't have discretion over. They are already called for by law. We already have to spend money on them.

There are those in Congress who will maintain that we shouldn't worry about discretionary spending, which is the primary focus of this measure, of this budget caps deal, and of this debt ceiling deal, because, really, the bigger picture, the bigger concern, and the bigger threat is, in fact, about mandatory spending. It is the entitlement programs, they will say, that really are driving the looming debt crisis. But it is important to point out that we are not reforming those either. We couldn't even stick to the budget caps that both parties in both Houses and the White House agreed to just a few years ago.

It defies logic and reason, in my mind, for people to say: Well, we shouldn't worry about discretionary spending because mandatory spending is really where the problem is. No one would ever advise someone struggling with alcohol consumption that they shouldn't worry about consuming too much alcohol if they are also addicted to something else—meth or heroin or some other terribly addictive substance that might also be harmful to them. The fact that you are dealing with one problem doesn't mean that you don't also have to face the other problem. That is the concern I have with this deal. That is the reason I plan to vote against it.

I know and I will be the first to admit that there are no easy solutions here. There are no solutions that anyone would look to and say: Yes, that sounds like a lot of fun. I don't want to do that.

It reminds me of a time when my sister, Stephanie, was enrolled in a new school shortly after my family moved back to Utah. Stephanie was in kinder-

garten. Stephanie was asked by the teacher, as they were testing her to try to figure out which class she should be in, to take out her favorite color of crayon and write down her name. My mom watched from a distance as the teacher administered this test. She knew that Stephanie knew full well how to write her name. She watched in a certain degree of agony as Stephanie sat there and didn't pick up a single crayon.

After the test was complete and the teacher concluded, mistakenly, that Stephanie didn't know how to write her name, my mom asked her: Why didn't you write your name?

She said: The lady asked me to pick out my favorite color of crayon, and they didn't have pink. So I didn't write my name.

Sometimes I wonder whether Congress is in the same position as my sister Stephanie when she was at that young age being tested. We don't see our favorite color of crayon. We don't see our favorite option. We don't see any easy options there.

In fact, we see a whole lot of options that would involve putting a dent in this problem—this growing, building problem that I have pointed out in the graph—and we see criticism that would likely ensue from any one of those options. Now, I understand that. It doesn't mean that the laws of mathematics will not eventually catch up to us.

Winston Churchill is known to have said of the American people that the American people will always make the right choice after they have exhausted every other alternative. Now, I don't know whether he, in fact, said that. If he did, in fact, say it, I don't think he meant it as a compliment to the American people, but I take it as such. It is a compliment. It is what differentiates us from other countries. We do, in fact, make the right choice. We are great not because of who we are but because of what we do, and, generally, at least after we have exhausted other alternatives, we do make the right choice—a choice that reflects the principles of liberty that really have always defined us as a nation.

Those principles cannot coexist with an effort that suggests to us that our government is so big and has to be so big that there is nothing we can do about the fact that Americans are required to work weeks or months out of every year just to pay their Federal taxes and then be told that we are \$22 trillion in debt. By the time the 2 years contemplated under this deal have passed, we may well be at \$23 trillion, \$24 trillion, or, perhaps, approaching \$25 trillion in debt. Is it going to be any easier then to deal with the problem than it is now? I think not.

If not us, who? If not now, when? The way we start making steps in the right direction is to vote against a bill—a bill that, like this one, does not meaningfully address the problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE).
The Senator from Indiana.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I have the good fortune every Thursday of sitting here anywhere from 3 to 6, depending on what the workload is. Since I have gotten here, as a Senator from Indiana, as a Main Street entrepreneur, almost everything I talk about is stuff that I have learned back in the real world.

Now and then, there will be a speaker here that breaks up the monotony of sitting there for that amount of time. My friend and fellow Senator, Mr. LEE, couldn't have said it more eloquently. You have a beautiful graph here to show the issue. I am going to take just a few minutes to reinforce what he said.

When I ran for Senate, I did it out of the frustration that it seems like only here in DC do we hear the same things year after year and nothing ever seems to change. I know the responsibility of leadership and trying to navigate through the system. But sooner or later, we have to simply say enough is enough.

This year, the President, I really think, wanted to shake the system up, I was hoping, like back in March of 2018, when there was a continuing resolution agreed to, to re-enable defense, which, in my opinion, is probably the most important thing the Federal Government should do. That might be the last time. As Senator LEE said: Look at the chart.

There was always a good reason in the past, and it was generally along the lines of defending our country. But the ethic back then should be what the ethic is now—like it is for every household, every State government, every school board, and especially every business—that you borrow money not to consume. That is called putting it on a credit card. In almost everything we do in the Federal Government, there is not a tangible asset to show for it. We are actually spending it and consuming it.

When you borrow money in any business, there is a difference between expenses and supplies and capital expenditures. We do not even talk about that.

I am going to accept the reality of the system today. I don't like it. I am going to vote against the bill as well. I have talked to my fellow Members that we need to, sooner or later, quit saying the same things. We need to, sooner or later, reform the system, to actually do things that are going to be different from everything we have done in the past that has led us to this.

How is it going to happen? We are going to need to have more Senators like Senator LEE, like myself, who get involved and make the case. But the only way this is really going to happen is if Hoosiers and Americans know you could never get by with this in your own household.

I know I could have never built a national business by doing this over 37 years. It is like in business. People always ask you: How did you get there? I will tell you how I got there: patience, perseverance, hard work, reinvesting every penny I made, borrowing money only when it made sense. And it wasn't for a nicer corporate headquarters. My office was in a mobile home for 17 years. I appreciated low overhead.

When you do things like that, great opportunities come your way. To all the people who come here from Indiana every week somehow connected with the Federal Government wanting more, my advice to them is hedge your bets. If you are dependent on an institution like this that just is so stubborn and will not correct itself, this trajectory will lead to a bad day somewhere down the road that our kids and grandkids will deal with.

I think the other side of the aisle does drive a lot of this mentality that the Federal Government should do more regardless of what it costs.

The income tax occurred about right back in here. That became a source of revenue for the Federal Government that we pretty well disciplined ourselves with, until we got to right here, when entitlements and the mandated spending took over the dynamic of our Federal Government.

We have everything on auto pilot here where you can't even discuss it. From Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and interest on our debt to about another 10 to 15 percent that we have moved from discretionary to mandatory—another gimmick here—it is only 30 percent of the budget that we can deal with. Senator LEE talked about it.

All of that we know, and all I am asking leadership and the President, when we do win in 2020—because I think we will, because anybody that is proposing ideas like the Green New Deal, Medicare for All, free college tuition, and getting rid of college debt is only going to add fuel to the fire—is that we as fiscal conservatives are going to have to be heard, and leadership and the President are going to have to hear us.

Even though it is not going to happen this time, we shouldn't be afraid to talk about it, because everyone else in our country—households, school boards, businesses, and State governments—does. That is because they have the common sense to live within their means, not loot the bank in the present and shovel all these troubles onto future generations.

I yield the floor.

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted no on roll-call vote No. 228, the confirmation of

Wendy Williams Berger, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Mr. President, I was necessarily absent but, had I been present, would have voted no on roll-call vote No. 229, the confirmation of Brian C. Buescher, of Nebraska, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nebraska.●

INTERFERENCE WITH ELECTIONS ACT

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak about the Prevention of Foreign Interference with Elections Act, which I introduced in June.

The bill is cosponsored by all 10 Democratic members of the Judiciary Committee, plus Senators MARKEY and SMITH. This bill is necessary because we know foreign actors are working to influence our elections. The Mueller report showed us how Russia interfered in 2016, and we can expect it to happen again in 2020. The bill's goal is to provide enhanced criminal penalties to prevent foreign interference in our elections. The bill makes five changes to current law in order to accomplish that.

First, it explicitly makes it a crime to work with foreign nationals to interfere in U.S. elections.

Second, the bill prohibits Americans from helping foreign nationals funnel illegal contributions or donations into U.S. elections.

Third, the bill expands restrictions on foreign-financed election ads. Notably, it restricts foreign-financed issue ads and foreign-financed digital ads.

Fourth, the bill creates a civil action so that when the Attorney General learns of foreign interference, the Justice Department can immediately get an injunction.

And fifth, the bill modifies immigration law so if a non-U.S. citizen is convicted of interfering in our elections, they would be inadmissible into the United States.

Unless we take action, Russia or another foreign power will interfere with our elections. It is not a question of if, it is a question of when.

We need to make clear that such interference will result in criminal punishment, and we must update our election laws to combat these new cyber attacks.

This bill accomplishes both. Thank you.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "APOLLO 11"

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the moon landing and New Hampshire's role in this important moment of history.

On July 20, 1969, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin completed their 13th orbit around the Moon and fired up the descent engine on the now-historic *Eagle* Apollo Lunar Module. With pilot Mi-

chael Collins staying behind in the command module, *Columbia*, these American heroes, with the entire world watching and backed by a whole generation of scientists, engineers, and specialists supporting them on the ground, began their initial descent to be the first humans to set foot on another planetary body.

What many Americans may not know is that as both pilots began their historic descent, critical New Hampshire-made technology was helping them along the way. Sensors made by RdF Corporation in Hudson were a part of the lunar module propulsion system guiding them to the lunar surface. RdF sensors were also on their spacesuits as they took that first giant leap for mankind.

RdF, which continues to support the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA, as it looks to return to the Moon and then Mars, is just one of the many innovative small businesses in the Granite State that have played such a critical role in our country's space program.

For example, the Saturn V rocket program, which launched the Apollo crews to the Moon, benefitted from a state-of-the-art computerized system which was developed at Sanders Associates in Nashua, now a part of BAE Systems. HaighFarr in Bedford has been in business for over 50 years designing complex antennas for the space program and has played a significant role in our Mars lander and rover programs. Mikrolar, in Hampton, manufactures high precision positioning systems and is a critical piece of the James Webb Telescope, which will be the successor to the Hubble sometime in the next decade.

The fact is that New Hampshire's pioneering and innovative small business community has been a mainstay in the aerospace community for decades and remains so today. As the ranking member on the Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees and funds NASA, I am supportive of NASA's efforts to get us back to the Moon and eventually Mars, particularly because I know Granite State businesses will be leading those efforts.

It is not just the private sector in New Hampshire that has stepped up to keep us competitive in science and space. It is also our educational community. The University of New Hampshire, UNH, is a key contributor to NASA's Lunar Reconnaissance Orbiter, which has been in orbit around the Moon since 2009. The New Hampshire Space Grant Consortium, which includes nine Granite State affiliates, including UNH, Dartmouth, and our very own McAuliffe-Shepard Discovery Center, is focused on educating our future scientists and space technicians.

A true accounting of New Hampshire's role in space would not be complete without calling attention to two of our State's most impressive space-faring heroes: Alan Shepard and Christa McAuliffe.

Alan Shepard was from Derry and is better known to the rest of the world as the first American in space. His historic 1961 Mercury flight paved the way for the Apollo missions to the Moon. I am also reminded that, as the commander of the follow-on *Apollo 14* mission, he also became the first human to golf on the Moon's surface.

Christa McAuliffe's legacy as an advocate for her students and for science education continues to inspire to this day. New Hampshire and the entire country are proud of her pioneering efforts. Earlier this month, the entire U.S. Senate honored that legacy and passed my legislation authorizing the U.S. Mint to produce a commemorative coin in her honor.

As we continue to celebrate these American achievements, we also celebrate the New Hampshire businesses, institutions, and people who helped make that possible and remember the pride Americans everywhere felt that day.

I also hope that the 50th anniversary of the Moon landing will serve as a wake-up call to all of us, a statement of the great things our country can do when we stand united, working together, and focused on a common goal. We need more of that today. I hope we will look to heroes like Christa McAuliffe, Alan Shepard, and the *Apollo 11* crew as we rededicate ourselves as a nation to achieving the impossible.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS LOCAL 158

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 100th anniversary of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers Local 158 from Green Bay, WI. The original charter of Local 158 was filed on June 6, 1919.

IBEW Local 158 occupies a storied place in the history of organized labor in northeast Wisconsin. Electrical workers in Green Bay began organizing for better wages and working conditions as early as 1902. By 1919, the workers had a committed core of electrical workers and filed the charter to establish a chapter of the IBEW on June 6 of that year. On June 17, 1919, the Local held its first meeting at the home of Brother August Verheyden. The Local increased its influence and magnified its voice by joining other groups advocating for workers and their families. In 1921, IBEW Local 158 joined the State Federation of Labor, the Green Bay Labor Council, and the Green Bay Building Trades.

Construction of paper mills and powerplants in the Fox Valley created steady employment for IBEW members. Their experience was especially important when the call for skilled labor went out during World War II to help build ships for the U.S. Navy. After the surprise attack on Pearl Harbor, the Navy rapidly began building low-cost cargo ships called Liberty

Ships, as well as smaller torpedo patrol and submarine chaser boats. Members of IBEW Local 158, along with their brethren from Local 1012 at the Leatham D. Smith Shipbuilding Company in Sturgeon Bay, stepped up to this challenge and contributed to the successful U.S. war effort.

IBEW Local 158 continued its significant contributions to the Green Bay economy and community through its work on Green Bay's City Hall, which opened in 1957. That same year, the Local celebrated its contribution to the completion of the Lake Michigan pipeline and the new City Stadium, home of the Green Bay Packers.

In the early 1970s, Local 158 merged with three other Wisconsin IBEW organizations: Local 751 in Manitowoc, Local 1012 in Sturgeon Bay, and Local 1235 in Marinette, making Local 158 a stronger, more diverse and financially sound Local in the Brotherhood.

In recent times, the skills and expertise of Local 158 members are on display at nearby nuclear power stations, paper mills, shipyards, and hospitals. In 2003, IBEW contributed to the significant renovations at Lambeau Field, a landmark we in Wisconsin like to refer to as the "8th Wonder of the World."

IBEW Local 158, however, is known for far more than its economic achievements. Its members also deserve recognition for their significant contributions to their community through generous charitable initiatives. In addition, its advocacy on behalf of family supporting wages has helped build the strong middle class Green Bay enjoys today.

On this important day, marking 100 years of outstanding service to its members, its union, and its community, I heartily congratulate IBEW Local 158 on its successful advocacy on behalf of working families, and I wish its members continued progress for the next 100 years.

RECOGNIZING THE FREEPORT FLAG LADIES

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to three great patriots, three inspiring women, from the town of Freeport, ME. Their names are Elaine Greene, Carmen Footer, and JoAnn Miller. They are known by our men and women in uniform, veterans, and grateful citizens throughout America as the Freeport Flag Ladies.

On September 11, 2001, an act of terror transformed a beautiful Tuesday morning into a day of unfathomable horror. Three days later, President Bush asked grief-stricken Americans to step outside their homes with lighted candles in memory of the heroes of 9/11 and of the nearly 3,000 innocent men, women, and children who perished.

Living on a secluded road, Elaine, Carmen, and JoAnn instead took their candles and an American flag to busy Main Street. Their location quickly began a rallying point for all of Free-

port, the site of a spontaneous, heartfelt memorial service.

Then they did something even more remarkable. They made a promise to stand with their flags on Main Street each and every Tuesday morning between the hours of 8 and 9, to mark the day and time of the attacks.

This coming September 11th will be their final vigil. When that day comes, they will have kept their promise for more than 900 consecutive Tuesdays, in rain, sleet, and snow, in bitter cold and in blistering heat. Carmen, the youngest of the three at 74, says their "retirement" is due solely to the fact that "Age wins, all the time."

For the past 4 years, the Freeport Flag Ladies have been joined each Tuesday by Darlene Jolly and frequently by Elaine's sister, Amy Gove.

They have kept their promise, and they have done so much more. From 2002 to 2016, they spearheaded a wonderful 9/11 tribute in Freeport. They have regularly made the long drive to Bangor International Airport, to join the legendary Maine Troop Greeters, and to Pease International Airport in New Hampshire, to meet the members of our Armed Forces as they head overseas or return home. They have greeted thousands of soldiers, and they are remembered by them all.

They have made a special effort to reach out to those who serve our country and to their families. Thousands of photographs of outbound troops have been sent back home, and families receive a weekly message. They have sent packages of games, magazines, and food to troops overseas. Parcels to combat support hospitals contain clothing and special pillows to make the transport of wounded soldiers more comfortable. They have funded these amazing efforts themselves, with yard sales, growing and selling "Flowers for Freedom," and donations.

Describing what Elaine Greene, Carmen Footer, and JoAnn Miller have done falls far short of putting into words what the Freeport Flag Ladies mean to our country. Perhaps the best words were spoken by Elaine: "Freedom shines on America, so let us shine for America." The Freeport Flag Ladies shine brightly, and their light will continue to inspire us all. Their prayer to be of service was answered with a mission to commemorate, to honor, and to remember. They are among those throughout our Nation who transformed one of America's darkest days into one of our finest hours.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the Flag Ladies of Freeport, ME, who will soon retire from their unwavering efforts to commemorate the heroes and the victims of the life-changing events that occurred on September 11, 2001. Every Tuesday since that day—for 18 years—the Freeport Flag Ladies have stood on Main Street in Freeport in our Nation's colors waving our Nation's flag. First standing to honor the lives lost in the 2001 attacks, these ladies have

continued to stand to support the brave men and women who serve our country today. Main Street shall see them wave the red, white, and blue for the last time on September 11, 2019.

In the days after the events of September 11, Elaine Greene, Carmen Footer, and Joann Miller were just like the rest of the country: they wanted to heal the Nation. So they acted, devoting their time and energy to honor and salute those who were lost and those who are willing to make the greatest sacrifice our Nation can ask. Since beginning their effort, these ladies have not missed a single Tuesday to share their message of patriotism and solidarity. Nothing could deter them, not the heaviest rains, the coldest snows, the blazing summer sun or even a dislocated shoulder. The Freeport Flag Ladies have showed up every week—no matter what.

When troops were deployed to Afghanistan and later Iraq, these women took this as an expansion of their mandate—traveling up to Bangor to send off soldiers and greet those returning home. The Freeport Flag Ladies have given up much themselves to ensure their mission is carried out week after week. Their own comfort has been forgone in their pursuit to bring comfort to their fellow countrymen. In waving the flag and shaking the hands of soldiers, Elaine Greene, Carmen Footer, and Joann Miller have represented the best of our Nation and the ideals of the flag they wave.

I want to thank the Freeport Flag Ladies for their commitment to honoring both the lives lost on September 11, 2001, and the soldiers who are currently serving and defending the United States. Their mission is not political. It is clear that what they do is an act of love and appreciation for the great sacrifices made by those who serve our country. These unwavering patriots are a reminder to the American people of what the flag represents. While they may wave their flags for the final time on September 11, 2019, the patriotism of these women will continue to be remembered and celebrated.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY OF MISSOURI CENTER FOR MISSOURI STUDIES

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, today, I stand to recognize the grand opening of the State Historical Society of Missouri's Center for Missouri Studies on August 10. The Center for Missouri Studies was established in 2014, and this new facility will move the State Historical Society from its home of 100 years to a new, visionary center meant to connect scholars of varied disciplines, showcase artwork by renowned Missourians, and provide state-of-the-art space for educational programming.

The State Historical Society of Missouri was founded in 1898 by the Missouri Press Association and has been an integral part of the preservation of Missouri's history ever since. Not only does it support research at centers in Cape Girardeau, Columbia, Kansas City, Rolla, St. Louis, and Springfield, it also houses an extensive collection of manuscripts, newspapers, books, maps, photographs, and art. Thanks to the efforts of dedicated staff over decades, the public can explore the records, myths, and culture that comprise the rich history of our State.

The new Center for Missouri Studies will build upon the State Historical Society's mission to "collect, preserve, publish, exhibit, and make available" to the public myriad resources and opportunities to learn. The center will feature a large art gallery, multipurpose and classroom space, an expanded research center, and modern conservation lab space. Not only will the public have greater access to historical archives and artwork, expert scholars will be able to study and examine the society's extensive collections in a space designed to facilitate collaboration.

The commitment of the State Historical Society of Missouri to preserve our history as we look forward to the beginning of a third century in our State is to be commended. The potential for the public to enjoy our State's unique past with greater ease cannot be undervalued. The dedication of the State Historical Society to drive this project to completion serves as an example to others. I extend my sincere thanks for all they do. Congratulations to Executive Director Gary Kremer and all State Historical Society of Missouri staff on this important occasion.●

TRIBUTE TO CHLOE JEAN MILSTEN

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Chloe Jean Milsten of Park County for her spirit of entrepreneurship in Livingston.

While still in high school, Ms. Milsten opened and operated her own business, Chloe's Barkery. Located in downtown Livingston, Chloe's Barkery sells dog treats to the Park County community. Now, after her high school graduation, she continues to manage the shop, providing Montanans with a unique, healthy bakery tailored for dogs.

Ms. Milsten's family has been a tremendous support system during her business endeavors. Her parents were some of her biggest influences in encouraging her to launch her business. Additionally, her younger sister Taeyha assists in the day-to-day operations of the store. Chloe's Barkery is the perfect example of a successful family-operated business that we can all be proud of in Montana.

Ms. Milsten's interest in animals is not merely related to her entrepre-

neurial spirit, but also that she hopes to become a veterinarian one day. I applaud Ms. Milsten for her impressive motivation and perseverance in owning and operating a successful small business, and I look forward to seeing all she accomplishes in the future.●

TRIBUTE TO CAROLINE DILLON

• Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I am proud to recognize Caroline Dillon of Rochester, NH, as July's Granite Stater of the Month for her work ensuring that every public high school and middle school in New Hampshire provides free feminine hygiene products to students who cannot afford them.

When Caroline first learned about "period poverty" in her high school's U.S. history class, she was shocked by the magnitude of this crisis. Period poverty occurs when someone does not have the means to afford basic feminine hygiene products. Caroline knew many of her classmates were on the reduced or free lunch program, and it did not take long for her to connect the dots and realize that some of her classmates were struggling with this problem every month.

Caroline turned her concern into political action. She took her history teacher's advice, who told Caroline's class that, if they ever had a problem with how things were run in the State, they should reach out to an elected official. She reached out to State Senator Martha Hennessey, an outspoken advocate for women's health and education.

Caroline, who at the time was not old enough to vote, worked with Senator Hennessey to draft the bill and to gain support for their legislation in the New Hampshire State House and among interest groups. Their argument was simple: If students do not need to bring essentials like toilet paper to school, why should they need to bring their own feminine hygiene products, which are just as essential?

Thanks to Caroline's efforts, the New Hampshire Governor last week signed into law a bill that mandates that every high school and middle school in the Granite State provide free feminine hygiene products in their female and gender-neutral bathrooms.

I want to thank Caroline once more for her work to help reduce the stigma around periods and to provide essential feminine hygiene products for those in need. I want to congratulate her as well for demonstrating how powerful individual compassion and advocacy can be in our democracy.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, 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.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:10 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 397. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a Pension Rehabilitation Trust Fund, to establish a Pension Rehabilitation Administration within the Department of the Treasury to make loans to multiemployer defined benefit plans, and for other purposes.

H.R. 434. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes.

H.R. 759. An act to restore an opportunity for tribal economic development on terms that are equal and fair, and for other purposes.

H.R. 776. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

H.R. 1058. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on autism spectrum disorder and enhance programs relating to autism, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1307. An act to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1365. An act to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act.

H.R. 1984. An act to amend chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to annually submit to Congress a report on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government.

H.R. 2035. An act to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to life-span respite care.

H.R. 2507. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain program under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3239. An act to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3245. An act to transfer a bridge over the Wabash River to the New Harmony River Bridge Authority and the New Harmony and Wabash River Bridge Authority, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3299. An act to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for income tax returns outside the statute of limitations, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify that all provisions shall apply to legally married same-sex couples in the same manner as other married couples, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3375. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to clarify the prohibitions on making robocalls, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3409. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 434. An act to amend the National Trails System act to provide for the study of the Emancipation National Historic Trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1307. An act to provide for an online repository for certain reporting requirements for recipients of Federal disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1365. An act to make technical corrections to the Guam World War II Loyalty Recognition Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1984. An act to amend chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to annually submit to Congress a report on all disaster-related assistance provided by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2507. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain programs under part A of title XI of such Act relating to genetic diseases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 3239. An act to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to perform an initial health screening on detainees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3409. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2258. A bill to provide anti-retaliation protections for antitrust whistleblowers.

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-2111. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Significant New Uses of Oxazolidine, 3,3'-Methylenebis[5-methyl-," (FRL No. 9995-09-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2112. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Nadja Y. West, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2113. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to terrorists who threaten to disrupt the Middle East peace process that was declared in Executive Order 12947 of January 23, 1995; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2114. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Prohibitions and Restrictions on Proprietary Trading and Certain Interests in, and Relationships With, Hedge Funds and Private Equity Funds" (RIN1557-AE47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2115. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Simplifications to the Capital Rule Pursuant to the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduction Act of 1996" (RIN1557-AE10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2116. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Removal of Obsolete Infectious Waste Incinerator Regulations" (FRL No. 9997-29-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2117. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Revisions to Nonattainment Permitting Regulations" (FRL No. 9996-96-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2118. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Feather River Air Quality Management District; Correction" (FRL No. 9997-33-Region 9) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2119. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treasury Decision (TD): Income Inclusion When Lessee Treated as Having Acquired Investment Credit Property" (RIN1545-BM74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2120. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulations on the Requirement to Notify the IRS of Intent to Operate as a Section 501(c)(4) Organization" (RIN1545-BN25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2121. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Creditable Foreign Taxes" (RIN1545-BM56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2122. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the

Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indexing adjustments for certain provisions under Section 36B of the Internal Revenue Code" (Rev. Proc. 2019-29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2123. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Automatic Consent to Change Methods of Accounting to Comply with Section 846" (Rev. Proc. 2019-30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2124. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice: Additional Preventive Care Benefits Permitted to be Provided by a High Deductible Health Plan Under Section 223" (Notice 2019-45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2125. A communication from the Attorney-Adviser, Office of the Legal Adviser, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Department of State 2019 Civil Monetary Penalties Inflationary Adjustment" (RIN1400-AE75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 23, 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2126. A communication from the Director, Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2018 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2127. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "EB-5 Immigrant Investor Program Modification" (RIN1615-AC07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 24, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON JULY 24, 2019

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 542. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions (Rept. No. 116-65).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 3305. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2509 George Mason Drive in Virginia Beach, Virginia, as the "Ryan Keith Cox Post Office Building".

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments:

S. 918. A bill to prohibit the President or a Federal agency from constructing, operating, or offering wholesale or retail services on broadband networks without authoriza-

tion from Congress, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-66).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with amendments:

S. 918. A bill to prohibit the President or a Federal agency from constructing, operating, or offering wholesale or retail services on broadband networks without authorization from Congress, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-66).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Richard K. Bell, of Pennsylvania, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cote d'Ivoire.

Nominee: Richard K. Bell.

Post: Cote d'Ivoire.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, Amount, Date and Donee:

1. Self: Possibly \$100, unknown, Obama or Democratic Party.
2. Spouse: \$50, 3/24/17, Democratic National Committee, \$50, 8/22/18, Beto O'Rourke.
3. Children and Spouses: Annis Catherine Bell, none; William Derek Bell, none.
4. Parents: William Delbert Bell, none; Catherine Marie Winfrey Bell, none.
5. Grandparents: NIA (all four deceased >20 years).
6. Brothers and Spouses: Mark Allan Bell, none; Paul Duane Bell, unknown*; Maryann Gallivan Bell (Paul's wife), unknown*.

*Unable to confirm contributions: he told me no details are available and she told me all handled by him. I searched FEC website on his name, state and employment but could not ascertain which results applied to him, if any.

Sisters and Spouses: NIA.

Pamela Bates, of Virginia, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, with the rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Pamela Bates.

Post: U.S. Representative to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Ian Christensen, a minor, none.
4. Parents: Deceased.
5. Grandparents: Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Col. George J. David, USMC, none; Medha P. David, none.

7. Sisters and Spouses: None.

Jonathan R. Cohen, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Arab Republic of Egypt.

Nominee: Jonathan R. Cohen.

Post: Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt.

Nominated: April 11, 2019.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Lidija Cohen: None.
3. Children: Alexandra R. Cohen, None; Gabriella Cohen, None.
4. Parents: Harry B. Cohen—deceased; Adrienne M. Cohen—deceased.
5. Grandparents: Saul Cohen—deceased; Bessie Cohen—deceased; Richard I. Mann—deceased; Sylvia Mann—deceased.

6. Brother: Sascha B. Cohen: \$10, 07-08-15, Bernie Sanders; \$10, 10-13-15, Bernie Sanders; \$18, 11-05-15, Bernie Sanders; \$10, 12-28-15, Bernie Sanders; \$36, 02-29-16, Bernie Sanders; \$10, 07-25-16, Elizabeth Warren; \$10, 07-25-16, Hillary Clinton; \$5, 11-23-16; Jill Stein recount; \$5, 11-26-16, Foster Campbell; \$25, 01-12-17, National Democratic Redistricting PAC; \$18, 01-31-17, Elizabeth Warren; \$1, 05-04-17, IL-06 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, OH-14 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, OH-10 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, MN-03 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, NE-01 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, CA-49 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, MI-03 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, FL-25 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, CA-25 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$1, 05-04-17, KS-03 2018 Democratic Nominee Fund; \$15, 05-31-17, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; \$10, 06-02-17, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; \$27, 09-20-17, Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee; \$3.34, 10-25-17, Sherrod Brown; \$3.33, 10-25-17, Tammy Baldwin; \$3.33, 10-25-17, Elizabeth Warren; \$27, 10-29-17, Friends of the Earth Action; \$10, 09-16-18, Giffords PAC-IE; \$5, 09-16-18, Sean Casten; \$10, 09-17-18, Sean Casten; \$9, 09-16-18, Mike Levin; \$10, 09-16-18, Beto O'Rourke; \$8, 09-17-18, Katie Porter; \$5, 09-16-18, Harley Rouda; \$2, 09-17-18, Adam Schiff; \$10, 09-16-18, Jon Tester; \$5, 09-16-18, Elizabeth Warren; \$10, 02-13-19, Kamala Harris; \$10, 03-1-19, Ditch Fund; \$18, 03-17-19, Vote Vets PAC; \$10, 03-17-19, Pete Buttigieg; \$5, 03-31-19, Kamala Harris; \$5, 03-31-19, Pete Buttigieg; \$3, 03-31-19, Jay Inslee.

7. Sisters: None.

Lana J. Marks, of Florida, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of South Africa.

Nominee: Lana Jennifer Marks.

Post: U.S. Ambassador to South Africa.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Martin Marks: \$2,700, 2015, Hillary for America; Tiffany Isaacs: \$35, 2018, RNC.

Parents:
Grandparents:
Brothers and Spouses:
Sisters and Spouses:

John Rakolta, Jr., of Michigan, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Arab Emirates.

Nominee: John Rakolta Jr.
Post: United Arab Emirates.
Nominated: 2-6-2019.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributor, amount, date, donee:

1. Self: John Rakolta Jr., \$101,700.00, 3/2/2017, Republican National Committee; \$33,900.00, 3/2/2017, Republican National Committee; \$14,400.00, 3/2/2017, Republican National Committee; \$10,000.00, 1/18/2017, Ronna McDaniel Fund; \$250,000.00, 1/2/2017, Presidential Inauguration; \$1,000.00, 11/2/2016, BERGMAN VICTORY COMMITTEE; \$2,700.00, 10/31/2016, Mike Bishop for Congress; \$250.00, 10/30/2016, Debbie Dingell for Congress; \$2,000.00, 10/27/2016, Debbie Dingell for Congress; \$2,700.00, 9/27/2016, Grassley Committee Inc.; \$10,800.00, 9/3/2016, Rubio Y Committee; \$5,400.00, 8/30/2016, Rubio Y Committee; \$2,700.00, 8/30/2016, Marc Rubio for Senate 2016; \$2,700.00, 8/30/2016, Marc Rubio for Senate 2016; \$125,000.00, 7/29/2016, Trump Victory; \$125,000.00, 7/27/2016, Trump Victory; \$1,000.00, 6/30/2016, Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc.; \$1,000.00, 6/30/2016, Friends of Kelly Ayotte Inc.; \$1,700.00, 6/8/2016, Rubio Refund; \$2,700.00, 6/8/2016, Rubio Refund; \$6,200.00, 5/25/2016, NRCC; \$33,400.00, 5/25/2016, NRCC; \$2,700.00, 5/25/2016, Ryan For Congress, Inc.; \$2,700.00, 5/25/2016, Ryan For Congress, Inc.; \$5,000.00, 5/25/2016, Prosperity Action Inc.; \$50,000.00, 5/25/2016, Team Ryan; \$2,700.00, 5/12/2016, David Trott For Congress; \$5,400.00, 3/2/2016, Sen. Rob Portman; \$2,700.00, 12/28/2015, Marco Rubio For President; (\$2,700.00), 12/28/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 12/14/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 12/4/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 10/2/2015, Jeb Bush for President; \$2,700.00, 9/29/2015, Ron Johnson For Senate Inc.; \$100.00, 8/20/2015, Ron Johnson For Senate Inc.; \$2,700.00, 8/17/2015, Rob Portman For US Senate; \$10,000.00, 1/26/2015, Ronna McDaniel Fund; \$1,000.00, 10/3/2014, Debbie Dingell for Congress; \$25,000.00, 10/1/2014, Michigan Republican Party; \$2,000.00, 7/27/2014, Asa Hutchinson; \$2,600.00, 7/1/2014, Transact A E; \$2,600.00, 7/1/2014, Rally Donations; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, TERRI LYNN LAND FOR SENATE; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, Mike Bishop for Congress; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, David Trott for Congress, Inc.; \$10,000.00, 6/30/2014, National Republican Senatorial Committee; \$32,400.00, 6/30/2014, Republican National Committee; \$500.00, 5/27/2014, Debbie Dingell For Congress; \$2,000.00, 3/20/2014, Debbie Dingell For Congress; \$4,233.33, 10/17/2016, Republican Party of Minnesota—Federal; \$4,233.33, 10/17/2016, Connecticut Republican Party; \$2,700.00, 10/5/2016, Mike Bishop For Congress; \$257.14, 9/30/2016, Republican Party Of Minnesota—Federal; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Connecticut Republican Party; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Wyoming Republican Party, Inc.; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Mississippi Republican Party; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Republican Party Of Arkansas; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Alabama Republican Party; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, West Virginia Republican Party, Inc.; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Kansas Republican Party; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Republican Party Of Virginia Inc.;

\$257.14, 9/27/2016, Missouri Republican State Committee—Federal; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, North Dakota Republican Party; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Republican Party Of Louisiana; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, Illinois Republican Party; \$5,400.00, 9/27/2016, Donald Trump For President; \$2,700.00, 8/3/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Republican Federal Committee Of Pennsylvania; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Mississippi Republican Party; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Wyoming Republican Party, Inc.; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Republican Party Of Arkansas; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Alabama Republican Party; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Kansas Republican Party; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, West Virginia Republican Party, Inc.; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Republican Party Of Wisconsin; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Republican Party Of Virginia Inc.; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Missouri Republican State Committee—Federal; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, North Dakota Republican Party; \$125,000.00, 7/26/2016, Trump Victory; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Republican Party Of Louisiana; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$4,233.33, 7/26/2016, Illinois Republican Party; \$1,000.00, 6/24/2016, Matt Gaetz For Congress.

2. Spouse: Rakolta, Terry L, \$4,233.33, 10/17/2016, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account; \$4,233.33, 10/17/2016, North Carolina Republican Party; \$4,233.33, 10/17/2016, Republican Party Of Minnesota—Federal; \$4,233.33, 10/17/2016, New Jersey Republican State Committee; \$4,233.33, 10/17/2016, South Carolina Republican Party; \$4,233.33, 10/17/2016, Connecticut Republican Party; \$1,000.00, 10/6/2016, Grassley Committee Inc.; \$257.14, 9/27/2016, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$2,700.00, 8/30/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate 2016; \$2,700.00, 8/30/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate 2016; \$2,700.00, 8/30/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate 2016; \$5,400.00, 8/30/2016, RUBIO VICTORY COMMITTEE; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Mississippi Republican Party; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Wyoming Republican Party, Inc.; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Republican Party Of Arkansas; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Alabama Republican Party; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Kansas Republican Party; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, West Virginia Republican Party, Inc.; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Republican Party Of Wisconsin; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Republican Party Of Virginia Inc.; \$33,400.00, 7/28/2016, Republican National Committee; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Missouri Republican State Committee—Federal; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, North Dakota Republican Party; \$2,700.00, 7/28/2016, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$125,000.00, 7/28/2016, Trump Victory; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Republican Party Of Louisiana; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, California Republican Party Federal Act; \$4,233.33, 7/28/2016, Illinois Republican Party; \$1,700.00, 5/13/2016, MARCO RUBIO FOR PRESIDENT; \$2,700.00, 2/29/2016, Portman For Senate Committee; \$1,700.00, 12/28/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$1,700.00, 12/14/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$1,700.00, 12/4/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$1,700.00, 10/2/2015, Jeb Bush For President; \$2,700.00, 9/29/2015, Ron Johnson For President, Inc.; \$1,000.00, 9/30/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, TERRI LYNN LAND FOR SENATE; \$2,600.00, 6/30/2014, TROTTI FOR CONGRESS, INC.

3. Daughter: \$2,700.00, 10/4/2016, Trump Victory; \$2,700.00, 10/4/2016, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$2,700.00, 12/14/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 8/24/2018, Rick Scott For Florida; \$15,000.00, 3/19/2018, Republican National Committee; \$2,700.00, 3/17/2018, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$2,700.00, 3/17/2018, Donald J. Trump For

President, Inc.; \$5,400.00, 3/17/2018, Trump Victory; \$5,000.00, 1/29/2018, Michigan Republican Party; \$1,000.00, 12/31/2017, Cathy McMorris Rodgers For Congress; \$5,000.00, 12/29/2017, Michigan Republican Party; \$2,700.00, 9/30/2017, John James For Senate Inc.; \$2,700.00, 8/3/2017, John James For Senate Inc.; \$15,000.00, 3/6/2017, Republican National Committee; \$1,000.00, 10/19/2016, Grassley Committee Inc.; \$1,000.00, 10/11/2016, Trott For Congress, Inc.; \$5,400.00, 9/27/2016, Trump Victory; \$2,700.00, 9/27/2016, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$2,700.00, 9/27/2016, Republican National Committee; \$2,700.00, 1/15/2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$5,400.00, 1/4/2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 10/26/2015, Jeb 2016, Inc. Daughter's Spouse: Michael Fitzgerald, \$2,700.00, 1/14/2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$5,400.00, 1/4/2016, Marco Rubio For President.

5. Daughter: Paige Frisch, \$2,700.00, 2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 2016, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc. Daughter's Spouse: Nickolos Frisch, \$2,700.00, 2016, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 2016, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.

6. Son: John III, Rakolta, \$500.00, 3/9/2018, Gus Bilirakis For Congress; \$15,000.00, 3/1/2018, Republican National Committee; \$2,700.00, 2/21/2018, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$2,700.00, 2/21/2018, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$10,000.00, 2/21/2018, Trump Victory; \$2,500.00, 1/5/2018, Associated Builders And Contractors Political Action Committee; \$5,000.00, 1/2/2018, Michigan Republican Party; (\$2,700.00), 12/28/2017, John James For Senate Inc.; \$5,400.00, 12/11/2017, John James For Senate Inc.; \$2,700.00, 5/13/2017, Francis Rooney For Congress; \$2,700.00, 10/5/2016, Mike Bishop For Congress; \$1,000.00, 10/1/2016, Chuck Grassley For Senate; \$5,400.00, 9/27/2016, Donald Trump For President; \$2,700.00, 8/3/2016, Marco Rubio For Senate; \$1,000.00, 6/24/2016, Matt Gaetz For Congress; \$2,700.00, 2/29/2016, Portman For Senate Committee; \$2,700.00, 12/14/2015, Marco Rubio For President; \$2,700.00, 8/20/2015, Rob Portman For Senate; \$2,700.00, 8/20/2015, Jeb 2016, Inc. Son's Prior Spouse: Jennifer Rakolta \$2,700.00, 12/28/2017, John James For Senate Inc.

7. Sister: Linda Rakolta, \$250.00, 10/10/2018, DNC Services Corp./Democratic National Committee; \$25.00, 9/29/2018, Actblue; \$250.00, 9/16/2018, Dccc; \$12.50, 11/30/2017, Actblue; \$25.00, 8/6/2017, Actblue; \$25.00, 6/14/2017, Actblue; \$1,500.00, 9/23/2016, Hillary For America; \$250.00, 9/30/2016, Hillary For America; \$250.00, 10/18/2016, Hillary For America; \$250.00, 11/3/2016, Hillary For America; \$250.00, 2/13/2016, Hillary For America; \$250.00, 2/3/2016, Hillary Victory Fund; \$41.72, 10/6/2016, Hillary For America; \$41.72, 10/6/2016, Hillary Victory Fund. Sister's Spouse: Joel Ravern, \$50.00, 10/5/2018, Actblue; \$50.00, 10/1/2018, Actblue; \$50.00, 10/1/2018, Actblue; \$25.00, 10/1/2018, Actblue; \$25.00, 7/27/2014, Actblue. Sister's Spouse: Marvin Keith, \$35.00, 11/24/2017, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$35.00, 10/24/2017, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$35.00, 9/24/2017, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$35.00, 8/24/2017, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$26.25, 7/24/2017, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$35.00, 7/24/2017, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$26.25, 6/24/2017, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$35.00, 6/24/2017, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$26.25, 5/24/2017, Donald J. Trump For President, Inc.; \$35.00, 5/24/2017, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$100.00, 2/28/2017, Trump Make America Great Again Committee;

\$50.00, 12/28/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$35.00, 12/24/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$35.00, 11/24/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$50.00, 11/1/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$35.00, 10/26/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$10.00, 10/25/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$50.00, 10/25/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$35.00, 10/6/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$10.00, 10/5/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$10.00, 10/5/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$50.00, 10/4/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$35.00, 8/24/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee; \$40.00, 6/28/2016, Trump Make America Great Again Committee.

Christopher Landau, of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the United Mexican States.

Nominee: Christopher Landau.

Post: Ambassador to Mexico.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$2,700, 6/24/16, Wendy Long for U.S. Senate.
2. Spouse: Caroline Landau: None.
3. Children and Spouses: Nathaniel and Julia Landau (no spouses): None.
4. Parents: George and Maria Landau (parents) (deceased): None.
5. Grandparents: Abraham Jakob Landau, Hubert Jobst, Jeannette Klausner Landau, Johanna Ertl Jobst—all deceased): None.
6. Brothers and spouses: Robert W. Landau, \$100, 4/10/16, Lindbeck for U.S. House; Linda M. Cero, (spouse), \$15, 8/9/16, Canova for U.S. House; \$1.50, 8/9/16, Actblue.
7. Sisters and spouses: None.

Richard B. Norland, of Iowa, 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 Libya.

Nominee: Richard B. Norland.

Post: Ambassador to Libya.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee.

1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Mary E. Hartnett, none.
3. Children and Spouses: Daniel Norland (son): \$5.00, 11/16/2016, Act Blue PAC; Jennifer Barkley (spouse): None; Kathleen Norland List (daughter): None; Bernhard Phillip List (spouse): None.
4. Parents: Donald R. Norland (deceased); Patricia B. Norland (deceased).
5. Grandparents: E. Norman Norland (deceased); Aletta Norland (deceased); August Bamman (deceased); Emily Bamman (deceased).
6. Brothers and Spouses: David Norland (brother): None; Susan Norland (spouse): None.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Patricia D. Norland (sister): None; Angela Dickey (spouse): \$5.00 4/30/2015, Act Blue; \$50.00, 4/30/2015, Act Blue; \$25.00, 5/11/2015, Act Blue; \$25.00, 6/11/2015, Act Blue; \$15.00, 6/24/2015, Act Blue; \$25.00, 7/11/2015, Act Blue; \$25.00, 8/11/2015, Act Blue;

\$5.00, 8/13/2015, Act Blue; \$5.00, 9/13/2015, Act Blue; \$5.00, 10/13/2015, Act Blue; \$5.00, 11/13/2015, Act Blue; \$5.00, 12/13/2015, Act Blue; \$2.50, 1/4/2016, Act Blue; \$25.00, 1/4/2016, Act Blue; \$10.00, 1/11/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 1/13/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 1/13/2016, Bernie 2016; \$10.00, 1/18/2016, Act Blue; \$10.00, 1/18/2016, Bernie 2016; \$10.00, 1/25/2016, Act Blue; \$10.00, 1/25/2016, Bernie 2016; \$10.00, 2/1/2016, Act Blue; \$10.00, 2/1/2016, Bernie 2016; \$15.00, 2/5/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 2/13/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 2/13/2016, Bernie 2016; \$3.00, 3/2/2016, Act Blue; \$15.00, 3/13/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 3/13/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 3/13/2016, Bernie 2016; \$15.00, 3/13/2016, Bernie 2016; \$3.00, 4/2/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 4/13/2016, Bernie 2016; \$3.00, 5/2/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 5/13/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 5/13/2016, Bernie 2016; \$3.00, 6/2/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 6/13/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 6/13/2016, Bernie 2016; \$3.00, 6/24/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 7/13/2016, Bernie 2016; \$3.00, 8/24/2016, Act Blue; \$3.00, 9/24/2016, Act Blue; \$3.00, 10/24/2016, Act Blue; \$15.00, 11/8/2016, Act Blue; \$5.00, 11/8/2016, Act Blue; \$15.00, 12/13/2017; Act Blue; \$50.00, 2/2/2018; Act Blue; \$25.00, 4/24/2018, Act Blue.

Kelly Craft, of Kentucky, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, and the Representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Kelly Craft, of Kentucky, to be Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations during her tenure of service as Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations.

Nominee: Kelly Knight Craft.

Post: Representative of the U.S. to the United Nations.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, date, amount, and recipient:

1. Self: Direct contributions to Federal Committees: 6/30/2015, \$2,700, Bush, Jeb VIA Jeb 2016, INC.; 12/22/2015, \$1,000, McCarthy, Kevin VIA Kevin McCarthy for Congress; 5/25/2016, \$2,700, Atkinson, Thomas M. VIA Tom Atkinson for Congress; 8/10/2016, \$5,400, Rubio, Marco VIA Marco Rubio for Senate; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Coffman, Mike VIA Coffman for Congress 2016; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Johnson, Ron Harold VIA Ron Johnson for Senate INC; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Heck, Joe VIA Friends of Joe Heck; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Young, Todd Christopher, VIA Friends of Todd Young, INC.; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Comstock, Barbara J. VIA Comstock for Congress.

Contributions to Joint Fundraising Committees: 7/14/2016, \$105,400, Trump Victory; 9/15/2016, \$160,000, Trump Victory.

Final Recipients of Joint Fundraising Committee Contributions: 7/14/2016, \$10,000, Republican Party of Wisconsin; 7/14/2016, \$10,000, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania; 7/14/2016, \$2,700, Trump, Donald J. VIA Donald J. Trump for President, INC.; 7/14/2016, \$2,700, Trump, Donald J. VIA Donald J. Trump for President, INC.; 7/14/2016, \$10,000, Illinois Republican Party; 7/14/2016, \$10,000, Missouri Republican State Committee-Federal; 7/14/2016, \$33,400, Republican National Committee; 8/10/2016, \$2,256.25, Alabama Republican Party; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, Republican Party of Virginia INC; 9/15/2016, \$7,743.75, Republican Party of Virginia INC; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, North Dakota Republican Party; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, Republican Party of Louisiana; 9/15/2016, \$7,743.75, Kansas Republican Party; 9/15/2016, \$7,743.75, Republican

Party of Louisiana; 9/15/2016, \$2,700, Trump, Donald J. VIA Donald J. Trump for President, INC.; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, Kansas Republican Party; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee; 9/15/2016, \$7,743.75, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, California Republican Party Federal Account; 9/15/2016, \$7,743.75, California Republican Party Federal Account; 9/15/2016, \$7,743.75, Mississippi Republican Party; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, West Virginia Republican Party, INC.; 9/15/2016, \$7,743.75, West Virginia Republican Party, INC.; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, Wyoming Republican Party, INC.; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, Mississippi Republican Party; 9/15/2016, \$2,256.25, Republican Party of Arkansas; 9/15/2016, \$7,743.75, Republican Party of Arkansas; 9/30/2016, \$7,743.75, New Jersey Republican State Committee; 9/30/2016, \$7,743.75, Republican Party of Minnesota - Federal; 9/30/2016, \$7,743.75, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account; 9/30/2016, \$7,743.75, Connecticut Republican Party; 9/30/2016, \$7,743.75, South Carolina Republican Party; 10/27/2016, \$2,256.25, Republican Party of Minnesota - Federal; 10/27/2016, \$10,000, North Carolina Republican Party; 10/27/2016, \$2,256.25, New Jersey Republican State Committee; 10/27/2016, \$2,256.25, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account; 10/27/2016, \$2,256.25, Connecticut Republican Party; 10/27/2016, \$2,256.25, South Carolina, Republican Party.

2. Spouse: Joseph Walton Craft III: Direct contributions to Federal Committees: 1/29/2015, \$2,500, Guthrie, Brett S. VIA Guthrie for Congress; 1/29/2015, \$2,700, Guthrie, Brett S. VIA Guthrie for Congress; 2/20/2015, \$2,700, Lankford, James Paul VIA Families for James Lankford; 2/27/2015 \$5,000, Oklahoma Strong Leadership PAC; 3/19/2015, \$5,000, Leadership Matters for America PAC, INC.; 3/26/2015, \$334,000, Republican National Committee; 4/2/2015, \$5,000, CoalPAC, A Political Action Committee of the National Mining Association; 5/15/2015, \$5,400, Johnson, Ron Harold VIA Ron Johnson for Senate INC; 9/28/2015, \$2,700, McCarthy, Kevin VIA Kevin McCarthy for Congress; 10/28/2015, \$2,700, Cole, Tom VIA Cole for Congress; 12/23/2015, \$5,000, Alliance Coal PAC; 3/29/2016, \$100,200, Republican National Committee; 3/29/2016, \$100,200, Republican National Committee; 3/29/2016, \$33,400, Republican National Committee; 3/29/2016, \$5,000, CoalPAC, A Political Action Committee of the National Mining Association; 3/31/2016, \$5,400, Blunt, Roy VIA Friends of Roy Blunt; 4/12/2016, \$2,700, Comer, James VIA Comer for Congress; 5/25/2016, \$2,700, Atkinson, Thomas M. VIA Tom Atkinson for Congress; 6/6/2016, \$5,000, Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America PAC (US Chamber PAC); 6/6/2016, \$5,000, Alliance Coal PAC; 7/11/2016, \$2,700, Paul, Rand VIA Rand Paul for US Senate; 7/11/2016, \$2,700, Paul, Rand VIA Rand Paul for US Senate; 7/26/2016, \$5,400, Rubio, Marco VIA Marco Rubio for Senate; 7/26/2016, \$12,500, Republican Party of Kentucky; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Coffman, Mike VIA Coffman for Congress 2016; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Heck, Joe VIA Friends of Joe Heck; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Young, Todd Christopher VIA Friends of Todd Young, INC.; 9/13/2016, \$2,700, Comstock, Barbara J. VIA Comstock for Congress; 9/29/2016, \$5,000, OKSTRONG PAC; 5/25/2017, \$5,000, US Chamber PAC; 8/15/2017, \$5,000, Alliance Coal PAC; 10/10/2017, \$5,000, CoalPAC, A Political Action Committee of the National Mining Association; 12/12/2017, \$35,000, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 12/22/2017, \$2,700, Yoder, Kevin VIA Yoder for Congress; 12/22/2017, \$2,700, Yoder, Kevin VIA Yoder for Congress; 3/1/2018, \$5,000, US Chamber PAC; 2/27/2018, \$5,000, CoalPAC, A Political Action Committee of the National Mining Association; 3/20/2018, \$2,700, Bost, Mike VIA Mike

Bost for Congress; 3/20/2018, \$2,700, Davis, Rodney VIA Rodney Davis for Congress; 3/20/2018, \$2,700, Roskam, Peter VIA Roskam for Congress; 3/20/2018, \$2,700, Hurd, Will VIA Hurd for Congress; 3/20/2018, \$2,700, Love, Mia VIA Friends of Mia Love; 3/20/2018, \$2,700, Hawley, Josh VIA Josh Hawley for Senate; 3/20/2018, \$2,700, Cramer, Kevin VIA Cramer for Senate; 3/20/2018, \$2,700, Blackburn, Marsha VIA Marsha for Senate; 3/20/2018, \$5,000, Alliance Coal PAC; 5/9/2018, \$35,000, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 5/9/2018, \$2,700, Barr, Andy VIA Andy Barr for Congress; 6/11/2018, \$2,700, Cramer, Kevin VIA Cramer for Senate; 6/11/2018, \$2,700, Scott, Rick VIA Rick Scott for Florida; 6/11/2018, \$2,700, Scott, Rick VIA Rick Scott for Florida; 6/11/2018, \$2,700, Morrisey, Patrick VIA Morrisey for Senate; 6/11/2018, \$2,700, Morrisey, Patrick VIA Morrisey for Senate; 6/11/2018, \$2,700, Heller, Dean VIA Heller for Senate; 6/11/2018, \$2,700, Heller, Dean VIA Heller for Senate; 8/3/2018, \$2,700, Barrasso, John VIA Friends of John Barrasso; 8/3/2018, \$2,700, Barrasso, John VIA Friends of John Barrasso; 8/3/2018, \$5,000, Barrasso, John VIA Common Values PAC; 8/27/2018, \$2,700, Miller, Carol VIA Miller for Congress; 8/27/2018, \$2,700, McSally, Martha VIA McSally for Senate; 9/12/2018, \$2,700, Braun, Mike VIA Mike Braun for Indiana; 9/12/2018, \$2,700, Braun, Mike VIA Mike Braun for Indiana; 9/21/2018, \$2,700, Romney, Mitt VIA Romney for Utah; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Kim, Young VIA Young Kim for Congress; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Handel, Karen VIA Handel for Congress; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Chabot, Steve VIA Steve Chabot for Congress; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Hagedorn, Jim VIA Friends of Hagedorn; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Stauber, Pete VIA Pete Stauber for Congress; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Gianforte, Greg VIA Greg for Montana; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Arrington, Katie VIA Katie Arrington for Congress; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Buetler, Herrera Jaime VIA Jaime for Congress; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, Miller, Carol VIA Carol for Congress; 10/23/2018, \$2,700, LaMalfa, Doug VIA Doug LaMalfa Committee; 1/29/2019, \$2,700, Daines, Steve VIA Steve Daines for Montana; 1/29/2019, \$2,700, Daines, Steve VIA Steve Daines for Montana; 1/29/2019, \$35,000, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 3/21/2019, \$5,000, US Chamber PAC; 3/21/2019, \$5,000, CoalPAC, A Political Action Committee of the National Mining Association.

Contributions to Independent Expenditure-Only Committees: 6/6/2016, \$1,000,000, American Crossroads; 8/05/2016, \$100,000, Kentuckians for Strong Leadership; 9/28/2016, \$125,000, Congressional Leadership Fund; 9/28/2016, \$750,000, Future45; 12/4/2017, \$500,000, US Chamber of Commerce; 3/20/2018, \$1,000,000, American Crossroads Senate Leadership Fund; 5/9/2018, \$50,000, American Opportunity Alliance; 5/10/2018, \$750,000, Congressional Leadership Fund; 8/3/2018, \$100,000, Kentuckians for Strong Leadership; 10/23/2018, \$250,000, US Chamber of Commerce; 10/23/2018, \$250,000, Senate Leadership Fund; 10/29/2018, \$1,000, Miners Dig It PAC; 1/29/2019, \$50,000, American Opportunity Alliance;

Contributions to Joint Fundraising Committees: 4/16/2015, \$5,400, Burr Toomey Victory Fund; 9/14/2015, \$43,800, Boehner for Speaker; 12/7/2015, \$5,400, Scalise Leadership Fund; 3/31/2016, \$43,800, Team Ryan; 7/11/2016, \$100,000, Trump Victory; 9/13/2016, \$65,400, Trump Victory; 12/12/2017, \$50,000, Team Ryan; 3/20/2018, \$50,000, Team Ryan; 8/3/2018, \$100,000, National Republican Senatorial Committee Targeted State Victory; 9/12/2018, \$5,400, Securing the Senate Majority Committee; 9/17/2018, \$5,400, Steil Victory Fund; 2/8/2019, \$50,000, Take Back the House Team McCarthy 2020.

Final Recipients of Joint Fundraising Committee Contributions: 6/10/2015, \$2,700,

Burr, Richard M. VIA Richard Burr Committee; 9/18/2015, \$2,700, Boehner, John A. VIA Friends of John Boehner; 9/18/2015, \$2,700, Boehner, John A. VIA Friends of John Boehner; 9/18/2015, \$5,000, Freedom Project; The; 9/18/2015, \$5,000, Freedom Project; The; 9/18/2015, \$33,400, NRCC; 9/18/2015, \$33,400, NRCC; 12/28/2015, \$2,700, Scalise, Steve VIA Scalise for Congress; 12/28/2015, \$2,700, Scalise, Steve VIA Scalise for Congress; 12/28/2015, \$2,700, Scalise, Steve VIA Scalise for Congress; 12/28/2015, \$2,700, Scalise, Steve VIA Scalise for Congress; 4/13/2016, \$10,800, NRCC; 4/13/2016, \$33,400, NRCC; 4/13/2016, \$5,000, Prosperity Action INC; 4/13/2016, \$2,700, Ryan, Paul D. VIA Ryan for Congress, INC.; 4/13/2016, \$2,700, Ryan, Paul D. VIA Ryan for Congress, INC.; 7/11/2016, \$5,912.50, Alabama Republican Party; 7/11/2016, \$5,912.50, California Republican Party Federal Account; 7/11/2016, \$6,327.50, Illinois Republican Party; 7/11/2016, \$5,912.50, Kansas Republican Party; 7/11/2016, \$3,036.36, Mississippi Republican Party; 7/11/2016, \$6,327.50, Missouri Republican State Committee - Federal; 7/11/2016, \$5,912.50, North Dakota Republican Party; 7/11/2016, \$3,036.36, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee; 7/11/2016, \$4,087.50, NY Republican Federal Campaign Committee; 7/11/2016, \$6,327.50, Republican Federal Committee of Pennsylvania; 7/11/2016, \$3,036.36, Republican Party of Arkansas; 7/11/2016, \$3,036.36, Republican Party of Louisiana; 7/11/2016, \$3,036.36, Republican Party of Virginia INC.; 7/11/2016, \$6,327.50, Republican Party of Wisconsin; 7/11/2016, \$2,700, Trump, Donald J. VIA Donald J. Trump for President, INC.; 7/11/2016, \$2,700, Trump, Donald J. VIA Donald J. Trump for President, INC.; 7/11/2016, \$3,036.36, West Virginia Republican Party, INC.; 9/15/2016, \$4,087.50, California Republican Party Federal Account; 9/15/2016, \$4,087.50, Kansas Republican Party; 9/15/2016, \$4,087.50, Mississippi Republican Party; 9/15/2016, \$4,087.50, Republican Party of Arkansas; 9/15/2016, \$4,087.50, Republican Party of Louisiana; 9/15/2016, \$4,087.50, Republican Party of Virginia INC; 9/15/2016, \$4,087.50, West Virginia Republican Party, INC.; 9/27/2016, \$3,036.36, South Carolina Republican Party; 9/30/2016, \$3,036.36, Connecticut Republican Party; 9/30/2016, \$4,087.50, Connecticut Republican Party; 9/30/2016, \$2,700, McConnell, Mitch VIA McConnell Senate Committee; 9/30/2016, \$3,036.36, New Jersey Republican State Committee; 9/30/2016, \$4,087.50, New Jersey Republican State Committee; 9/30/2016, \$4,087.50, Republican Party of Minnesota - Federal; 9/30/2016, \$4,087.50, South Carolina Republican Party; 9/30/2016, \$3,036.36, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account; 9/30/2016, \$4,087.50, Tennessee Republican Party Federal Election Account; 10/17/2016, \$6,327.50, North Carolina Republican Party; 10/17/2016, \$5,912.50, Republican Party of Minnesota - Federal; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Republican Party of Arizona; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Republican Party of Florida; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Republican Party of Indiana; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Missouri Republican State Committee; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Republican Party of Montana; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Nevada Republican Central Committee; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Republican Party of North Dakota; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Republican Party of Ohio; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Republican Party of Tennessee; 8/3/2018, \$10,000, Republican Party of West Virginia; 9/12/2018, \$2,700, Hawley, Josh VIA Josh Hawley for Senate; 9/12/2018, \$2,700, McSally, Martha VIA McSally for Congress; 9/17/2018, \$2,700, Steil, Brian VIA Steil for Wisconsin; 9/17/2018, \$2,700, Republican Party of Wisconsin.

3. Stepson: Joseph W "JW" Craft IV: Direct Contributions to Federal Committees: 4/24/2015, \$5,000, Oklahoma Strong Leadership PAC; 2/29/2016, \$2,700, Rubio, Marco VIA Marco Rubio for President; 3/15/2016, \$5,400, Blunt, Roy VIA Friends of Roy Blunt; 3/28/2016, \$5,400, Cole, Tom VIA Cole for Congress;

4/12/2016, \$2,700, Comer, James VIA Comer for Congress; 1/2/2018, \$5,000, Alliance Coal PAC; 6/8/2018, \$2,700, Morrisey, Patrick VIA Morrisey for Senate; 6/11/2018, \$5,400, Scott, Rick VIA Rick Scott for Florida; 10/29/2018, \$25,000, National Republican Senatorial Committee; 2/21/2019, \$2,800, Cole, Tom VIA Tom Cole for Congress; 2/21/2019, \$2,800, Cole, Tom VIA Tom Cole for Congress.

Contributions to Joint Fundraising Committees: 9/18/2015, \$43,800, Boehner for Speaker; 4/13/2016, \$10,800, Team Ryan; 8/1/2016, \$2,700, McConnell for Majority Leader Committee.

4. Stepdaughter-in-Law: Mollie Craft: Direct Contributions to Federal Committees: 4/24/2015, \$5,000, Oklahoma Strong Leadership PAC; 3/3/2016, \$2,700, Rubio, Marco VIA Marco Rubio for President; 3/15/2016, \$2,100, Blunt, Roy VIA Friends of Roy Blunt; 3/29/2016, \$2,100, Cole, Tom VIA Cole for Congress; 6/11/2018, \$5,400, Scott, Rick VIA Rick Scott for Florida.

Contributions to Joint Fundraising Committees: 9/18/2015, \$43,800, Boehner for Speaker.

Final Recipients of Joint Fundraising Committee Contributions: 9/18/2015, \$2,700, NRCC; 9/18/2015, \$2,700, Boehner, John A. VIA Friends of John Boehner; 9/18/2015, \$5,000, Freedom Project; The; 9/18/2015, \$33,400, NRCC.

5. Stepson: Ryan Edward Craft: Direct Contributions to Federal Committees: 4/22/2015, \$5,000, Oklahoma Strong Leadership PAC; 4/18/2016, \$2,700, Comer, James VIA Comer for Congress; 8/7/2016, \$5,400, Rubio, Marco VIA Marco Rubio for Senate.

Contributions to Joint Fundraising Committees: 4/24/2015, \$5,400, Burr Toomey Victory Fund; 5/5/2016, \$5,400, Team Ryan.

Final Recipients of Joint Fundraising Committee Contributions: 6/4/2015, \$2,700, Toomey, Patrick Joseph VIA Friends of Pat Toomey; 6/10/2015, \$2,700, Burr, Richard M. VIA Richard Burr Committee; The; 5/5/2016, \$2,700, Ryan, Paul D. VIA Ryan for Congress, INC.; 5/5/2016, \$2,700, Ryan, Paul D. VIA Ryan for Congress, INC.;

6. Stepdaughter-in-law: Lauren Craft: Direct Contributions to Federal Committees: 4/22/2015, \$5,000, Oklahoma Strong Leadership PAC; 4/18/2016, \$2,700, Comer James VIA Comer for Congress; 8/7/2016, \$5,400, Rubio, Marco VIA Marco Rubio for Senate.

Contributions to Joint Fundraising Committees: 4/24/2015, \$5,400, Burr Toomey Victory Fund; 5/5/2016, \$5,400, Team Ryan.

Final Recipients of Joint Fundraising Committee Contributions: 6/4/2015, \$2,700, Toomey, Patrick Joseph VIA Friends of Pat Toomey; 6/10/2015, \$2,700, Burr, Richard M. VIA Richard Burr Committee; The; 5/5/2016, \$2,700, Ryan, Paul D. VIA Ryan for Congress, INC.; 5/5/2016, \$2,700, Ryan, Paul D. VIA Ryan for Congress, INC.

7. Brother: Marc Guilfoil: No contributions.

8. Daughter: Mia Moross Blumberg: Direct Contributions to Federal Committees: 2018, \$450, Hoar, Will VIA Will Hoar for Congress.

9. Son-in-Law: Stuart Blumberg: Direct Contributions to Federal Committees: 2018, \$450, Hoar, Will VIA Will Hoar for Congress.

10. Son-in-Law: Wyatt Melzer: No contributions.

11. Sister-in-Law: Elisabeth Jensen: Direct Contributions to Federal Committees: 2/28/2015, \$98,142.43, Jensen, Elizabeth VIA Elizabeth Jensen for Congress; 4/26/2018, \$1,000, McGrath, Amy VIA Amy McGrath for Congress; 10/9/2018, \$500, McGrath, Amy VIA Amy McGrath for Congress.

12. Sister: Micah Guilfoil: Direct Contributions to Federal Committees: 1/26/2016, \$100, Gray, Jim VIA Jim Gray for Kentucky; 8/2/2017, \$100, McGrath, Amy VIA Amy McGrath for Congress; 6/23/2018, \$25, Hegar, MJ VIA MJ

for Texas; 9/11/2018, \$25, O'Rourke, Beto VIA Beto for Texas; 9/11/2018, \$25, McGrath, Amy VIA Amy McGrath for Congress; 1/6/2019, \$25, Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee.

13. Grandparents: (N/A, deceased): No contributions.

14. Brother-in-Law: Bruce Payne: No contributions.

15. Daughter: Jane Knight: No contributions.

16. Stepdaughter: Caroline Craft Fiddes: No contributions.

17. Stepson-in-Law: Mark Fiddes: No contributions.

18. Stepson: Kyle O'Keefe Craft: No contributions.

19. Mother: Sherry D. Guilfoil (deceased): No contributions.

20. Father: Bobby Austin Guilfoil (deceased): No contributions.

Philip S. Goldberg, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Ambassador, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Colombia.

Nominee: Philip S. Goldberg.

Post: Colombia.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: N/A.
3. Children and Spouses: N/A.
4. Parents: N/A.
5. Grandparents: N/A.
6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: Donna G. Eskind and Jeffrey Eskind (See attachment).

POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS BY IMMEDIATE FAMILY MEMBERS

DONNA GOLDBERG ESKIND, NASHVILLE TN (SISTER)

2019

Believe in Service, \$1000.

2017–2018

Believe in Service, \$2500; Bredesen for Senate, \$2700; Bredesen for Senate, \$2,700; James Mackler for Senate, \$1,700; Act Blue, \$25; Act Blue, \$50; James Mackler for Senate, \$1,000.

2016–2017

Hillary for America, \$2,652; Hillary for America, \$48; Hillary for America, \$24.72; Hillary for America, \$10; Hillary for America, \$10.

2015–2015

None.

DR. JEFFREY ESKIND, NASHVILLE, TN (BROTHER-IN-LAW)

2017–2018

Believe in Service, \$2500; Bredesen for Senate, \$2700; Bredesen for Senate, \$2700.

2016–2016

Hillary for America, \$2700.

2014–2015

Republican National Committee, \$10,000; Massachusetts Victory Committee, \$10,000.

Jessica E. Lapenn, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Nominee: Jessica E. Lapenn.

Post: U.S. Mission to the African Union.

The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: \$31.55, 6/15/16, Hilary Victory Fund; \$600, 6/15/16, Hilary Victory Fund.
2. Spouse: N/A.
3. Children: Jasper Lapenn: none.
4. Parents: James A. Lapenn: 150, 9/16/15, HANYS PAC—Health Assoc. of NYS & Allied Associate PACS; 150, 12/9/16, HANYS PAC; 50, 10/1/17, Friends of Tom Carty—Hillsdale NY; 150, 10/16/17, HANYS PAC; 100, 4/21/18, Hillsdale NY Democratic Club; 50, 7/20/18, Hillsdale NY Democratic Club; 250, 8/22/18, Delgado for Congress; 150, 8/27/18, HANYS PAC; 250, 9/20/18, Act Blue. Joyces. Lapenn: 100, 4/21/17, Hillsdale NY Democratic Club; 250, 8/22/18, Delgado for Congress; 100, 10/9/18, Act Blue; 100, 10/9/18, Act Blue; 150, 10/14/18, Act Blue; 25, 10/27/28, Act Blue; 25, 10/27/18, Act Blue; 10, 9/20/18, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 10, 10/04/18, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 10, 11/01/18, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 10, 12/2/18, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 10, 1/4/19, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 10, 2/1/19, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 10, 3/1/19, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 10, 4/1/19, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 50, 4/4/19, Columbia County (NY) Democrats; 10, 5/1/19, Columbia County (NY) Democrats.
5. Grandparents: Thelma J. Lapenn—Deceased; David Lapenn—Deceased; Hilda Sankel—Deceased; Abraham Sankel—Deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

Mary Beth Leonard, of Massachusetts, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Nominee: Mary Beth Leonard.

Post: Nigeria.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

- Contributions, Amount, Date, Donee:
1. Self: none.
 2. Spouse: N/A.
 3. Children and Spouses: N/A.
 4. Parents: Earl W. Leonard—(deceased); Margaret M. Leonard, None.
 5. Grandparents: Thomas F. Leonard—(deceased); Florence Leonard—(deceased); Joseph Mastrorio—(deceased); Catherine A. Mastrorio—(deceased).
 6. Brothers and Spouses: Michael Leonard—(deceased).
 7. Sisters and Spouses: Claire M. and William K. McIntire, none; Ann Marie and David N. Stoica, none.

Jennifer D. Nordquist, of Virginia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jennifer M. Adams and ending with Sarah-Ann Lynch, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2019.

Foreign Service nomination of William S. Martin.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Christine Byrne and ending with Robert Mason, which nominations were received by

the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 10, 2019.

Michelle A. Bekkering, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with James J. Higgiston and ending with Bobby G. Richey, Jr., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2019.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS 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.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Uchenna Nnayelugo Agu and ending with Jaime Alber Zea Cifuentes, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2019. (minus 1 nominee: Courtney L. Lacroix)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Jennifer Ann Amos and ending with Michael L. Mahoney, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2019. (minus 1 nominee: Jay P. Williams)

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Allison Margaret Bartels and ending with Yang Q. Zhou, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2019.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Vanessa L. Adams and ending with Lyndsey K. Yoshino-Spencer, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2019.

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Sonja Joy Andersen and ending with Sandra M. Zuniga Guzman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 21, 2019.

By Mr. INHOFE for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

*David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

(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. UDALL:

S. 2261. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to issue Clean Energy Victory Bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. REED, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HASSAN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2262. A bill to provide for phased-in payment of Social Security Disability Insurance

payments during the waiting period for individuals with a terminal illness; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the requirements for secure geological storage of carbon oxide for purposes of the carbon oxide sequestration credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2264. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require the impaneling of a new jury if a jury fails to recommend by unanimous vote a sentence for conviction of a crime punishable by death; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 2265. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the work-study allowance program administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 2266. A bill to extend group flood insurance policy assistance for victims of the 2016 West Virginia floods, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 2267. A bill for the relief of Cesar Carlos Silva Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 2269. A bill to establish a competitive bidding process for the relocation of the headquarters of Executive agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 2270. A bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to promote timely exploration for geothermal resources under geothermal leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 2271. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a program to improve infrastructure development in Appalachia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 2272. A bill to provide for the implementation of a system of licensing for purchasers of certain firearms and for a record of sale system for those firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 2273. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to reauthorize the Appalachian Regional Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2274. A bill to establish a voluntary program that strengthens the economy, public health, and environment of the United States by reducing emissions from wood

heaters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 2275. A bill to improve the collection and distribution of broadband availability data; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 2276. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to protect employees in the building and construction industry who are participants in multiemployer plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2277. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to make innovative technology loan guarantees available for battery storage technologies; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 2278. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to issue rules requiring the inclusion of new safety equipment in school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2279. A bill to make necessary reforms to improve compliance with loss mitigation requirements by servicers of mortgages for single family housing insured by the FHA, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 2280. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to establish an Appalachian regional energy hub initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2281. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2282. A bill to amend the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to enable Indian Tribes and tribally designated housing entities to apply for, receive, and administer grants and subgrants under the Continuum of Care Program of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2283. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an investment tax credit for waste heat to power technology; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2284. A bill to create a Climate Action Rebate Fund in order to efficiently reduce greenhouse gas emissions, provide a monthly rebate to the American people, encourage innovation of clean energy technologies and create new economic opportunities, ensure the resiliency of our infrastructure, assist with the transition to a clean energy economy, and leave a healthier, more stable, and more prosperous nation for future generations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 2285. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to authorize a pilot program within the nationally significant freight and highway projects program to increase State

infrastructure investments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2286. A bill to establish a Science Advisory Board at the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2287. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal antidiscrimination claims; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Mr. KING, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2288. A bill to amend title VI of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978 to establish a Federal energy efficiency resource standard for electricity and natural gas suppliers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. REED, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. COONS, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 2289. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an extension of the energy credit and the credit for residential energy efficient property; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 2290. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for expenditures to provide access to disabled individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 2291. A bill to require all newly constructed, federally assisted, single-family houses and town houses to meet minimum standards of visitability for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2292. A bill to require asylum officers to conduct credible fear screenings before admitting aliens seeking asylum into the United States, to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish an alternatives to detention pilot program, and to clarify that aliens transiting through third countries on the way to the United States are ineligible for asylum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Ms. HASSAN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2293. A bill to extend the authority of the Export-Import Bank of the United States and to modify the quorum requirement of the Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2294. A bill to establish the Office of Disability Policy in the legislative branch; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN,

Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2295. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2296. A bill to reauthorize the Pregnancy Assistance Fund; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Mr. WICKER, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2297. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2298. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate the corn ethanol mandate for renewable fuel; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 2299. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to enhance the safety and reliability of pipeline transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2300. A bill to amend the Energy Independence and Security Act of 2007 to establish a program to incentivize innovation and to enhance the industrial competitiveness of the United States by developing technologies to reduce emissions of nonpower industrial sectors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 2301. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to provide disaster assistance to States, insular areas, units of general local government, and Indian tribes under a community development block grant disaster recovery program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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 Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 284. A resolution calling upon the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 285. A resolution designating September 2019 as "School Bus Safety Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. SASSE):

S. Res. 286. A resolution designating July 26, 2019, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 157

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 157, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit kindergarten through grade 12 educational expenses to be paid from a 529 account.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 348

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

S. 560

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 560, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for treatment of a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 727

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 727, a bill to combat international extremism by addressing global fragility and violence and stabilizing conflict-affected areas, and for other purposes.

S. 775

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to amend the America COMPETES Act to require

certain agencies to develop scientific integrity policies, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to amend part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to provide full Federal funding of such part.

S. 1060

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1060, a bill to deter foreign interference in United States elections, and for other purposes.

S. 1088

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1088, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the President to set a minimum annual goal for the number of refugees to be admitted, and for other purposes.

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1107, a bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1141

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1141, a bill to provide predictability and certainty in the tax law, create jobs, and encourage investment.

S. 1162

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1162, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the individual tax provisions of the tax reform law, and for other purposes.

S. 1172

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1172, a bill to require full funding of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

S. 1385

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1385, a bill to prohibit the awarding of a contract or grant in excess of the simplified acquisition threshold unless the prospective contractor or grantee certifies in writing to the agency awarding the contract or grant that the contractor or grantee has no seriously delinquent tax debts, and for other purposes.

S. 1441

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr.

GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1441, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to the provision of certain vessels for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, and for other purposes.

S. 1527

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1527, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct, and submit to Congress a report describing the results of, an assessment of the total amount of nonhighway recreational fuel taxes received by the Secretary of the Treasury and transferred to the Highway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1575

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1575, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to make available to the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention copies of consular reports of death of United States citizens, and for other purposes.

S. 1637

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1637, a bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to reaffirm the authority of the Under Secretary of Agriculture for Research, Education, and Economics, and for other purposes.

S. 1675

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1675, a bill to impose requirements on the payment of compensation to professional persons employed in voluntary cases commenced under title III of PROMESA.

S. 1838

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1838, a bill to amend the Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, and for other purposes.

S. 1906

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1906, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide financial assistance to eligible entities to provide and coordinate the provision of suicide prevention services for veterans at risk of suicide and veteran families through the award of grants to such entities, and for other purposes.

S. 1953

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1953, a bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to extend the jurisdiction of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to include the setting of reference prices for aluminum premiums, and for other purposes.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1982, a bill to improve efforts to combat marine debris, and for other purposes.

S. 2034

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2034, a bill to authorize small business development centers to provide cybersecurity assistance to small business concerns, and for other purposes.

S. 2054

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2054, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2066

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2066, a bill to review United States Saudi Arabia Policy, and for other purposes.

S. 2080

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2080, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to increase the number of permanent faculty in palliative care at accredited allopathic and osteopathic medical schools, nursing schools, social work schools, and other programs, including physician assistant education programs, to promote education and research in palliative care and hospice, and to support the development of faculty careers in academic palliative medicine.

S. 2103

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2103, a bill to improve access to affordable insulin.

S. 2147

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2147, a bill to double the existing penalties for the provision of misleading or inaccurate caller identification information, and to extend the statute of limitations for forfeiture penalties for persons who commit such violations.

S. 2166

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 2166, a bill to designate Regional Ocean Partnerships of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 2177

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2177, a bill to provide taxpayers with an improved understanding of Government programs through the disclosure of cost, performance, and areas of duplication among them, leverage existing data to achieve a functional Federal program inventory, and for other purposes.

S. 2179

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 2179, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide social service agencies with the resources to provide services to meet the urgent needs of Holocaust survivors to age in place with dignity, comfort, security, and quality of life.

S. 2203

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) were added as cosponsors of S. 2203, a bill to extend the transfer of Electronic Travel Authorization System fees from the Travel Promotion Fund to the Corporation for Travel Promotion (Brand USA) through fiscal year 2027, and for other purposes.

S. 2222

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2222, a bill to prohibit the Export-Import Bank of the United States from providing financing to persons with seriously delinquent tax debt.

S. 2223

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2223, a bill to facilitate a national pipeline of spectrum for commercial use, and for other purposes.

S. 2240

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2240, a bill to promote digital citizenship and media literacy.

At the request of Mr. BROWN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2240, supra.

S. 2250

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2250, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish State and Indian tribe grants for community colleges and grants for Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Tribal Colleges and Universities, and Minority-Serving Institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2253

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2253, a bill to amend chapter 2205 of title 36, United States Code, to provide pay equity for amateur athletes and other personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 2256

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2256, a bill to protect children affected by immigration enforcement actions.

S. 2260

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2260, a bill to provide for the improvement of domestic infrastructure in order to prevent marine debris, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 112

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 112, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States condemns all forms of violence against children globally and recognizes the harmful impacts of violence against children.

S. RES. 142

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 142, a resolution condemning the Government of the Philippines for its continued detention of Senator Leila De Lima, calling for her immediate release, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 252

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 252, a resolution designating September 2019 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive remuneration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am introducing the Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act with Senators BLUMENTHAL, WHITEHOUSE, MERKLEY, BALDWIN, WARREN, VAN HOLLEN, and BROWN. This legislation would end special tax deductions for huge executive bonuses by closing a

loophole that still allows publicly traded corporations to deduct the cost of multimillion-dollar bonuses from their corporate tax bills. U.S. taxpayers shouldn't have to subsidize these massive bonuses.

Under section 162(m) of the tax code as amended by the 2017 Trump tax law (TCJA), when a publicly traded corporation calculates its taxable income, it is generally permitted to deduct the cost of compensation from its revenues, with limits up to \$1 million for some of the firm's most senior executives.

In the last Congress, the TCJA closed some of the pre-existing 162(m) loopholes by incorporating provisions from my Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act, including removing the exemption for performance-based compensation, which previously permitted compensation deductions above \$1 million when executives met performance benchmarks set by the corporation's Board of Directors.

In addition, a technical correction from my bill to ensure that all publicly traded corporations that are required to provide quarterly and annual reports to their investors under Securities and Exchange Commission rules and regulations are subject to section 162(m) was also included in the TCJA. Previously, this section of the tax code only covered some publicly traded corporations who are required to provide these periodic reports to their shareholders.

While these were positive steps, even more should have been done, such as applying section 162(m) to all employees of publicly traded corporations so that all compensation is subject to a deductibility cap of \$1 million. This was the lone provision from my Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act from the 115th Congress that was not incorporated into the Trump tax law.

Partially closing these 162(m) loopholes saved taxpayers \$9.2 billion according to the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT), but according to Americans for Tax Fairness, "Extending the \$1 million deductibility cap to all forms of compensation for all employees might generate about \$20 billion over 10 years. This is based on JCT's original \$50 billion revenue estimate, discounted to \$30 billion because of the 40% corporate tax cut, and subtracting the \$9.2 billion already being raised by the TCJA's partial reform."

This is why we are introducing a revised version of the Stop Subsidizing Multimillion Dollar Corporate Bonuses Act to finish what was started. Our legislation would extend section 162(m) to all employees of publicly traded corporations so that all compensation is subject to a deductibility cap of \$1 million. Publicly traded corporations would still be permitted to pay their executives as much as they desire, but compensation above and beyond \$1 million would no longer be subsidized by other hardworking taxpayers through our tax code.

Our legislation tackles this issue head on by ending the public subsidy of excessive executive compensation. This is simply a matter of fairness, ensuring that corporations—and not hardworking taxpayers who face their own challenges in this economy—are paying for the multi-million dollar bonuses corporations have decided to dole out to their senior executives.

We need to prioritize tax breaks that grow our economy and strengthen the middle class, and this bill helps eliminate some of the unfairness in the tax code.

I thank Public Citizen, the Institute for Policy Studies, Global Economy Project, Americans for Financial Reform, the AFL-CIO, and MIT Professor Simon Johnson for their support. I also want to thank Senator BLUMENTHAL for working with me on this issue, and I urge our colleagues to join us in cosponsoring this legislation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2281. A bill to amend chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, to require the voluntary collection of demographic information for patent applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Inventor Diversity for Economic Advancement Act of 2019. I thank my colleague from North Carolina, Senator TILLIS, for working with me on this important piece of legislation, which serves as a first step to closing the diversity gap in our patent system by collecting demographic data on patent applicants.

Women and racial minorities have made some of the most significant inventions in this country's history. The \$75 billion home security industry grew from an initial home security system invented by Marie Van Brittan Brown. The computer would never have become the multimedia device it is today without the microcomputer system invented by Mark Dean. The genetic revolution would still be science fiction if not for the CRISPR gene-editing tool discovered by Jennifer Doudna—raised on Hawaii's Big Island.

We should celebrate these inventors and the many others like them who have contributed to innovation in this country. But we must also recognize the hard truth that women, racial minorities, and many other groups are greatly underrepresented in the U.S. patent system.

The Patent and Trademark Office's recent report on women inventors shines a spotlight on one part of this problem. The PTO found that only 21 percent of U.S. patents list a woman as an inventor and that women make up only 12 percent of all inventors. This is true even though women held 43 percent of all full-time jobs in 2016 and 28 percent of STEM jobs in 2015.

Other reports highlight racial and income patent gaps. For example, a report by the Institute for Women's Policy Research found that the percentage

of African American and Hispanic college graduates who hold patents is approximately half that of their white counterparts. Another report found that children born into families with incomes below the median U.S. income are 90 percent less likely to receive a patent in their lifetimes than those born into wealthier families.

Closing these gaps would turbocharge our economy. According to a study by Michigan State University Professor Lisa Cook, including more women and African Americans in the “initial stage of the process of innovation” could increase GDP by as much as \$640 billion. Another study by the National Bureau of Economic Research found that eliminating the patent gap for women with science and engineering degrees alone would increase GDP by over \$500 billion.

It’s simply good policy and good business to want to fully integrate people of all types into our innovation economy.

But if we have any hope of closing the various patent gaps, we must first get a firm grasp on the scope of the problem.

Studies of the demographic makeup of patentees, like the ones I described, are few and far between. The reason is a simple one. A lack of data. The PTO does not collect any data on applicants beyond their first and last names and city, state, and country of residence. As a result, those wishing to study patent gaps between different demographic groups are forced to guess the gender of an applicant based on his or her name, determine the race or income status of an applicant by cross-referencing census data, or explore a number of other options that are time-consuming, unreliable, or both.

The IDEA Act solves this problem. It would require the PTO to collect demographic data—including gender, race, military or veteran status, and income level, among others—from patent applicants on a voluntary basis. It would further require the PTO to issue reports on the data collected and, perhaps more importantly, make the data available to the public with appropriate protections for personally identifiable information. Outside researchers could therefore conduct their own analyses and offer insights into the various patent gaps in our society.

Let me be clear. Closing the information gap facing researchers alone will not solve the patent gap facing women, racial minorities, and so many others. But it is a critical first step. I therefore encourage my colleagues to support the IDEA Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 284—CALLING UPON THE UNITED STATES SENATE TO GIVE ITS ADVICE AND CONSENT TO THE RATIFICATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF THE SEA

Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 284

Whereas the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) was adopted by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in December 1982, and entered into force in November 1994 to establish a treaty regime to govern activities on, over, and under the world’s oceans;

Whereas UNCLOS builds on four 1958 Law of the Sea conventions to which the United States is a party, including the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, the Convention on the High Seas, the Convention on the Continental Shelf, and the Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas;

Whereas the treaty and an associated 1994 agreement relating to implementation of the treaty were transmitted to the Senate on October 6, 1994, and, in the absence of Senate advice and consent to adherence, the United States is not a party to the convention and the associated 1994 agreement;

Whereas the convention has been ratified by 167 parties, which includes 166 countries and the European Union, but not the United States;

Whereas the United States, like most other countries, believes that coastal states under UNCLOS have the right to regulate economic activities in their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), but do not have the right to regulate foreign military activities in their EEZs;

Whereas the treaty’s provisions relating to navigational rights, including those in EEZs, reflect the United States diplomatic position on the issue dating back to UNCLOS’s adoption in 1982;

Whereas becoming a party to the treaty would reinforce the United States perspective into permanent international law;

Whereas becoming a party to the treaty would give the United States standing to participate in discussions relating to the treaty and thereby improve the United States ability to intervene as a full party to disputes relating to navigational rights, and to defend United States interpretations of the treaty’s provisions, including those relating to whether coastal states have a right under UNCLOS to regulate foreign military activities in their EEZs;

Whereas relying on customary international norms to defend United States interests in these issues is not sufficient, because it is not universally accepted and is subject to change over time based on state practice;

Whereas relying on other countries to assert claims on behalf of the United States at the Hague Convention is woefully insufficient to defend and uphold United States sovereign rights and interests;

Whereas the Permanent Court of Arbitration, in their July 12, 2016, ruling on the case in the matter of the South China Sea Arbitration, stated, “the Tribunal forwarded to the Parties for their comment a Note Verbale from the Embassy of the United States of America, requesting to send a rep-

resentative to observe the hearing”, and “the Tribunal communicated to the Parties and the U.S. Embassy that it had decided that ‘only interested States parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea will be admitted as observers’ and thus could not accede to the U.S. request.”;

Whereas, on November 25, 2018, the Russian Federation violated international norms and binding agreements, including the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, in firing upon, ramming, and seizing Ukrainian vessels and crews attempting to pass through the Kerch Strait;

Whereas, on May 25, 2019, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea ruled in a vote of 19–1 that “the Russian Federation shall immediately release the Ukrainian naval vessels Berdyansk, Nikopol and Yany Kapu, and return them to the custody of Ukraine,” and that “the Russian Federation shall immediately release the 24 detained Ukrainian servicemen and allow them to return to Ukraine,” demonstrating the Tribunal’s rejection of Russia’s arguments in this matter in relation to the Law of the Sea;

Whereas, despite the Tribunal’s ruling aligning with the United States Government’s position on the incident, the United States continued nonparticipation in UNCLOS limits the United States ability to effectively respond to Russia’s actions in the November 25, 2018, incident, as well as to any potential future violations by the Russian Federation and any other signatory of UNCLOS;

Whereas the confirmed nominee and future Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Bill Moran, stated that “becoming a party to the Convention would reinforce freedom of the seas and the navigational rights vital to our global force posture in the world’s largest maneuver space. Joining the Convention would also demonstrate our commitment to the rule of law, and strengthen our credibility with other Convention parties,” in response to advance policy questions on April 30, 2019, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Ray Mabus, stated, “the UNCLOS treaty guarantees rights such as innocent passage through territorial seas; transit passage through, under and over international straits; and the laying and maintaining of submarine cables,” and “the convention has been approved by nearly every maritime power and all the permanent members of the UN Security Council, except the United States”, on February 16, 2012, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Secretary of the Navy, the Honorable Ray Mabus, further stated, “Our notable absence as a signatory weakens our position with other nations, allowing the introduction of expansive definitions of sovereignty on the high seas that undermine our ability to defend our mineral rights along our own continental shelf and in the Arctic.”, and “the Department strongly supports the accession to UNCLOS, an action consistently recommended by my predecessors of both parties”, on February 16, 2012, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past President and current Chief Executive Officer of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Thomas J. Donahue, stated, “we support joining the Convention because it is in our national interest—both in our national security and our economic interests”, and, “becoming a party to the Treaty benefits the U.S. economically by providing American companies the legal certainty and stability they need to hire and invest”, and, “companies will be hesitant to

take on the investment risk and cost to explore and develop the resources of the sea—particularly on the extended continental shelf (ECS)—without the legal certainty and stability accession to LOS provides”, on June 28, 2012, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

Whereas the past President and current Chief Executive Officer of the United States Chamber of Commerce, Mr. Thomas J. Donahue, further stated, “the benefits of joining cut across many important industries including telecommunications, mining, shipping, and oil and natural gas”, and, “joining the Convention will provide the U.S. a critical voice on maritime issues—from mineral claims in the Arctic to how International Seabed Authority (ISA) funds are distributed”, on June 28, 2012, before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

Whereas the past Commander of United States Pacific Command, Admiral Samuel J. Locklear, stated that UNCLOS is “widely accepted after a lot of years of deliberation by many, many countries, most countries in my Area of Responsibility (AOR)”, and, “when we’re not a signatory, it reduces our overall credibility when we bring it up as a choice of how you might solve a dispute of any kind”, on April 16, 2015, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, retired Admiral Paul Zukunft, stated on February 12, 2016, “With the receding of the icepack, the Arctic Ocean has become the focus of international interest.”, and “All Arctic states agree that the Law of the Sea Convention is the governing legal regime for the Arctic Ocean . . . yet, we remain the only Arctic nation that has not ratified the very instrument that provides this accepted legal framework governing the Arctic Ocean and its seabed.”, and “Ratification of the Law of the Sea Convention supports our economic interests, environmental protection, and safety of life at sea, especially in the Arctic Ocean.”;

Whereas the past Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jonathan Greenert, further stated, “remaining outside Law of the Sea Convention (LOSC) is inconsistent with our principles, our national security strategy and our leadership in commerce and trade”, and, “virtually every major ally of the U.S. is a party to LOSC, as are all other permanent members of the U.N. Security Council and all other Arctic nations”, on June 14, 2012, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Jonathan Greenert, further stated, “our absence [from LOSC] could provide an excuse for nations to selectively choose among Convention provisions or abandon it altogether, thereby eroding the navigational freedoms we enjoy today”, and, “accession would enhance multilateral operations with our partners and demonstrate a clear commitment to the rule of law for the oceans”, on June 14, 2012, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the United States Special Representative of State for the Arctic and former Commandant of the Coast Guard, Admiral Robert Papp, Jr., stated, “as a non-party to the Law of the Sea Convention, the U.S. is at a significant disadvantage relative to the other Arctic Ocean coastal States”, and, “those States are parties to the Convention, and are well along the path to obtaining legal certainty and international recognition of their Arctic extended continental shelf”, and, “becoming a Party to the Law of the Sea Convention would allow the United States to fully secure its rights to the continental shelf off the coast of Alaska, which is likely to extend out to more than 600 nau-

tical miles”, on December 10, 2014, before the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

Whereas the Chairman of the Joints Chiefs of Staff, General Joseph F. Dunford, stated, “The Convention provides legal certainty in the world’s largest maneuver space.”, and, “access would strengthen the legal foundation for our ability to transit through international straits and archipelagic waters; preserve our right to conduct military activities in other countries’ Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) without notice or permission; reaffirm the sovereign immunity of warships; provide a framework to counter excessive maritime claims; and preserve or operations and intelligence-collection activities”, and, “joining the Convention would also demonstrate our commitment to the rule of law, strengthen our credibility among those nations that are already party to the Convention, and allow us to bring the full force of our influence in challenging excessive maritime claims”, on July 9, 2015, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the Chairman of the Joints Chief of Staff, General Joseph F. Dunford, further stated, “by remaining outside the Convention, the United States remains in scarce company with Iran, Venezuela, North Korea, and Syria”, and, “by failing to join the Convention, some countries may come to doubt our commitment to act in accordance with international law”, on July 9, 2015, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral John M. Richardson, stated, “acceding to the Convention would strengthen our credibility and strategic position”, and, “we undermine our leverage by not signing up to the same rule book by which we are asking other countries to accept”, on July 30, 2015, in his nomination hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral John M. Richardson, further stated, “that becoming a part of [UNCLOS] would give us a great deal of credibility, and particularly as it pertains to the unfolding opportunities in the Arctic”, and, “this provides a framework to adjudicate disputes”, on July 30, 2015, in his nomination hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Assistant Secretary of Defense for Asian and Pacific Security Affairs, the Honorable David Shear, stated, “that while the United States operates consistent with the United Nations convention on the Law of the Sea, we’ve seen positive momentum in promoting shared rules of the road”, and, “our efforts would be greatly strengthened by Senate ratification of UNCLOS”, on September 17, 2015, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the Commander of United States Indo-Pacific Command, Admiral Philip S. Davidson, stated “our accession to the UNCLOS would help our position legally across the globe and would do nothing to limit our military operations in the manner in which we’re conducting them now”, on April 17, 2018, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

Whereas the past Commander of United States Pacific Command, retired Admiral Harry B. Harris, stated “I believe that UNCLOS gives Russia the potential to, quote, unquote ‘own’ almost half of the Arctic Circle, and we will not have that opportunity because of, we’re not a signatory to UNCLOS,” on March 15, 2018, before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate; and

Whereas the past Commander of United States Pacific Command, Admiral Harry B. Harris, stated “I think that by not signing onto it that we lose the creditability for the very same thing that we’re arguing for”, and “which is the following—accepting rules and norms in the international arena. The United States is a beacon—we’re a beacon on a hill but I think that light is brighter if we sign on to UNCLOS”, on February 23, 2016, at a hearing before the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that it is in the national interest for the United States to become a formal signatory of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea;

(2) urges the United States Senate to give its advice and consent to the ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS); and

(3) recommends the ratification of UNCLOS remain a top priority for the Administration, having received bipartisan support from every President since 1994, and having most recently been underscored by the strategic challenges the United States faces in the Asia-Pacific, the Arctic, and the Black Sea regions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 285—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2019 AS “SCHOOL BUS SAFETY MONTH”

Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 285

Whereas, every school day in the United States, approximately 500,000 public and private school buses carry more than 26,000,000 children to and from school;

Whereas school buses comprise the largest mass transportation fleet in the United States;

Whereas 48 percent of all K–12 students ride a school bus for each of the 180 school days in a year, totaling nearly 4,680,000,000 miles driven in school buses annually;

Whereas the Child Safety Network, celebrating 30 years of national public service, supports the CSN Safe Bus campaign, which is designed to provide the latest training, technology, and free safety and security resources to the school bus industry;

Whereas the designation of School Bus Safety Month will allow broadcast and digital media and social networking industries to make commitments to disseminate public service announcements that are produced in order—

(1) to provide free resources designed to safeguard children;

(2) to recognize school bus drivers and professionals; and

(3) to encourage the driving public to engage in safer driving behavior near school buses when students are boarding and disembarking from the school buses;

Whereas key leaders who are deserving of recognition during School Bus Safety Month and beyond have provided security awareness training materials to more than 14,000 public and private school districts, trained more than 100,000 school bus operators, and provided more than 150,000 counterterrorism guides to individuals who are key to providing both safety and security for children in the United States; and

Whereas School Bus Safety Month offers the Senate and the people of the United States an opportunity to recognize and thank all of the school bus drivers in the United States and the professionals who are focused on school bus safety and security: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 2019 as “School Bus Safety Month”.

SENATE RESOLUTION 286—DESIGNATING JULY 26, 2019, AS “UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY”

Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. BURR, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, and Mr. SASSE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 286

Whereas on July 26, 1908, Attorney General Charles Bonaparte ordered newly-hired Federal investigators to report to the Office of the Chief Examiner of the Department of Justice, which subsequently was renamed the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

Whereas on July 26, 1947, President Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.), creating the Department of Defense, the National Security Council, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, thereby laying the foundation for today’s intelligence community;

Whereas the National Security Act of 1947, which appears in title 50, United States Code, governs the definition, composition, responsibilities, authorities, and oversight of the intelligence community of the United States;

Whereas the intelligence community is defined by section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003) to include the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, other offices within the Department of Defense for the collection of specialized national intelligence through reconnaissance programs, the intelligence elements of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Department of Energy, the Bureau of Intelligence and Research of the Department of State, the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, the elements of the Department of Homeland Security concerned with the analysis of intelligence information, and other elements as may be designated;

Whereas July 26, 2019, is the 72nd anniversary of the signing of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.);

Whereas the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (Public Law 108-458; 118 Stat. 3638) created the position of the Director of National Intelligence to serve as the head of the intelligence community and to ensure that national intelligence be timely, objective, independent of political considerations, and based upon all sources available;

Whereas Congress has previously passed joint resolutions, signed by the President, to designate Peace Officers Memorial Day on May 15, Patriot Day on September 11, and other commemorative occasions, to honor the sacrifices of law enforcement officers and of those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001;

Whereas the United States has increasingly relied upon the men and women of the intelligence community to protect and defend the security of the United States in the years since the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community, both civilian and military, have been increasingly called upon to deploy to theaters of war in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere since September 11, 2001;

Whereas numerous intelligence officers of the elements of the intelligence community have been injured or killed in the line of duty;

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States are routinely called upon to accept personal hardship and sacrifice in the furtherance of their mission to protect the United States, to undertake dangerous assignments in the defense of the interests of the United States, to collect reliable information within prescribed legal authorities upon which the leaders of the United States rely in life-and-death situations, and to “speak truth to power” by providing their best assessments to decision makers, regardless of political and policy considerations;

Whereas the men and women of the intelligence community have on numerous occasions succeeded in preventing attacks upon the United States and allies of the United States, saving numerous innocent lives; and

Whereas intelligence officers of the United States must of necessity often remain unknown and unrecognized for their substantial achievements and successes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 26, 2019, as “United States Intelligence Professionals Day”;

(2) acknowledges the courage, fidelity, sacrifice, and professionalism of the men and women of the intelligence community of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 930. Mr. SCOTT, of Florida (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3253, to provide for certain extensions with respect to the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 930. Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for Mr. BLUNT) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 3253, to provide for certain extensions with respect to the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Sustaining Excellence in Medicaid Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note), as amended by Public Law 116-29, is amended by striking “July 14, 2019” and inserting “September 13, 2019”.

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF PROTECTION FOR MEDICAID RECIPIENTS OF HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES AGAINST SPOUSAL IMPOVERISHMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2404 of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 1396r-5 note) is amended by striking “September 30, 2019” and inserting “December 31, 2019”.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in section 2404 of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C.

1396r-5 note) or section 1902(a)(17) or 1924 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(17), 1396r-5) shall be construed as prohibiting a State from applying an income or resource disregard under a methodology authorized under section 1902(r)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(r)(2))—

(1) to the income or resources of an individual described in section 1902(a)(10)(A)(ii)(VI) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(ii)(VI)) (including a disregard of the income or resources of such individual’s spouse); or

(2) on the basis of an individual’s need for home and community-based services authorized under subsection (c), (d), (i), or (k) of section 1915 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396n) or under section 1115 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1315).

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF MONEY FOLLOWS THE PERSON REBALANCING DEMONSTRATION.

Section 6071(h)(1)(F) of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended by striking “\$132,000,000” and inserting “\$254,500,000”.

SEC. 5. EXTENSION FOR FAMILY-TO-FAMILY HEALTH INFORMATION CENTERS.

Section 501(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 701(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)(vii), by striking “and 2019” and inserting “through 2024”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking “fiscal years 2018 and 2019” and inserting “fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter”.

SEC. 6. REDUCED WHOLESALE ACQUISITION COST (WAC)-BASED PAYMENTS FOR NEW DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS.

Section 1847A(c)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3a(c)(4)) is amended by striking “payable under this section for the drug or biological based on—” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: “payable under this section—

“(A) in the case of a drug or biological furnished prior to January 1, 2019, based on—

“(i) the wholesale acquisition cost; or

“(ii) the methodologies in effect under this part on November 1, 2003, to determine payment amounts for drugs or biologicals; and

“(B) in the case of a drug or biological furnished on or after January 1, 2019—

“(i) at an amount not to exceed 103 percent of the wholesale acquisition cost; or

“(ii) based on the methodologies in effect under this part on November 1, 2003, to determine payment amounts for drugs or biologicals.”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have 8 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 Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 24,

2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing pending military nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 9:30 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 Thursday, July 25, 2019, 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 Thursday, July 25, 2019, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRAUN). The Senator from Florida.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, as if in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, Executive Calendar No. 125.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Joseph V. Cuffari, of Arizona, to be Inspector General, Department of Homeland Security.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

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

The nomination was confirmed.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 3877

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate receives H.R. 3877, it be placed on the calendar and not be required to lay over a day before a motion to proceed is in order.

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

EMPOWERING BENEFICIARIES, ENSURING ACCESS, AND STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2019

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3253.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3253) to provide for certain extensions with respect to the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Blunt substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The amendment (No. 930) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Sustaining Excellence in Medicaid Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF THE COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.

Section 223(d)(3) of the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note), as amended by Public Law 116-29, is amended by striking "July 14, 2019" and inserting "September 13, 2019".

SEC. 3. EXTENSION OF PROTECTION FOR MEDICAID RECIPIENTS OF HOME AND COMMUNITY-BASED SERVICES AGAINST SPOUSAL IMPOVERISHMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2404 of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 1396r-5 note) is amended by striking "September 30, 2019" and inserting "December 31, 2019".

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in section 2404 of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 1396r-5 note) or section 1902(a)(17) or 1924 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(17), 1396r-5) shall be construed as prohibiting a State from applying an income or resource disregard under a methodology authorized under section 1902(r)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(r)(2))—

(1) to the income or resources of an individual described in section 1902(a)(10)(A)(ii)(VI) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396a(a)(10)(A)(ii)(VI)) (including a disregard of the income or resources of such individual's spouse); or

(2) on the basis of an individual's need for home and community-based services authorized under subsection (c), (d), (i), or (k) of section 1915 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396n) or

under section 1115 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1315).

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF MONEY FOLLOWS THE PERSON REBALANCING DEMONSTRATION.

Section 6071(h)(1)(F) of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 1396a note) is amended by striking "\$132,000,000" and inserting "\$254,500,000".

SEC. 5. EXTENSION FOR FAMILY-TO-FAMILY HEALTH INFORMATION CENTERS.

Section 501(c) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 701(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A)(vii), by striking "and 2019" and inserting "through 2024"; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking "fiscal years 2018 and 2019" and inserting "fiscal year 2018 and each fiscal year thereafter".

SEC. 6. REDUCED WHOLESALE ACQUISITION COST (WAC)-BASED PAYMENTS FOR NEW DRUGS AND BIOLOGICALS.

Section 1847A(c)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-3a(c)(4)) is amended by striking "payable under this section for the drug or biological based on—" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting the following: "payable under this section—

"(A) in the case of a drug or biological furnished prior to January 1, 2019, based on—

"(i) the wholesale acquisition cost; or

"(ii) the methodologies in effect under this part on November 1, 2003, to determine payment amounts for drugs or biologicals; and

"(B) in the case of a drug or biological furnished on or after January 1, 2019—

"(i) at an amount not to exceed 103 percent of the wholesale acquisition cost; or

"(ii) based on the methodologies in effect under this part on November 1, 2003, to determine payment amounts for drugs or biologicals."

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 3253), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, 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.

AMENDING TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE, TO ADD FLAGSTAFF AND YUMA TO THE LIST OF LOCATIONS IN WHICH COURT SHALL BE HELD IN THE JUDICIAL DISTRICT FOR THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1569, which was received from the House and is at the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1569) to amend title 28, United States Code, to add Flagstaff and Yuma to the list of locations in which court shall be held in the judicial district for the State of Arizona.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 1569) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DHS FIELD ENGAGEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 47, H.R. 504.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 504) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Department of Homeland Security to develop an engagement strategy with fusion centers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “DHS Field Engagement Accountability Act”.

SEC. 2. ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY WITH FUSION CENTERS.

Section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h) is amended by—

(1) redesignating subsections (j) and (k) as subsections (k) and (l), respectively; and

(2) inserting after subsection (i) the following:

“(j) **FUSION CENTER INFORMATION SHARING STRATEGY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the DHS Field Engagement Accountability Act, and not less frequently than once every 5 years thereafter, the Secretary shall develop or update a strategy for Department engagement with fusion centers. Such strategy shall be developed and updated in consultation with the heads of intelligence components of the Department, the Chief Privacy Officer, the Officer for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties, officials of fusion centers, officers designated as Homeland Security Advisors, and the heads of other relevant agencies, as appropriate. Such strategy shall include the following:

“(1) Specific goals and objectives for sharing information and engaging with fusion centers—

“(A) through the direct deployment of personnel from intelligence components of the Department;

“(B) through the use of Department unclassified and classified information sharing systems, including the Homeland Security Information Network and the Homeland Secure Data Network, or any successor systems; and

“(C) through any additional means.

“(2) The performance metrics to be used to measure success in achieving the goals and objectives referred to in paragraph (1).

“(3) A 5-year plan for continued engagement with fusion centers.”.

SEC. 3. OFFICE OF INTELLIGENCE AND ANALYSIS FIELD PERSONNEL SUPPORT TO FUSION CENTERS.

(a) **PERFORMANCE METRICS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis shall—

(1) consider the effectiveness of existing processes to identify and prepare field personnel for deployment to support fusion centers and internal mechanisms to ensure oversight and accountability of such field personnel, including field personnel assigned to one center and field personnel assigned to multiple centers; and

(2) publish and disseminate performance metrics, taking into account, as appropriate, regional and threat diversity, for—

(A) field personnel from the Office of Intelligence and Analysis assigned to an individual fusion center;

(B) field personnel from the Office of Intelligence and Analysis assigned to multiple fusion centers; and

(C) Regional Directors of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis to ensure accountability for monitoring all field personnel under the supervision of such Regional Directors.

(b) **TRAINING.**—In consultation with the Chief Information Officer, the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis shall develop and implement a formalized training module for fusion center personnel regarding the classified Homeland Secure Data Network, or any successor system.

(c) **FUSION CENTER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “fusion center” has the meaning given such term in section 210A(k) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as so redesignated by section 2.

SEC. 4. DHS COMPONENT USAGE OF THE HOMELAND SECURITY INFORMATION NETWORK.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Under Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, and in accordance with the functions and responsibilities assigned to the Under Secretary under title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 121 et seq.), shall—

(1) develop policies and metrics to ensure effective use by components of the Department of the unclassified Homeland Security Information Network (referred to in this section as “HSIN”), or any successor system; and

(2) develop policies for posting unclassified products on HSIN, or any successor system.

(b) **TECHNICAL ENHANCEMENTS.**—The Chief Information Officer, in consultation with the Chief Intelligence Officer, shall assess and implement, as appropriate, technical enhancements to HSIN to improve usability, including search functionality, data analysis, and collaboration capabilities.

SEC. 5. REPORT.

Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives that describes the implementation of—

(1) the fusion center information sharing strategy required under section 210A(j) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 2, based on performance metrics developed pursuant to such strategy;

(2) the deployment of field personnel to fusion centers (as such term is defined in section 210A of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124h)), in accordance with section 3, based on performance metrics developed pursuant to such section; and

(3) policies that seek to ensure the effective use of the Homeland Security Information Network, in accordance with section 4, based on the metrics developed pursuant to such section.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be consid-

ered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 504), as amended, was passed.

FEDERAL AGENCY CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE ACT OF 2019

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 111, S. 1275.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1275) to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets, and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italics.)

S. 1275

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Agency Customer Experience Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government serves the people of the United States and should seek to continually improve public services provided by the Federal Government based on customer feedback;

(2) the people of the United States deserve a Federal Government that provides efficient, effective, and high-quality services across multiple channels;

(3) many agencies, offices, programs, and Federal employees provide excellent service to individuals, however, many parts of the Federal Government still fall short on delivering the customer service experience that individuals have come to expect from the private sector;

(4) according to the 2018 American Customer Satisfaction Index, the Federal Government ranks among the bottom of all industries in the United States in customer satisfaction;

(5) providing quality services to individuals improves the confidence of the people of the United States in their [government] Government and helps agencies achieve greater impact and fulfill their missions; and

(6) improving service to individuals requires agencies to work across organizational boundaries, leverage technology, collect and share standardized data, and develop customer-centered mindsets and service strategies.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) all agencies should strive to provide high-quality, courteous, effective, and efficient services to the people of the United

States and seek to measure, collect, report, and utilize metrics relating to the experience of individuals interacting with agencies to continually improve services to the people of the United States; and

(2) adequate Federal funding is needed to ensure agency staffing levels that can provide the public with appropriate customer service levels.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(3) COVERED AGENCY.—The term “covered agency” means an agency or component of an agency that is required by the Director to collect voluntary feedback for purposes of section 6, based on an assessment of the components and programs of the agency with the highest impact on or number of interactions with individuals or entities.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) VOLUNTARY FEEDBACK.—The term “voluntary feedback” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT TO COLLECTION OF VOLUNTARY FEEDBACK.

Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”), is amended—

(1) in section 3502, as amended by section 202(a) of the *Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-435)*—

(A) in paragraph [(13)(D)] (22), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph [(14)] (23), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(1524) the term ‘voluntary feedback’ means any submission of information, opinion, or concern that is—

“(A) voluntarily made by a specific individual or other entity relating to a particular service of or transaction with an agency; and

“(B) specifically solicited by that agency.”; and

(2) in section 3518(c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) by an agency that is voluntary feedback.”.

SEC. 5. GUIDELINES FOR VOLUNTARY FEEDBACK.

Each agency that solicits voluntary feedback shall ensure that—

(1) responses to the solicitation of voluntary feedback remain anonymous and shall not be traced to specific individuals or entities;

(2) individuals and entities who decline to participate in the solicitation of voluntary feedback shall not be treated differently by the agency for purposes of providing services or information;

(3) the solicitation does not include more than 10 questions;

(4) the voluntary nature of the solicitation is clear;

(5) the proposed solicitation of voluntary feedback will contribute to improved customer service;

(6) solicitations of voluntary feedback are limited to 1 solicitation per interaction with an individual or entity;

(7) to the extent practicable, the solicitation of voluntary feedback is made at the point of service with an individual or entity;

(8) instruments for collecting voluntary feedback are accessible to individuals with disabilities in accordance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d); and

(9) internal agency data governance policies remain in effect with respect to the collection of voluntary feedback from individuals and entities.

SEC. 6. CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE DATA COLLECTION.

(a) COLLECTION OF RESPONSES.—The head of each covered agency (or a designee), assisted by and in coordination with the senior accountable official for customer service of the covered agency, shall collect voluntary feedback with respect to services of or transactions with the covered agency.

(b) CONTENT OF QUESTIONS.—

(1) STANDARDIZED QUESTIONS.—The Director, in coordination with the Administrator, shall develop a set of standardized questions for use by covered agencies in collecting voluntary feedback under this section that address—

(A) overall satisfaction of individuals or entities with the specific interaction or service received;

(B) the extent to which individuals or entities were able to accomplish their intended task or purpose;

(C) whether the individual or entity was treated with respect and professionalism;

(D) whether the individual or entity believes they were served in a timely manner; and

(E) any additional metrics as determined by the Director, in coordination with the Administrator.

(2) ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.—In addition to the questions developed under paragraph (1), the senior accountable official for customer service at a covered agency may develop questions relevant to the specific operations or programs of the covered agency.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—To the extent practicable—

(1) each covered agency shall collect voluntary feedback across all platforms or channels through which the covered agency interacts with individuals or other entities to deliver information or services; and

(2) voluntary feedback collected under this section shall be tied to specific transactions or interactions with customers of the covered agency.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT TO THE DIRECTOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, each covered agency shall publish on the website of the covered agency and submit to the Director, in a manner determined by the Director, a report on the voluntary feedback required to be collected under this section that includes—

(i) the detailed results, including a summary of how individuals and entities responded to each question;

(ii) the total number of survey responses; and

(iii) the response rate for each survey administered.

(B) CENTRALIZED WEBSITE.—The Director shall—

(i) include and maintain on a publicly available website links to the information provided on the websites of covered agencies under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) for purposes of clause (i), establish a website or make use of an existing website, such as the website required under section 1122 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) AGGREGATED REPORT.—Each covered agency shall publish, on a regular basis, an aggregated report on the solicitation of vol-

untary feedback sent to individuals or entities, which shall include—

(A) the intended purpose of each solicitation of voluntary feedback conducted by the covered agency;

(B) the appropriate point of contact within each covered agency for each solicitation of voluntary feedback conducted;

(C) the questions or survey instrument submitted to members of the public as part of the solicitation of voluntary information; and

(D) a description of how the covered agency uses the voluntary feedback received by the covered agency to improve the customer service of the covered agency.

SEC. 7. CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 months after the date on which all covered agencies have submitted the first annual reports to the Director required under section 6(d)(1), and every 2 years thereafter until the date that is 10 years after such date, the Comptroller General of the United States shall make publicly available and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives a report assessing the data collected and reported by the covered agencies.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a summary of the information required to be published by covered agencies under section 6(d); and

(2) a description of how each covered agency will use the voluntary feedback received by the covered agency to improve service delivery.

SEC. 8. RESTRICTION ON USE OF INFORMATION.

Any information collected pursuant to this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, may not be used in any appraisal of job performance of a Federal employee under chapter 43 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. 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 (S. 1275), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 1275

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Agency Customer Experience Act of 2019”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF CONGRESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Federal Government serves the people of the United States and should seek to continually improve public services provided by the Federal Government based on customer feedback;

(2) the people of the United States deserve a Federal Government that provides efficient, effective, and high-quality services across multiple channels;

(3) many agencies, offices, programs, and Federal employees provide excellent service to individuals, however, many parts of the Federal Government still fall short on delivering the customer service experience that individuals have come to expect from the private sector;

(4) according to the 2018 American Customer Satisfaction Index, the Federal Government ranks among the bottom of all industries in the United States in customer satisfaction;

(5) providing quality services to individuals improves the confidence of the people of the United States in their Government and helps agencies achieve greater impact and fulfill their missions; and

(6) improving service to individuals requires agencies to work across organizational boundaries, leverage technology, collect and share standardized data, and develop customer-centered mindsets and service strategies.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) all agencies should strive to provide high-quality, courteous, effective, and efficient services to the people of the United States and seek to measure, collect, report, and utilize metrics relating to the experience of individuals interacting with agencies to continually improve services to the people of the United States; and

(2) adequate Federal funding is needed to ensure agency staffing levels that can provide the public with appropriate customer service levels.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of General Services.

(2) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(3) COVERED AGENCY.—The term “covered agency” means an agency or component of an agency that is required by the Director to collect voluntary feedback for purposes of section 6, based on an assessment of the components and programs of the agency with the highest impact on or number of interactions with individuals or entities.

(4) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

(5) VOLUNTARY FEEDBACK.—The term “voluntary feedback” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 4. APPLICATION OF THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT TO COLLECTION OF VOLUNTARY FEEDBACK.

Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”), is amended—

(1) in section 3502, as amended by section 202(a) of the Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-435)—

(A) in paragraph (22), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in paragraph (23), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(24) the term ‘voluntary feedback’ means any submission of information, opinion, or concern that is—

“(A) voluntarily made by a specific individual or other entity relating to a particular service of or transaction with an agency; and

“(B) specifically solicited by that agency.”; and

(2) in section 3518(c)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (D), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; or”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) by an agency that is voluntary feedback.”.

SEC. 5. GUIDELINES FOR VOLUNTARY FEEDBACK.

Each agency that solicits voluntary feedback shall ensure that—

(1) responses to the solicitation of voluntary feedback remain anonymous and shall not be traced to specific individuals or entities;

(2) individuals and entities who decline to participate in the solicitation of voluntary feedback shall not be treated differently by the agency for purposes of providing services or information;

(3) the solicitation does not include more than 10 questions;

(4) the voluntary nature of the solicitation is clear;

(5) the proposed solicitation of voluntary feedback will contribute to improved customer service;

(6) solicitations of voluntary feedback are limited to 1 solicitation per interaction with an individual or entity;

(7) to the extent practicable, the solicitation of voluntary feedback is made at the point of service with an individual or entity;

(8) instruments for collecting voluntary feedback are accessible to individuals with disabilities in accordance with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d); and

(9) internal agency data governance policies remain in effect with respect to the collection of voluntary feedback from individuals and entities.

SEC. 6. CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE DATA COLLECTION.

(a) COLLECTION OF RESPONSES.—The head of each covered agency (or a designee), assisted by and in coordination with the senior accountable official for customer service of the covered agency, shall collect voluntary feedback with respect to services of or transactions with the covered agency.

(b) CONTENT OF QUESTIONS.—

(1) STANDARDIZED QUESTIONS.—The Director, in coordination with the Administrator, shall develop a set of standardized questions for use by covered agencies in collecting voluntary feedback under this section that address—

(A) overall satisfaction of individuals or entities with the specific interaction or service received;

(B) the extent to which individuals or entities were able to accomplish their intended task or purpose;

(C) whether the individual or entity was treated with respect and professionalism;

(D) whether the individual or entity believes they were served in a timely manner; and

(E) any additional metrics as determined by the Director, in coordination with the Administrator.

(2) ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS.—In addition to the questions developed under paragraph (1), the senior accountable official for customer service at a covered agency may develop questions relevant to the specific operations or programs of the covered agency.

(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—To the extent practicable—

(1) each covered agency shall collect voluntary feedback across all platforms or channels through which the covered agency interacts with individuals or other entities to deliver information or services; and

(2) voluntary feedback collected under this section shall be tied to specific transactions or interactions with customers of the covered agency.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) ANNUAL REPORT TO THE DIRECTOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than annually thereafter, each covered agency shall publish on the website of the covered agency and submit to the Director, in a manner determined by the Director, a report on the voluntary feedback required to be collected under this section that includes—

(i) the detailed results, including a summary of how individuals and entities responded to each question;

(ii) the total number of survey responses; and

(iii) the response rate for each survey administered.

(B) CENTRALIZED WEBSITE.—The Director shall—

(i) include and maintain on a publicly available website links to the information provided on the websites of covered agencies under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) for purposes of clause (i), establish a website or make use of an existing website, such as the website required under section 1122 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) AGGREGATED REPORT.—Each covered agency shall publish, on a regular basis, an aggregated report on the solicitation of voluntary feedback sent to individuals or entities, which shall include—

(A) the intended purpose of each solicitation of voluntary feedback conducted by the covered agency;

(B) the appropriate point of contact within each covered agency for each solicitation of voluntary feedback conducted;

(C) the questions or survey instrument submitted to members of the public as part of the solicitation of voluntary information; and

(D) a description of how the covered agency uses the voluntary feedback received by the covered agency to improve the customer service of the covered agency.

SEC. 7. CUSTOMER EXPERIENCE REPORT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 months after the date on which all covered agencies have submitted the first annual reports to the Director required under section 6(d)(1), and every 2 years thereafter until the date that is 10 years after such date, the Comptroller General of the United States shall make publicly available and submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives a report assessing the data collected and reported by the covered agencies.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a summary of the information required to be published by covered agencies under section 6(d); and

(2) a description of how each covered agency will use the voluntary feedback received by the covered agency to improve service delivery.

SEC. 8. RESTRICTION ON USE OF INFORMATION.

Any information collected pursuant to this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, may not be used in any appraisal of job performance of a Federal employee under chapter 43 of title 5, United States Code, or any other provision of law.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. 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.

AMENDING TITLE 38, UNITED STATES CODE, TO REDUCE THE CREDIT HOUR REQUIREMENT FOR THE EDITH NOURSE ROGERS STEM SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be discharged and that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 2196.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2196) to amend title 38, United States Code, to reduce the credit hour requirement for the Edith Nourse Rogers STEM Scholarship program of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. 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. SCOTT of Florida. 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. 2196) was passed.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. 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.

UNITED STATES INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS DAY

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 286, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 286) designating July 26, 2019, as "United States Intelligence Professionals Day".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 286) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 29, 2019

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 29; 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; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to consideration of the veto messages to accompany S.J. Res 36, 37, and 38, with the time until 5:30 p.m. divided as under the previous order; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session of the Senate ripen following disposition of the joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 29, 2019, at 3 P.M.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. 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 5:05 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 29, 2019, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

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. GLEN D. VANHERCK

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 major general

BRIG. GEN. ARTHUR J. LOGAN

FOREIGN SERVICE

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:

GEORGE HABIB ABI-NADER, OF VIRGINIA
 HECTOR JAVIER ACEVEDO RIOS, OF MARYLAND
 BRANDON C. ATTCHISON, OF VIRGINIA
 TODD ALIX ALPHONSE, OF VIRGINIA
 CORI A. ALSTON, OF ILLINOIS
 ALI FERDUN ARIN, OF FLORIDA
 BETHANY SARAH ARNOLD-BIK, OF VIRGINIA
 SAMUEL I. ARONSON, OF NEW JERSEY
 ANEESHA S. ASKEW, OF VIRGINIA
 EMILY ROSE AUGUSTINE, OF VIRGINIA
 PAUL STEPHEN BAILEY, JR., OF VIRGINIA
 TIMOTHY TRAVER BAKER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ROBERT L. BALDRIDGE, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL STEPHEN BASHI, OF VIRGINIA
 JOSHUA P. BARTLETT, OF OHIO
 ASHLEY U. BENTZEN, OF VIRGINIA
 ALEXANDRA L. B. BERNARDO, OF VIRGINIA
 ERIC J. BERNAU, OF CALIFORNIA
 NATHALIA RICARTE GILLOT BORDEN, OF VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM T. BRENT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 SOMALI BUN, OF VIRGINIA
 JOHN MATTHEWS BYRNE III, OF VIRGINIA
 KELLY ALPINE BYRNES, OF VIRGINIA

CHRISTOPHER DESHAWN CARR, OF TEXAS
 BARRIE JAMIESON CHANG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 SRAVANTHI CHERUKURI, OF VIRGINIA
 PATRICK D. CHO, OF OHIO
 CHIH HAO CHOU, OF VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM P. CLARK, OF TEXAS
 ERICA LYNN CLAYTON, OF VIRGINIA
 ROSS A. CONROY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ROBERT R. COOPER, OF UTAH
 JASON E. CURRIER, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 KATHARINE MARIE DANIELS, OF VIRGINIA
 RAYMOND JOHN DI NOVO, JR., OF VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM L. F. DING-EVERSON, OF CALIFORNIA
 EMILY KATELIN DIONNE, OF VIRGINIA
 LORRAINE DIOS, OF VIRGINIA
 CHRISTOPHER ROBERT DITTMAYER, OF VIRGINIA
 STEPHEN C. DOVE, OF TEXAS
 HILARY G. DOWNEY, OF VIRGINIA
 SUZANNE K. EBERT, OF NEBRASKA
 FRANK VINCENT EMERSON, OF VIRGINIA
 JENNA NICOLE EWALD, OF VIRGINIA
 WILLIAM ERIK EZEKIEL, OF VIRGINIA
 STEPHEN LINDER FERNANDEZ, OF VIRGINIA
 LAURA A. FIELDS, OF CALIFORNIA
 JOHN MATTHEW PINE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JOSEPH C. FORD, OF VIRGINIA
 KRISTEAN O'BRYAN FORREST, OF VIRGINIA
 TANJA CATHERINE FRANCIS, OF VIRGINIA
 ANTHONY FRANZES, OF VIRGINIA
 MATTHEW JOSEPH GALLERY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 PETER JOHN GALLO, OF VIRGINIA
 ADAM R. GANNAWAY, OF TEXAS
 MARY C. GILLMORE, OF VIRGINIA
 ALFREDO L. GONZALEZ, JR., OF FLORIDA
 RACHEL LOUISE GRADY, OF VIRGINIA
 RICHARD JUN HA, OF VIRGINIA
 PATRICK M. HAKLEY, OF VIRGINIA
 ADAM R. HALL, OF ILLINOIS
 PRESTON DARYL HALL, OF VIRGINIA
 TRAVIS C. HALL, OF WASHINGTON
 PENNY G. HAMBLOMATIS, OF VIRGINIA
 PETER L. HANSEN, OF WASHINGTON
 STEPHANIE LYNN HARRISON, OF VIRGINIA
 MEREDITH LINDSAY HART, OF VIRGINIA
 MORIA LYNN HENNING, OF VIRGINIA
 GRANT A. HOLYOAK, OF VIRGINIA
 WESLEY A. HOLZER, OF CALIFORNIA
 PHILIP AUSTIN HOVIS, OF VIRGINIA
 ELIZABETH A. HUML, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ANDREA J. HUSTON, OF VIRGINIA
 AUSTIN KYLE INGHAM, OF VIRGINIA
 JUSTIN V. IVEY, OF FLORIDA
 DANIEL F. JACKSON, OF FLORIDA
 FAULETTE K. JANUS, OF ILLINOIS
 ISAAC B. JENKINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ALEX R. JOHNSON, OF MARYLAND
 ALEXANDRA K. JOHNSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 BRIANA NICHOLE JOHNSON, OF RHODE ISLAND
 CHANCE LOGAN JOHNSON, OF VIRGINIA
 KATHRYN L. JONES, OF OKLAHOMA
 ERIC MICHAEL JOYNER, OF VIRGINIA
 SAMANTHA ANNE KACOS, OF VIRGINIA
 MANDY JOY KAMEN, OF VIRGINIA
 ARI KATZ, OF WASHINGTON
 RICHARD DEAN KIM, OF VIRGINIA
 YONGKYU KIM, OF CALIFORNIA
 JAMES GORDON KING, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 PATRICK RYAN KLOTZBACH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JAMES O. KNABLE, OF MARYLAND
 KEVIN A. KRAVITZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ELIASZ KRAWCZUK, OF NEW YORK
 JAMES PETER KROMHOUT, OF VIRGINIA
 BETH A. KUCH, OF HAWAII
 MATTHEW ALLEN LANDMEIER, OF VIRGINIA
 SCOTT J. LAVON, OF MARYLAND
 DAVID EDWARD LEARY, OF VIRGINIA
 SCOTTIE LEONARD III, OF VIRGINIA
 MATTHEW BRETT LEVEY, OF VIRGINIA
 EARNESTINE LING, OF VIRGINIA
 JULIAN H. LIPSCOMB III, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 JAKUB D. LISKOWIAK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 SARAH E. LOCKE, OF CALIFORNIA
 EMILY BRIDGETTE LOPEZ, OF MARYLAND
 MARK A. LOWRY, OF VIRGINIA
 RUBY KEHAULANI MACKO, OF TEXAS
 SEAN R. MADDEN, OF VIRGINIA
 LAUREN KAYE MALAFO, OF VIRGINIA
 SHEREE N. MARAMBIO, OF CALIFORNIA
 TAYLOR R. MAUCK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 MICHAEL LORIN MAYNE, OF FLORIDA
 CAROLYN ANN MCCOLLOW, OF VIRGINIA
 EDWARD DOUGLAS MCINTOSH, OF VIRGINIA
 ROBERT T. MCNEARY, OF VIRGINIA
 KENNETH DONALD MCNEIL III, OF VIRGINIA
 JENNIFER VAINIE MILLER, OF VIRGINIA
 TASHA ROYEL MINOR, OF VIRGINIA
 RYAN M. MULLEN, OF MARYLAND
 DEREK CHRISTOPHER MURPHY, OF VIRGINIA
 KRISTEN A. NAGLE, OF VIRGINIA
 STEVEN ANTHONY NIGGL, OF VIRGINIA
 SHAWN K. O'DONNELL, OF CALIFORNIA
 DRU B. OLSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 DENIZ Z. OZDEMIR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 MICHAEL A. PANDO, OF VIRGINIA
 TASHA ESTELLE PARASKEVOPOULOS, OF VIRGINIA
 LARA MARISSA PARK, OF NEW MEXICO
 VALERIE J. PARRY, OF WASHINGTON
 KEVIN BRUCE PASZINSKI, OF VIRGINIA
 RYAN EMILIE PENDER, OF VIRGINIA
 RYAN ALLEN PEREIRA, OF VIRGINIA
 AUGUSTA B. PHEBIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 CEDAR I. PHILLIPS, OF MINNESOTA
 JENNIFER A. PIERSON, OF TEXAS

CHRISTIAN DALE PIMENTEL, OF VIRGINIA
 JAMES WILLIAM PINER, OF VIRGINIA
 AJLA PORCA, OF VIRGINIA
 LEAH WOODARD PURNELL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 FELICE MCKELVEY RAITERI, OF VIRGINIA
 FRANCISCO JAVIER REYES, OF VIRGINIA
 JOHN E. RIES, OF VIRGINIA
 JAMES JOHN RIZZI, OF VIRGINIA
 JAMES E. ROBBINS, OF TEXAS
 HADLEY MARGUERITE ROBERTS, OF MARYLAND
 PATRICK TERRENCE ROHAN, OF VIRGINIA
 ZACHARY A. ROSNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 AARON DAVID ROTH, OF VIRGINIA
 RENAE REYES SAN NICOLAS, OF VIRGINIA
 WHITNEY MARIE SAUER, OF VIRGINIA
 BARBARA ANN SCHECKEL, OF VIRGINIA
 MAX MICHAEL SCHINDLER, OF VIRGINIA
 ETHAN LEWIS SCHULMAN, OF MARYLAND
 ANNE N. SHERMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 MIKAELA MARIE SHUPP, OF VIRGINIA
 PENELOPE ANNE SIMMONS, OF VIRGINIA
 WHITNEY LORRAINE SKIPPINGS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 MARIA SKIRK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 MIKOLAJ M. SLOMKA, OF VIRGINIA
 JULIAN STRASSMANN SMISEK, OF TEXAS
 CHARLES EDWARD SMITH II, OF FLORIDA
 DANIEL ARTHUR SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
 EMILIA B. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON
 LAWRENCE ANDREW SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
 MCRAE JOSEPH SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
 PATRICK D. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON
 MARY ELIZABETH SNEDEKER, OF VIRGINIA
 JAMES ANDREW SOMERS III, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JESSICA LYNN SOUDER, OF VIRGINIA
 ERICA LAUREN STEWART, OF VIRGINIA
 GREGORY B. STONEBERG, OF VIRGINIA
 JENNIFER SHARI STRINGER, OF VIRGINIA
 HILARY SEEGER SZOT, OF VIRGINIA
 KELLY L. TEK, OF VIRGINIA
 BART J. THILTGEN, JR., OF CALIFORNIA
 ALISA M. THOMAS, OF OHIO
 GREGORY MCDONALD TYREE, OF VIRGINIA
 NJOKI PATRICE URIBE, OF VIRGINIA
 ANTHONY JOHN VALDEZ, OF VIRGINIA
 CRISPIN M. VANBUER, OF CALIFORNIA
 STEPHANIE C. VANN, OF VIRGINIA
 THEODORE J. VASTINE, OF VIRGINIA
 CHRISTINE SHORTLEY VILLANI, OF MARYLAND
 SARA DIANE VOTIPKA, OF VIRGINIA
 THOMAS ARTHUR WALKER, OF VIRGINIA
 MARGARET H. WALROD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 DANIEL J. WALSH, OF FLORIDA
 BRANDON KENNETH WARREN, OF VIRGINIA
 ELAINE ROBBINS WARREN, OF VIRGINIA
 KRISTIN WEBER, OF VIRGINIA
 AMANDA GUAY WELDON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ZACHARY CANNON WHITLEY, OF VIRGINIA
 KIP T. WHITTINGTON, OF TEXAS
 SHAINA MARIE WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
 SAMUEL THOMAS WILLIAMSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 AMY SUE WISSLER, OF VIRGINIA
 ROBERT WILLIAM WOODALL, OF VIRGINIA
 ERICA MICHELLE PARKER YACUS, OF FLORIDA
 GABRIELLE MARIE YORK, OF VIRGINIA
 JORDAN E. YOUNES, OF VIRGINIA
 ROXANA ISABELLE ZIAREK, OF VIRGINIA
 RYAN KELLY ZIMMERMAN, OF VIRGINIA
 ALEXIS LYN ZINTAK, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SEN-

IOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:
 CYNTHIA K. DUERR, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JESSICA ABENSTEIN, OF FLORIDA
 SETH FLINCHBAUGH, OF OKLAHOMA
 TIMOTHY LAMPING, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 TYLER SCHEUPELE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
 JAE SONG, OF TEXAS
 DAVID WALDRON, OF PENNSYLVANIA

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:

KENDRA MICHELLE ARBAIZA-SUNDAL, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
 SARAH H. ASHBY, OF TEXAS
 CLAIRE J. ASHCRAFT, OF CALIFORNIA
 JOHN T. AVRETT II, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
 SAPTARSHI BASU, OF TEXAS
 HEATHER J. BEGGS, OF ALASKA
 CHELSEA R. BERGENSEN, OF WASHINGTON
 CHRISTOPHER J. BODINGTON, OF VIRGINIA
 MATTHEW CARL BOWLBY, OF MINNESOTA
 TIMOTHY S. BROWN, OF MICHIGAN
 ANDRES K. CALDERON, OF TEXAS
 HOOJU CHOI, OF VIRGINIA
 CYBELE M. COCHRAN, OF VIRGINIA
 TASHINA ETTER COOPER, OF TEXAS
 DAVID P. COUGHRAN, JR., OF WASHINGTON
 IAIN A. CRAWFORD, OF CALIFORNIA
 GREGORY DAVID, OF FLORIDA
 CLAIRE Y. DESJARDINS, OF OHIO
 TAYLOR B. DEWEY, OF VIRGINIA
 MICHAEL H. DING, OF CALIFORNIA
 JEFFREY D. DIRKS, OF WASHINGTON
 ERIC S. ELLIOTT, OF NEW MEXICO
 PAUL R. ESTRADA, OF CALIFORNIA
 JOHN T. FOJUT, OF VIRGINIA
 LAWRENCE POSTER, OF FLORIDA
 PAUL S. GARR, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 MATTHEW J. GERDIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 LUIS L. GONZALEZ III, OF TEXAS
 PAUL J. GORMLEY, OF COLORADO
 SHIRLEY C. GREEN, OF TEXAS
 LAWRENCE J. GROMAN, OF VIRGINIA
 STEPHANIE KARLA GUERRA-SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
 BLYTHE M. GUIGNON, OF VIRGINIA
 TODD D. HEFFNER, OF VIRGINIA
 BENJAMIN J. HILLBERRY, OF VIRGINIA
 ILDIKO A. HRUBOS, OF HAWAII
 SONG Y. HUANG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JASON INSLIE, OF FLORIDA
 MELY A. JACOBSON, OF TEXAS
 MATTHEW M. JENNINGS, OF TEXAS
 JAE-MAN JEON, OF VIRGINIA
 DAVID H. JOHNSON, OF MICHIGAN
 LAUREN A. JOHNSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 SYDNEY PASQUIER-VICTORIA KELLY, OF WASHINGTON
 MAUREN G. KUMAR, OF TEXAS
 NEAL B. LARKINS, OF OREGON
 JOHN D. LATHERS II, OF NORTH CAROLINA
 BRIGID A. LAUGHLIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 HYE R. LEE, OF VIRGINIA
 AVA GIANA LEONE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
 AUSTIN J. LEWIS, OF TEXAS
 ANN R. MANGOLD, OF PENNSYLVANIA

JENNIFER D. MARSH, OF FLORIDA
 JESSICA E. MARTIN, OF CALIFORNIA
 JAY R. MCCANN, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 JAMES W. MCPHERSON IV, OF MARYLAND
 OMAR W. MEDINA, OF FLORIDA
 SEAN C. MURRAY, OF VIRGINIA
 TAMORA JOHNSON NOBILSKI, OF NEW YORK
 MATTHEW J. PAGETT, OF FLORIDA
 ROBERT E. POULSON-HOUSER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 NICHOLAS A. PSYHOS, OF VIRGINIA
 SAMIDHA REDKAR, OF OHIO
 ALEXANDER M. ROSENBLATT, OF MAINE
 LUIS G. SALAS, OF CALIFORNIA
 MIKEL L. SAVIDES, OF CALIFORNIA
 COLIN M. SEALS, OF FLORIDA
 JULIECLAIRE B. SHEPPARD, OF FLORIDA
 DAVID RAYMOND SKORSKI, OF FLORIDA
 JESSICA KELLY SLATTERY, OF NEBRASKA
 WILLIAM A. SLOAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 SHANNON A. SMALL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JULIA MARIE SMART, OF VIRGINIA
 CHRISTOPHER J. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON
 MELANIE J. SMITH, OF WASHINGTON
 BRIAN E. SMYSER, OF NEW YORK
 THOMAS A. SNYDER, OF MINNESOTA
 WILLIAM E. STANGE, OF WASHINGTON
 CATHERINE L. SWANSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 LUKE K. TATEOKA, OF HAWAII
 SARAH E. TATUM, OF TENNESSEE
 ESTHER E. TETRUSHVILY, OF NEW JERSEY
 NATHANIEL G. TISHMAN, OF FLORIDA
 AMANDA S. TOLLEFSON, OF WASHINGTON
 RYAN H. USTICK, OF FLORIDA
 JERRY J. WANG, OF TEXAS
 TRAVIS J. WARNER, OF KANSAS
 RICHARD A. WESCH, OF TEXAS
 BRYANT H. WHITFIELD, OF INDIANA
 MATTHEW L. WILLIGER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
 KELLY M. WINCK, OF TENNESSEE
 MATTHEW D. WINSLOW, OF WYOMING
 JOSEPH B. WITTERS, OF VIRGINIA
 GORDON T. WOOD, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AS A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:
 JACQUELINE LEANN WARD, OF FLORIDA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 25, 2019:

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

JOSEPH V. CUFFARI, OF ARIZONA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF AND 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., SECTIONS 152 AND 601:

To be general

GEN. MARK A. MILLEY