

of S. 2633, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil forfeitures relating to certain seized animals, and for other purposes.

S. 2652

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2652, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Stephen Michael Gleason.

S. 2667

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2667, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for State and Tribal regulation of hemp production, and for other purposes.

S. 2757

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2757, a bill to require a national economic security strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 2762

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2762, a bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to support opportunities for beginning farmers and ranchers, and for other purposes.

S. 2789

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2789, a bill to prevent substance abuse and reduce demand for illicit narcotics.

S. 2811

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2811, a bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to reauthorize the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2815. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to increase transparency and oversight of third-party litigation funding in certain actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2815

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 “Litigation Funding Transparency Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. TRANSPARENCY AND OVERSIGHT OF THIRD-PARTY LITIGATION FUNDING IN CLASS ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 114 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 1716. Third-party litigation funding disclosure

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In any class action, class counsel shall—

“(1) disclose in writing to the court and all other named parties to the class action the identity of any commercial enterprise, other than a class member or class counsel of record, that has a right to receive payment that is contingent on the receipt of monetary relief in the class action by settlement, judgment, or otherwise; and

“(2) produce for inspection and copying, except as otherwise stipulated or ordered by the court, any agreement creating the contingent right.

“(b) TIMING.—The disclosure required by subsection (a) shall be made not later than the later of—

“(1) 10 days after execution of any agreement described in subsection (a)(2); or

“(2) the time of service of the action.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 114 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1716. Third-party litigation funding disclosure.”.

SEC. 3. TRANSPARENCY AND OVERSIGHT OF THIRD-PARTY LITIGATION FUNDING IN MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION.

Section 1407 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (g) and (h) as subsections (h) and (i), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

“(g)(1) In any coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings conducted pursuant to this section, counsel for a party asserting a claim whose civil action is assigned to or directly filed in the proceedings shall—

“(A) disclose in writing to the court and all other parties the identity of any commercial enterprise, other than the named parties or counsel, that has a right to receive payment that is contingent on the receipt of monetary relief in the civil action by settlement, judgment, or otherwise; and

“(B) produce for inspection and copying, except as otherwise stipulated or ordered by the court, any agreement creating the contingent right.

“(2) The disclosure required by paragraph (1) shall be made not later than the later of—

“(A) 10 days after execution of any agreement described in paragraph (1)(B); or

“(B) the time the civil action becomes subject to this section.”.

SEC. 4. APPLICABILITY.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any case pending on or commenced after the date of the enactment of this Act.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2826. A bill to safeguard certain technology and intellectual property in the United States from export to or influence by the People’s Republic of China and to protect United States industry from unfair competition by the People’s Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, when the story of the 21st century is written,

there will be a couple chapters about Vladimir Putin’s Russia, most certainly chapters about radical jihadists, and perhaps a few chapters on some other things we have yet to fully anticipate.

There still remains over 80 years in this century, but there is no doubt that the vast majority of the story about the 21st century will be about the relationship between the United States and China. China—the most populous nation on Earth, the second largest economy, and soon to be the largest economy on the planet—is a country that cannot be contained. It will be a major factor, both economically and geopolitically, as it should be for a nation of that magnitude and a culture that deep, with such long history. However, there are imbalances developing in that relationship, which I believe are threatening, not just to our Nation but ultimately to the peace and security and the stability of the world.

It is on that topic I wanted to come to the floor and speak today and perhaps about some of the things we need to do about it. There was a consensus—which I would admit I, perhaps, from time to time, was a partaker in—that China was a country that would, eventually, as it grew more prosperous, become not just more democratic but more willing to live by the rules the world has conducted itself by since the end of the Second World War.

Perhaps I wasn’t as strong an adherent to that as some others. I have always been, of course, deeply suspicious of communism and autocratic nations, but there was still the belief that things could work out, and, eventually, at some point, both demographics and economics would force China to accept the benefits and the wisdom of a global economic order that has maintained the peace since the end of the Second World War.

That was a terrible mistake. For, in fact, that is not how it has played out. For the better part of 30 years now, China has been allowed to systemically violate all of the rules of fair play in trade and commerce under the guise of saying, eventually, they are going to come around and behave. Not only has it not worked, it has allowed them to accelerate their economic growth to the detriment of American workers, American industry, and economies all over the world.

Today, China is 3 years into a plan called Made in China 2025. What “Made in China” means, and what it is all about, is China intends to be the dominant power and dominate 10 key sectors of the future economy. They outline what all 10 of those are.

Now, if that dominance was the result of being more innovative or spending more money on research or just being better, then we would have little to complain about. It would be on us to become more innovative ourselves and put more money into research and technology and these sorts of things. That is not what it is the product of. It

is the product of cheating. It is the massive theft of intellectual property—the largest single transfer of wealth in the history of mankind stolen; stolen because they buy small companies that are developing some key component in a broader technology, and they take it for themselves; stolen because when an American company or any foreign company, for that matter, wants to do business in China and have access to their 1.4 billion people, you have to partner with them. They make you partner with a Chinese company. Your “partner” steals your secrets and then they kick you out and now they are your competitor.

So think about it. They are able to make all of these advances without paying for them. Imagine if you had a business that was able to grow without having to pay for all the research that went to getting you to that point. This is what they do. It has allowed them to expand militarily, commercially, and economically to the point where we are at the edge of a very dangerous economic and geopolitical imbalance that needs to be addressed. It needs to be addressed now. We are almost out of time because 5 years from now, 6 years from now, or 3 years from now, it may be too late to address this.

I want to reiterate what I said at the outset. This is not about containing China, nor is it about crippling China. It is about ensuring that we are going to have stability in the world; a stability in which our companies and their companies can partner, but they need to do so voluntarily; a stability where they cannot steal our secrets; a stability where they cannot violate the rules of trade but benefit from the rules of trade.

That is what I hope to address through a new bill called the Fair Trade With China Enforcement Act, which I am introducing today. The first problem we want to address is that China is building its industrial capacity with U.S. intellectual property and technology.

I have highlighted how they steal our technology and our intellectual property, and they use it. As an example, General Electric and Honeywell technology is being used in China by one of GE's and Honeywell's competitors. They didn't sell it to them. It was stolen from them. Two American companies had their secrets stolen, and now their competitor in China is using their technology that they spent money and time investing in.

The solution to that problem is to pass a law that prohibits the sale of national security-sensitive technology and intellectual property to China. The bill would do this by directing the Department of Commerce to use its export control authority to block military capacity exports and components of Made in China 2025 exports to China.

So, basically, the Department of Commerce would look at Made in China 2025. These are the sectors they are trying to dominate, and we would

prohibit the sale or the transfer of intellectual property sensitive to those industries. That means American companies—even if they have a partnership with China—would be prohibited by law in sharing this information with them willingly.

The second problem we have, frankly, is here at home. We have these large multinational U.S. companies that have very valuable intellectual property and technology that partner with Chinese firms. They know their intellectual property is going to be stolen, but they don't care. They don't care, No. 1, because they are not going to pay the full cost of the loss of this intellectual property. It is going to be borne by the entire country.

A great example of that would be a CEO or business executive who knows they are only going to be at the company for x number of years. They make the decision: I don't care if they are going to steal our intellectual property. I want to have access to the Chinese market because it is 1.4 billion people. That is going to allow us to sell a bunch of stuff there. Our profits will go up. I am going to look good in the quarterly reports and look good before the board of directors. Who cares if this harms the United States? My obligation is to the corporation and not the country.

That is their view. In fact, many of these CEOs of large multinational companies consider themselves to be citizens of the world before they consider themselves to be citizens of the United States. They are willing to turn these things over because by the time we are hurt by it as a nation, they are long gone; by the time they are hurt by it as a company, they are long gone, but they are going to have some pretty good quarters as they expand into the largest market in the world, and their shareholders and board of directors are going to be very happy about it.

That is a big problem. Just because a company has their address in the United States, does not mean they consider themselves to be American companies. Of course, this is a big problem among many large multinational corporations that are doing business there and know exactly what is going on but are more interested in the short-term profits than the impact on our national security.

The solution I propose to that problem in this law is to increase taxes on multinational corporations on the income they earn in China. The tax would be increased equal to the amount of the lost value of the stolen intellectual property or technology. So if we lost \$1 billion, there would be a \$1 billion increase in that business's profit that they made in China through that partnership.

It does this by imposing a tax rate of 2 percent—roughly equal to what the Trade Representative's office estimates is the cost of lost intellectual property as a percent of total corporate profits in China.

The third problem we have is that China—and I mean China, both its sovereign wealth management and individuals who made a lot of money, directed by the government, in many cases—has gone on a buying spree of U.S. debt—meaning Treasuries, stocks, and even real estate. My hometown of Miami is one of the places being heavily invested in now to increase their trade surplus and to weaken the U.S. economy.

You say how? Let me give you an example. After China rose to the World Trade Organization, it had all this excess capital resulting from its large surpluses. That drove them to take that excess capital they were making now that they were part of the WTO and invest it in the United States in real estate, for example. Here you have people coming in and paying for real estate above the value of the property, driving up prices. It is one of the things that helped fuel the housing bubble. You can only imagine that if the property next door, the building next door, or the luxury condominium units next door are sold at a price higher than what the asking price might be, you are driving up the market for everyone. But they do this over and over again. This cheap financing of our debt, this buying up so many of our Treasury notes because there is such demand for our debt, our yield—the amount of interest we pay back to the investor—is lower. The result is it is one of the things that has driven our national debt here. It has been easy to borrow because it has been cheap.

What is the solution? The solution is to update the income tax treaty that was signed in the 1980s and that taxes China's profits on these investments, including their holdings of the national debt at a preferential rate for what it would be for anybody else.

What my law would do is make withholding taxes on China's investment income revert to what the law is for everyone else. For example, the U.S. payor would withhold the greater amount of tax on distributions to Chinese payees, so whatever income they are making from the debt, from the stocks, from the assets they bought in the United States and they have invested in—whatever they are making on it, they would pay taxes on that income the same as anyone else would, as opposed to under a preferential rate from the 1980s.

This is important because among the things that all of this surplus investment does in the United States, it increases the value of the dollar artificially. They did that when they were manipulating the currency. The stronger the dollar, the weaker our exports, the more expensive it is to buy something in the United States than somewhere else.

The currency fluctuates as a matter of course through economic engagement. This is the deliberate manipulation of our currency. This is one of the byproducts of this. Taxing the income

they make on those investments the same as anybody else would have to pay—and not this preferential rate—would help bring some balance to that.

One additional problem we want to address is that the Chinese Government's Made in China 2025 plan is a plan to displace advanced American manufacturing, and they intend to do that no matter what it takes. Let me give you an example. Made in China 2025 targets artificial intelligence and next-generation information technology. They target robotics. They target new energy vehicles. They target biotechnology—meaning biopharma, biologics—in terms of curing disease. They target energy and power generation. They target aerospace, which is not just airplanes and space travel. They target high-tech shipping, advanced railway, new material, agricultural machinery. These advanced, high-tech industries are supposed to be the competitive advantage of the United States in the 21st century.

What I am talking about is not protectionism. If this were a fair competition of these technologies versus them, that is what free markets are supposed to do. That is not how they are doing it. The way they compete with us in these industries—in addition to stealing our secrets and buying up the companies that are up in the supply chain—is to deny our companies access to their markets, but they want full and unfettered access to ours.

What is the solution? The solution is to prepare duties on and impose Chinese investor shareholding caps on U.S. companies producing goods targeted by Made in China 2025. This bill would do this by defining Made in China 2025 as a countervailable subsidy for American industries affected by Made in China 2025 exports, thus reducing future demand for Chinese exports in these industries.

We have to raise the prices of the products they are stealing from us; otherwise, they will put our industries out of business, and our children will live in a world where we depend on China for artificial intelligence, for robotics, for new energy vehicles, for aerospace, for biopharma.

Can you imagine living in a world where the cure to Alzheimer's is controlled by Chinese pharmaceutical companies—the amount of leverage it would give them geopolitically? If they reach that plateau because they outthrust us, that is one thing. But to get there by stealing what we produce, by denying our companies the ability to sell over there but asking us to allow their companies to sell here—that is not competition; that is theft. That is an imbalance that needs to be addressed.

We will also have the SEC block any majority stake acquisition of a listed company producing the component goods in any of these industries—the Made in China 2025 exports—in order to limit their ability to buy up our small companies or buy up enough of a con-

trolling interest in American companies to take them from us. That is the other strategy they have. They go into industries that go under the threshold of what the government looks into, and they buy up percentages of the company or the entire company itself. Then they control what is supposedly an American company, and they own it. Try doing that in China if you are an American.

The argument that we should continue to allow them to do it because they are a developing industry is ridiculous. No one can make that argument anymore. That is the argument that has been made for all of these years.

There is one last thing we need to do, and it has been on the news a lot lately. The Chinese have tried in the United States and around the world to use their companies involved in telecommunications, particularly Huawei and ZTE, to infiltrate U.S. networks. Basically how that works is they wanted us to buy components, parts, and equipment from Huawei and use it for our cell phone networks, our internet networks, our servers and routers—put those in our country. If you are a country that, as a matter of geopolitical strategy, steals—not just spies as normal countries do, but steals intellectual property and corporate secrets to build your economy at the expense of someone else's and you control the routers and the telecom system or enough of it in another country, we are just making it easier for you to steal these things from us.

Imagine a major U.S. university conducting research, and their entire back office and all of their computer networks in which it is stored has Huawei equipment. This would allow the Chinese Government to go into this equipment and use it remotely to extract all of this information. They don't even have to send any spies over here because we have brought them inside. This is a problem across the economy, and that needs to be dealt with in broader terms.

In this bill—a bill I have separately introduced with Senator COTTON—we would prohibit the Federal Government or subsidiaries and contractors of the Federal Government from buying telecommunications equipment or services from Huawei or ZTE. What we cannot afford is to have in our own government—or in companies that are servicing the government—telecommunications equipment and services vulnerable to espionage, either corporate or national security.

Let me close with this. There are a lot of big issues going on in the world, and for a lot of people, including myself, this issue is pretty new. I have long been concerned about China's military expansion. They are putting all kinds of missiles now on the islands in the South China Sea. I most certainly have long been concerned about human rights violations—what they have done with Tibet and the way they are bullying people in Taiwan. By the

way, just so you know the sort of influence level they have, Marriott Corporation fired an American worker—an American living in the United States, working for Marriott, was fired because they liked a social media post about Tibet. So the Chinese got mad. They told Marriott: You need to correct this. And they fired the employee—this American—because he liked a social media post by mistake about Tibet.

Do you know that United Airlines and American Airlines just got a letter from the Chinese Government saying: Unless you change your website so that it says Taiwan-China and not just Taiwan, we are going to start fining you and may take away your ability to fly into China. These are American companies that I hope do not give in. This is happening every single day.

Do you know that Hollywood movies are made so that they will be allowed to be distributed in China? Hollywood entertainment is deliberately not making movies or saying certain things in movies—political things, things that would offend the Chinese Government—because if they do, they will not let them sell their movies to 1.3, 1.4 billion people. Do you know there are actors, like Richard Gere, for example, who can't make major movies anymore because they can't be distributed in China because he is in favor of Tibet and its independence?

These things are happening, and we are arguing about a bunch of other silly things. This is historic. This is the single biggest challenge facing this Nation for the next 20, 30, or 40 years, and we are almost out of time to take it seriously.

Just a week ago, I traveled to Latin America. I was in Panama, where the Chinese have built not one but two port facilities on the Panama Canal. Not surprisingly, because of all this investment, last year Panama decided to switch. It no longer recognizes Taiwan. It switched to China. Last week, while I was in Panama, the Dominican Republic announced they have switched. Little by little they are going and using their investments in these countries, first just to get them to derecognize Taiwan but, ultimately, because they are spending so much money in these countries to leverage them, to align their foreign policy to China's in our own hemisphere.

We do not want conflict with China. We want parity, stability, reciprocity, and fairness. That is not what we have right now, and we have taken far too long to take it seriously. Now is the time to do it.

This is about more than just trade. This is about geopolitics and national security. It will be the defining issue of the century, and the time to take it seriously is now.

My bill, which we hope to continue to build on and improve, is our effort to hopefully begin this dialogue and take steps on this very important topic.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 2830. A bill to reauthorize the rural emergency medical services training and equipment assistance program under section 330J of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2830

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 “Supporting and Improving Rural EMS Needs Act of 2018” or the “SIREN Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF RURAL EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 330J of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254c-15) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “in rural areas” and inserting “in rural areas or to residents of rural areas”; and

(2) by striking subsections (b) through (g) and inserting the following:

“(b) ELIGIBILITY; APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive grant under this section, an entity shall—

“(1) be—

“(A) an emergency medical services agency operated by a local or tribal government (including fire-based and non-fire based); or

“(B) an emergency medical services agency that is described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code; and

“(2) submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity shall use amounts received through a grant under subsection (a) to—

“(1) recruit and retain emergency medical services personnel, which may include volunteer personnel;

“(2) train emergency medical services personnel as appropriate to obtain and maintain licenses and certifications relevant to service in an emergency medical services agency described in subsection (b)(1);

“(3) conduct courses that qualify graduates to serve in an emergency medical services agency described in subsection (b)(1) in accordance with State and local requirements;

“(4) fund specific training to meet Federal or State licensing or certification requirements;

“(5) develop new ways to educate emergency health care providers through the use of technology-enhanced educational methods;

“(6) acquire emergency medical services equipment; or

“(7) acquire personal protective equipment for emergency medical services personnel as required by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

“(d) GRANT AMOUNTS.—Each grant awarded under this section shall be in an amount not to exceed \$200,000.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) The term ‘emergency medical services’—

“(A) means resources used by a public or private nonprofit licensed entity to deliver

medical care outside of a medical facility under emergency conditions that occur as a result of the condition of the patient; and

“(B) includes services delivered (either on a compensated or volunteer basis) by an emergency medical services provider or other provider that is licensed or certified by the State involved as an emergency medical technician, a paramedic, or an equivalent professional (as determined by the State).

“(2) The term ‘rural area’ means—

“(A) a nonmetropolitan statistical area;

“(B) an area designated as a rural area by any law or regulation of a State; or

“(C) a rural census tract of a metropolitan statistical area (as determined under the most recent rural urban commuting area code as set forth by the Office of Management and Budget).

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$20,000,000 for each fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

“(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary may use not more than 10 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) for a fiscal year for the administrative expenses of carrying out this section.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 503—COMMEMORATING THE TRICENTENIAL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 503

Whereas in 1718, the Mission San Antonio de Valero, the Presidio San Antonio de Bejar, and the Villa de Bejar were founded in the area that would become the City of San Antonio (referred to in this preamble as “San Antonio”);

Whereas in 1821, San Antonio became a part of the Mexican empire;

Whereas in the Battle of the Alamo in 1836, Mexican forces led by General Lopez de Santa Anna stormed the Alamo and more than 200 United States colonists, Texians, and Tejanos died defending the future State of Texas;

Whereas in 1836, the new government of the State of Texas formed the county government of Bexar, and made San Antonio the county seat of Bexar;

Whereas in 1837, by action of the City Council, Ciudad San Antonio de Bejar was officially renamed the City of San Antonio;

Whereas the United States Army post at San Antonio was established in 1865, and is known today as Fort Sam Houston;

Whereas in 1877, the first passenger train of the renamed Galveston, Harrisburg, and San Antonio railroad arrived in San Antonio;

Whereas Brooks Air Force Base was built in 1917 in San Antonio and operated until closure in 2011;

Whereas Kelly Field, also known as Kelly Air Force Base, was founded in 1917 and operated until 2001, making it the oldest continuously operating air base in the United States;

Whereas in 1931, Randolph Air Force Base began operating as a training facility in San Antonio and is now part of Joint Base San Antonio;

Whereas in 1941, Lackland Air Force Base began operating as a training facility in San Antonio and is now part of Joint Base San Antonio;

Whereas in 1968, San Antonio hosted a 6-month international exposition known as “HemisFair ‘68”, which welcomed more than 6,000,000 visitors from across the world;

Whereas in 1973, San Antonio received the first and only major professional sports team of the city, the San Antonio Spurs, which has won a total of 5 National Basketball Association championships;

Whereas in 1987, Pope John Paul II became the first and only pontiff to visit the State of Texas and San Antonio;

Whereas in 1992, the United States, Mexico, and Canada signed the North American Free Trade Agreement in San Antonio;

Whereas in 2017, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization inscribed the 5 Spanish colonial missions in San Antonio as a World Heritage Site;

Whereas San Antonio is also called the Alamo City, the Mission City, and the River City, and was officially trademarked “Military City, USA” in 2017;

Whereas San Antonio has been home to several notable individuals, including President Dwight D. Eisenhower, President Lyndon B. Johnson, President Theodore Roosevelt, Attorney General Alberto Gonzales, Congressman David Crockett, Congressman Garlington Jerome Sutton, General Douglas MacArthur, General Jimmy Doolittle, Colonel James Bowie, Lieutenant Colonel Ed White, Master Sergeant Raul Perez Benavidez, Charles Lindbergh, Carol Burnett, Joan Crawford, Tommy Lee Jones, Johnny Cash, Rosita Fernandez, Santiago Jimenez, Santiago Jimenez Jr., Flaco Jimenez, and Secretary Henry Cisneros;

Whereas San Antonio hosts one of the largest annual marches in the United States for Martin Luther King Jr. Day, with nearly 300,000 participants;

Whereas San Antonio is the seventh largest city in the United States based on population;

Whereas San Antonio contributes to the cultural life and historical understanding of the State of Texas through events such as—

- (1) Fiesta;
- (2) Luminaria;
- (3) the San Antonio Stock Show & Rodeo;
- (4) the Armed Forces River Parade; and
- (5) the Texas Folk Life Festival; and

Whereas during the first week of May, 2018—

(1) San Antonio will honor and celebrate the tricentennial anniversary of the city; and

(2) each day of that week will have a specific focus, including a Day of Reflection, History & Education Day, Founders Day, Arts for All Day, Legacy Day, and Military Appreciation Day; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates 2018 as the year of the “San Antonio Tricentennial”; and

(2) honors the history and founding of the City of San Antonio, Texas.

SENATE RESOLUTION 504—DESIGNATING MAY 11, 2018, AS MILITARY SPOUSE APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 504

Whereas the month of May marks National Military Appreciation Month;

Whereas the Senate recognizes military spouses’ dedication of a lifetime of love, support, and patriotism that helps make the service and sacrifice of the men and women in the Armed Forces possible;