

to examine and report on the facts regarding the extent of Russian official and unofficial cyber operations and other attempts to interfere in the 2016 United States national election, and for other purposes.

S. 30

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 30, a bill to extend the civil statute of limitations for victims of Federal sex offenses.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution approving the location of a memorial to commemorate and honor the members of the Armed Forces who served on active duty in support of Operation Desert Storm or Operation Desert Shield.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution clarifying any potential misunderstanding as to whether actions taken by President-elect Donald Trump constitute a violation of the Emoluments Clause, and calling on President-elect Trump to divest his interest in, and sever his relationship to, the Trump Organization.

S. RES. 5

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 5, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate in support of Israel.

S. RES. 6

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 6, a resolution objecting to United Nations Security Council Resolution 2334 and to all efforts that undermine direct negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians for a secure and peaceful settlement.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 32. A bill to provide for conservation, enhanced recreation opportunities, and development of renewable energy in the California Desert Conservation Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am proud to introduce the Desert Protection and Recreation Act of 2017.

This bill, a decade in the making, charts a commonsense path forward for the California desert. The goal is simple: to manage California's fragile desert resources in a sustainable and comprehensive manner.

This bill provides something for everyone that appreciates the national treasure that is the California desert. That this bill provides something for everyone is a result of the painstaking effort to build consensus among the array of groups that use the desert, including: environmental groups; Federal, State, and local governments; the off-road community; cattle ranchers; mining interests; and energy companies and California's public utility companies.

As I will further describe later, the bill preserves 230,000 acres of wilderness and another 44,000 acres of national park land, each unrivaled for their unique natural landscapes. The bill also safeguards 77 miles of free-flowing rivers and the abundant life and rich biodiversity these rivers and streams often support.

Importantly, the bill provides certainty to off-road enthusiasts, establishing 142,000 acres of permanent off-highway recreation areas—a first for the Nation. I made a commitment to off-roaders to enact the entire bill, not just parts of the bill. I hope to fulfill that promise.

The efforts to protect the desert are a long time coming. This effort first began with the original California Desert Protection Act, signed into law more than twenty years ago.

Picking up where my predecessors left off, I introduced that bill only three months after I was sworn in as a senator. Through hard work and perseverance, we were able to pass that law on the last day of the 103rd Congress, and President Clinton signed the bill into law in October 1994.

The original Desert Protection Act was a crowning achievement for desert conservation, establishing 69 new Wilderness areas, creating the Mojave National Preserve, and converting Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Monuments into National Parks. All told, we were able to protect, or increase protections for, about 9.6 million acres.

It continues to attract millions of tourists to southern California, which is a boon for the economy.

It has ensured that these enduring landscapes will be preserved for future generations.

Since we passed the 1994 desert conservation bill, we've tried to build on this legacy of conservation. After years of collaboration with an array of stakeholders, we introduced new legislation in 2009.

The goal of that bill was simple: to help manage California's desert resources through a comprehensive ap-

proach that balanced conservation, recreation, energy production, among other needs.

After years of work, including two hearings in the Senate, we reached a major milestone this past February, when President Obama designated three new national monuments in the California desert: Castle Mountains, Mojave Trails, and Sand to Snow.

Those monuments, based on the legislation I had introduced, created one of the world's largest desert reserves, encompassing nearly 1.8 million acres of America's public lands.

Those monuments connect vital wildlife corridors and habitats, preserve cultural resources, and establish an important buffer to the inevitable changes climate change will usher in for these fragile desert ecosystems.

While the newly-designed desert monuments formed a cornerstone for future desert protection, our work is not complete. That is why I am introducing this legislation today.

While I supported President Obama's decision to create three national monuments in the Mojave Desert, his authority under the Antiquities Act did not allow him to include the many other valuable provisions in the original legislation.

Our intention has always been to balance the many uses of the desert through legislation, and that remains the case today. That is why I reintroduced that legislation immediately following the President's designation, and that is why I am introducing a bill again today: to make the rest of the provisions a reality.

The legislation I am introducing today therefore includes all of the provisions the President was not able to enact through executive action under the Antiquities Act.

These negotiated provisions—which represent our best attempt to achieve consensus among desert stakeholders—deserve to become law.

That legislation includes many additional conservation areas and provides permanent protection for five Off-Highway Recreation Areas covering approximately 142,000 acres. Off-roaders were a vital part of the coalition we put together, and unfortunately those lands could not be designated under executive action. Off-roaders deserve certainty about their future use of the land, just as there is now certainty for conservation purposes. I gave them my word that I would fight for them, and I intend to do so again in this new Congress.

This bill would also expand wilderness areas in the desert, by designating five additional wilderness areas that cover 230,000 acres of land near Fort Irwin.

The bill would ensure clean and free-flowing rivers, through the designation of 77 miles of rivers as Wild and Scenic Rivers; add to our national parks, by expanding Death Valley National Park Wilderness by 39,000 acres and Joshua Tree National Park by 4,500 acres; expand National Scenic Areas, by adding

18,610 acres to the Alabama Hills National Scenic Area in Inyo County; and protect 81,000 acres of land in San Bernardino and Imperial County, and requires the Department of the Interior to protect petroglyphs and other cultural resources important to the surrounding tribes and communities.

Lastly, the bill will facilitate renewable energy development in a way that protects delicate habitat.

I want to highlight some of the key provisions of this legislation:

By designating five new wilderness areas, this bill protects fragile desert ecosystems across 230,000 acres of wilderness near Fort Irwin. This includes 88,000 acres of Avawatz Mountains, 8,000-acre Great Falls Basin Wilderness, the 80,000-acre Soda Mountains Wilderness, and the 32,500-acre Death Valley Wilderness.

The desert's sweeping desert vistas and rugged mountain terrain not only provide for a truly remarkable backcountry experience, but also provide vital refuge for everything from bighorn sheep and desert tortoises to Joshua Trees and Native American artifacts.

This bill is more than just wilderness, however. It also designates four new Wild and Scenic Rivers, totaling 77 miles in length. These beautiful waterways, carved through the heart of the arid desert, are Deep Creek and the Whitewater River in and near the San Bernardino National Forest, as well as the Amargosa River and Surprise Canyon Creek near Death Valley National Park.

The bill also releases 126,000 acres of land from their existing wilderness study area designation in response to requests from local government and recreation users. This will allow the land to be made available for other purposes, including recreational off-highway vehicle use on designated routes.

We must also take into account another use of the desert land: renewable energy. I believe that we can honor our commitment to conservation while fulfilling California's pledge to develop a clean energy portfolio.

Balancing conservation, development and other uses is possible, we just need to come up with the right solutions. Thankfully, some of these compromises are already in place.

By April 2009, solar and wind companies had proposed 28 projects to be included in the Mojave Trails National Monument, including sites on former Catellus lands intended for permanent conservation. I visited some of those sites at the time, including one particularly beautiful area known as the Broadwell Valley, where thousands of acres of pristine lands were proposed for development. Seeing it first hand, I quickly came to the conclusion that those lands were simply not the right place for renewable energy development.

Since then, 26 of the 28 applications have been withdrawn. This is due in

part to the state and federal governments' efforts to develop and finalize the Desert Renewable Energy Conservation Plan—an ambitious effort to comprehensively manage renewable energy, conservation, and recreation on 22.5 million acres of California desert.

By working with our state to develop this Plan, the federal government has shown it can be an effective partner in the State's efforts to combat climate change, all while protecting the magnificent, yet fragile, California desert landscape.

The bill also makes use of about 370,000 acres of isolated, unusable parcels of State lands spread across the California desert. These small isolated parcels of State land in wilderness, national parks and monuments would be exchanged for Federal lands elsewhere that could potentially provide the State with viable sites for renewable energy development, off-highway vehicle recreation, or other commercial purposes.

This blueprint will help identify pristine lands that warrant protection and direct energy projects elsewhere.

This is a fair balancing of priorities, and I think it provides a clear path forward.

I strongly urge my colleagues to take a good look at this legislation. I hope they understand that the many stakeholders involved have made their voices heard.

As you can see, there are many diverse interests in California's desert lands, and it is not easy to bring them all into agreement. But after years of painstaking efforts, they have reached agreement on this bill.

Desert conservation has never been a partisan issue. Over the years, legislators have come together across party lines to preserve this great piece of land.

Given our past success, I am hopeful this Congress will take this legislation up and move it forward. Most importantly, I hope this body recognizes the simple fact that desert conservation has never been a partisan issue.

Over the years, legislators have come together across party lines to preserve this great piece of land. It's the right thing to do.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 49. A bill to provide a leasing program within the Coastal Plain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to once again open a small portion of the Arctic coastal plain, in my home State of Alaska, to oil and gas development. I am introducing the bill because, now more than ever, new production in northern Alaska is vital not only to my state's future, but also to our Nation's energy and economic security.

It has been known for more than nearly 4 decades that the 1.5 million acres of the Arctic coastal plain that

lie inside the northern one-eleventh of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge are the most prospective lands in North America for a major conventional oil and gas discovery. The U.S. Geological Survey continues to estimate that this part of the coastal plain—which represents just 3 percent of the coastal plain in all of northern Alaska—has a mean likelihood of containing 10.4 billion barrels of oil and 8.6 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, as well as a reasonable chance of economically producing 16 billion barrels of oil. Even the relatively recent major finds in North Dakota's Bakken field and the recent estimates of shale oil in Texas' Wolfcamp formation pale in comparison, as ANWR is likely to hold over three times more conventional oil than any other onshore energy deposit in North America.

In the 1990s, opponents dismissed ANWR's potential and argued that the nearby National Petroleum Reserve-Alaska was forecast to contain almost as much oil. However, early this decade the U.S. Geological Survey significantly reduced its oil estimates in the 23 million acre reserve. Instead of containing somewhere between the 6.7 to 15 billion barrels as forecast in 2002, the USGS now forecasts a mean of 896 million barrels—a dramatic downward revision. While I still believe oil production must be allowed to proceed in NPRA and that development of satellite fields must be allowed to occur, the revised forecast means that opening a small area on shore to the east on the coastal plain, is now more vital than ever for America's economic and national security interests.

That is especially the case given that President Obama late last year closed almost all of Alaska's outer continental shelf oil and gas deposits to future exploration and development. That makes production of onshore deposits even more vital for Alaska's economic future, and for the Nation's long-term energy security.

America once received more than 10 percent of its daily domestic oil production from fields in Alaska. You heard correctly, production already occurs in Arctic Alaska, and has for nearly 40 years. We have successfully balanced resource development with environmental protection. Alaskans have proven, over and over again, that those endeavors are not mutually exclusive.

Today, however, we face a tipping point. Alaska's North Slope production has declined for years and now accounts for just under 5 percent of the Nation's daily production. It is now forecast to decline further to levels next decade that will threaten the continued operation of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System. A closure of TAPS would shut down all northern Alaska oil production. This would devastate Alaska's economy, drag global oil prices even higher, and deepen our energy dependence on unstable petrostates throughout the world, especially once oil shale production peaks in the Lower 48 States.

Anyone who takes the long view on energy policy recognizes that no matter what energy policy our Nation pursues, we will use substantial amounts of oil well into the future. The more of that oil we produce at home, the better off our economy, our trade deficit, our employment levels, and the world's environment will be. To help meet future demand both here in America and throughout the rest of the world, and to help avoid a tremendous price spike in the event of supply disruptions, we need to take steps today to ensure new production is brought online, as soon as possible.

ANWR development will provide huge benefits for the U.S. Treasury. Let's examine this with some simple math. ANWR's mean estimate of over 10 billion barrels, at even today's \$50 per barrel price, means that there is half a trillion dollars worth of oil locked up beneath this small area in northern Alaska—and even more when prices rebound. That is half a trillion taxable dollars, and it is difficult to calculate or even fathom the corporate and payroll taxes that this would generate for our treasury. But we do know that there are hundreds of billions of dollars in pure Federal royalties since my bill devotes 50 percent of the value to a Federal share, rather than the 10 percent which current law allows.

As our Nation grapples with a huge budget deficit, nearly \$20 trillion in national debt, and a lack of capital to incentivize new energy development, it is folly for America to further delay new onshore oil development from Alaska. The question is no longer, "Should we drill in ANWR?" Today, it has become, "Can we afford not to?"

I understand that no matter what happens, some will remain opposed to development in this region. The outgoing administration has attempted to not only prohibit oil and gas development onshore in the coastal plain—proposing to forever lock the area up into formal wilderness—but also has proposed to impede oil and even natural gas development from vast portions of NPRA and from the offshore waters of the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas. This mindset ignores Alaska's economic realities, it ignores the Nation's looming energy challenges, and it ignores the fact that Arctic oil production can proceed without any significant environmental impact. Our development has coexisted productively with polar bears, and will not harm the Porcupine caribou herd or any other form of wildlife on the Arctic coast. The groups who oppose my legislation seem totally oblivious to strides made in directional, extended reach drilling, three- and four-dimensional seismic testing, and new pipeline leak detection technology, all of which permit Alaskan energy development to proceed safely without harm to wildlife or the environment.

For all these reasons, I am reintroducing legislation to open the coastal plain of ANWR to development. At the

same time, I am again focusing and narrowing that development so that just 2,000 acres of the 1.5 million acre coastal plain can be physically disturbed by roads, pipelines, wells, buildings or other support facilities. At most, just one-tenth of 1 percent of the refuge's coastal plain would be impacted. For comparison's sake, 2,000 acres is roughly the size of National Airport—compared to an area roughly three times the size of the state of Maryland. It is hardly a blip on the map.

Limiting development to such a small area is important. It will help guarantee—beyond any shadow of doubt—the preservation in a natural state of more than sufficient habitat for caribou, muskoxen, polar bear, and Arctic bird life. My legislation also includes stringent environmental standards.

The bill, named the Alaska Oil and Gas Production Act, AOGPA, which is being cosponsored by my colleague from Alaska, Senator DAN SULLIVAN, also includes guaranteed finding to mitigate any impacts in the region, and guarantees that the Federal Government will receive half of all revenues generated.

For decades, Alaskans, whom polls show overwhelmingly support ANWR development, have been asking permission to explore and develop oil in the coastal plain. Finally, technology has advanced so that it is possible to develop oil and gas from the coastal plain with little or no impact on the area and its wildlife.

At this time of unsustainable debt, and an unstable global environment, we need to pursue domestic development opportunities more than ever. My ANWR bill offers us a chance to produce more of our own energy, for the good of the American people, in an environmentally-friendly way. I hope this Congress, given the new administration that will soon take office, will have the common sense to allow America to help itself by developing ANWR's substantial resources. This is critical to my state and the Nation as a whole. And with this in mind, I will work to educate the members of this chamber about ANWR. I will show why such development should occur, why it must occur, and how it can benefit our Nation at a time when we need the domestic jobs and energy security that ANWR will produce.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 54. A bill to prohibit the creation of an immigration-related registry program that classifies people on the basis of religion, race, age, gender, ethnicity, national origin, nationality, or citizenship; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today, I introduced the Protect American Fam-

ilies from Unnecessary Registration and Deportation Act of 2017, or the Protect American Families Act. This critical bill would advance civil and human rights by ensuring we protect American immigrants from being wrongfully targeted by the Federal Government because of who they are or how they worship. I thank Senators ELIZABETH WARREN, BRIAN SCHATZ, ED MARKEY, PATTY MURRAY, BERNIE SANDERS, PATRICK LEAHY, JEFF MERKLEY, MAZIE HIRONO, and RON WYDEN for joining me on this important legislation.

Enshrined in the Constitution are the ideas that all people are free to practice the religion of their choice and that we will not discriminate because of your faith or national origin. Creating a Federal immigration program that requires people to register their status with the Federal Government on the basis of their religion, race, ethnicity, gender, age, nationality, national origin, or citizenship is contrary to those values. Because the United States is the world's beacon of democracy, we must lead by example and live the values we preach.

Yet, in troubling times we have not always stayed true to our values. During World War II, soon after Imperial Japan attacked United States Naval Base Pearl Harbor, President Franklin Roosevelt issued Executive Order 9066. That order authorized the Secretary of War to designate particular areas as military zones, which allowed for the removal of Japanese Americans from certain parts of the United States. Subsequently, more than 110,000 Japanese Americans were relocated to internment camps.

Similarly, in 2002, the year following the tragic terrorist attacks on September 11, the Federal Government created the National Security Entry-Exit Registration System, NSEERS. This Federal program required non-citizen visa holders from certain countries to register with the Federal Government. The registration process included fingerprinting, photographs, and interrogation. Once an individual registered, NSEERS required the person to regularly check in with immigration officials. Finally, NSEERS monitored people who registered with the program to ensure that no one remained in the country longer than the law permitted them.

Inconsistent with the American values of religious freedom and non-discrimination, the NSEERS program wrongfully targeted males over 16 years old from the following countries: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, Eritrea, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, Yemen, and North Korea. Thus, 24 out of the 25 countries listed in the NSEERS program were Arab and Muslim countries. This was another moment in our nation's history where our leaders succumbed to the politics of

fear and adopted a program that tore at the very fabric of our country.

Immigration-registry programs do not make the public more safe. The purpose of NSEERS was to identify and capture terrorists. Yet, despite registering over 83,000 people, the program yielded zero terrorism convictions. Without proof of a single terrorist related conviction, the NSEERS program did not do its job of keeping the homeland safe.

But immigration-registry programs do result in discrimination. The fact that NSEERS led to the forced registry, interrogation, and deportations of immigrants from predominantly Muslim or Arab countries is proof that broadly defined enforcement programs often result in racial and religious profiling. That is why the United Nations and major American civil rights groups condemned NSEERS for unfairly singling out Muslims. By targeting Muslims, NSEERS sent the wrong message that America does not welcome immigrants from certain lands.

While the Obama administration dismantled the NSEERS program, this alone will not prevent the incoming administration from attempting to follow through on its threats to create a registry based on religion or national origin. On the campaign trail President-elect Trump called for a “total and complete shutdown” of Muslim immigrants entering the United States. Additionally, he has called for “extreme vetting” of immigrants reminiscent of NSEERS. It is incumbent upon congressional leaders to ensure that the United States does not sacrifice its values in the face of fear.

Today, I introduce the Protect American Families Act to ensure that America protects the rights and liberties of American immigrants from overly broad, ineffective, and discriminatory registry programs. This bill would prohibit the Federal Government from requiring noncitizens to register or check in with the Federal Government simply because of their religion, race, ethnicity, age, gender, national origin, nationality, or citizenship. Banning the creation of a discriminatory registration program is not only consistent with our democratic values, but it allows law enforcement to focus resources on the real threats to our safety.

The bill has commonsense exemptions. Data collection is critical in our fight against terrorists, and the bill allows the government to collect routine data on the entry and exit of noncitizens. The bill would also protect important immigration programs like Temporary Protected Status, Deferred Enforced Departure, the Visa Waiver Program, and Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. This provision makes clear that legitimate Federal programs that confer immigration benefits are not prohibited by the ban on enforcement immigration programs that target immigrants and other vulnerable Americans.

In his First Inaugural Address, President Roosevelt said that “the only thing we have to fear is fear itself.” Unfortunately, he failed to live up to that statement when he issued Executive Order 9066. But we have a chance to fulfill that vision. We have a chance to stand up against fear and stay true to our American values in the face of hardship. I am proud to introduce the Protect American Families Act today, and I urge my colleagues to support its speedy passage through the Senate.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 7—TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY’S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. McCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 7

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the majority party’s membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Roberts (Chairman), Mr. Cochran, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Thune, Mr. Daines, Mr. Perdue.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Cochran (Chairman), Mr. McConnell, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Alexander, Ms. Collins, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Graham, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Moran, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Boozman, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Rubio.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. McCain (Chairman), Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Graham, Mr. Sasse.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Crapo (Chairman), Mr. Shelby, Mr. Corker, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Perdue, Ms. Tillis, Mr. Kennedy.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION: Mr. Thune (Chairman), Mr. Wicker, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Moran, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Heller, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Lee, Mr. Johnson, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Young.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES: Ms. Murkowski (Chairman), Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Risch, Mr. Lee, Mr. Flake, Mr. Daines, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Portman.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS: Mr. Barrasso (Chairman), Mr. Inhofe, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Moran, Mr. Rounds, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Sullivan.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Hatch (Chairman), Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Heller, Mr. Scott, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Corker (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr.

Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Flake, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Young, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Alexander (Chairman), Mr. Enzi, Mr. Burr, Mr. Isakson, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Young, Mr. Hatch, Mr. Roberts, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Scott.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS: Mr. Johnson (Chairman), Mr. McCain, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Hoeven, Mr. Daines.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY: Mr. Grassley (Chairman), Mr. Hatch, Mr. Graham, Mr. Cornyn, Mr. Lee, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Flake, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Kennedy.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE: Mr. Burr (Chairman), Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Ms. Collins, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Cornyn.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING: Ms. Collins (Chairman), Mr. Hatch, Mr. Flake, Mr. Scott, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Corker, Mr. Burr, Mr. Rubio, Mrs. Fischer.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET: Mr. Enzi (Chairman), Mr. Grassley, Mr. Sessions, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Graham, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Corker, Mr. Perdue, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Kennedy, Mr. Boozman.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS: Mr. Hoeven (Chairman), Mr. Barrasso, Mr. McCain, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Moran.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Lee (Vice Chairman), Mr. Cotton, Mr. Sasse, Mr. Portman, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Cassidy.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION: Mr. Blunt (Chairman), Mr. McConnell, Mr. Cochran, Mr. Alexander, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Shelby, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Capito, Mr. Wicker, Mrs. Fischer.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Risch (Chairman), Mr. Rubio, Mr. Paul, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Ernst, Mr. Inhofe, Mr. Young, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Rounds, and Mr. Kennedy.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS’ AFFAIRS: Mr. Isakson (Chairman), Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Heller, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Isakson (Chairman), Mr. Roberts, Mr. Risch.

SENATE RESOLUTION 8—TO CONSTITUTE THE MINORITY PARTY’S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 8

Resolved, That the following shall constitute the minority party’s membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Ms. Stabenow, Mr. Leahy, Mr. Brown, Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Benét, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Donnelly, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Casey, Mr. Van Hollen.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: Mr. Leahy, Mrs. Murray, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Reed, Mr. Tester, Mr. Udall, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Coons, Mr. Schatz, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Manchin, Mr. Van Hollen.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Reed, Mr. Nelson, Mrs. McCaskill, Mrs. Shaheen, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr.