

(Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 918, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing medical assistance at a residential pediatric recovery center to infants under 1 year of age with neonatal abstinence syndrome and their families.

S. 1354

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1354, a bill to establish an Individual Market Reinsurance fund to provide funding for State individual market stabilization reinsurance programs.

S. 1556

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1556, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, and for other purposes.

S. 2004

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2004, a bill to increase funding for the State response to the opioid misuse crisis and to provide funding for research on addiction and pain related to the substance misuse crisis.

S. 2127

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2127, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 2144

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2144, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements.

S. 2203

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2203, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 2255

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2255, a bill to reauthorize title VI of the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve and encourage innovation in international education, and for other purposes.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2330, a bill to prohibit earmarks.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. COONS, and Mr. JONES):

S. 2334. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide clarity with respect to, and to modernize, the licensing system for musical works under section 115 of that title, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of that title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise with my good friend from Tennessee to discuss some truly landmark legislation we are introducing today that is long overdue. It is called the Music Modernization Act, and it will reshape the music licensing landscape to bring it into the 21st century.

As a songwriter myself, I have a deep interest in music issues and in ensuring we have a music licensing system that works. Unfortunately, our music licensing laws have not kept pace with technological change. We have an outdated, antiquated system that is designed for the era of CDs and cassette tapes rather than the era of digital streamlining and audio on demand.

Most of us rarely think about the complex laws that govern who can listen to what music when and who gets paid when we purchase an MP3 or listen to an interactive stream. We pay our money to iTunes or the streaming service without thinking about how that money then gets distributed to dozens or even hundreds of actors across the music industry. You have songwriters and publishers and recording artists and record labels. You have agents and broadcasters and streaming services and performing rights organizations. You have multiple copyrights across multiple individuals for the same song. It is a dense, interconnected web of licenses, rights, and legal obligations that all need and should be carefully calibrated, but our current regime is not well calibrated—far from it.

To begin with, the process of ensuring that songwriters are paid when the songs they have written are downloaded or played on the internet is a complete mess. The problem lies in matching sound recordings to the underlying musical work; that is, to the

song performed in the sound recording. When a person downloads or streams a song, there are actually two sets of copyright holders whose interests come into play.

The first is the recording artist who owns a copyright in the sound recording; that is, in the recorded version of the song. Often, the recording artist will have assigned his or her copyright to a record label.

The other relevant copyright holder is the songwriter—the person who actually wrote the music and, in virtually every case, the lyrics that the recording artist performed. The songwriter owns a copyright in the song itself, in the actual words and music. Often, the songwriter will have assigned his or her copyright to a music publisher.

When a sound recording is reproduced, whether by download, interactive stream, or fixing the song on a CD or other physical object, the recording artist and songwriter or their respective assignees will both receive royalties. The recording artist receives a royalty for the sound recording itself, and the songwriter receives a royalty for the underlying song. These are called mechanical royalties because, historically, the reproduction of sound recordings was done through mechanical means. Think of a vinyl record and its grooves.

There is also a second type of royalty that comes into play when a song is performed publicly, such as on the radio, at a concert, or over a digital transmission service like Pandora. This type of royalty is called, sensibly enough, a public performance royalty. Just like with mechanical royalties, it is paid to both the recording artist and the songwriter or their assignees.

As I said earlier, the problem lies in matching the sound recording to the underlying musical work; that is, in determining who should get paid when an individual downloads a song or listens to an interactive stream.

Figuring out the recording artist is pretty easy. When digital music services play music, they play sound recordings. They play a song recorded by Taylor Swift or Jay-Z or Garth Brooks or they offer the sound recording for download. In either case, determining who recorded the song is straightforward. Figuring out who the songwriter is, however, can be much more complicated.

A recording artist may play 10 different songs by 10 different songwriters on a single album or 10 separate writers may have contributed to a single song, with each being entitled to a cut. Unlike with recording artists, it is usually not apparent from the sound recording itself who the songwriter is.

Of course, the recording artist—or the record label, if the recording artist has assigned his or her rights to a record label—may know who the songwriter is, but not always, and it is simply not feasible for digital music providers to independently track down

every individual songwriter for the millions of songs they offer over their services.

The problem of unmatched works—that is, works for which the sound recording has not been matched to the underlying songwriter—creates significant difficulties for both digital music providers and songwriters.

Start with digital music providers. By law, these services are required to pay mechanical royalties to songwriters for interactive streams and digital downloads. But if they don't know who the relevant songwriter or publisher is, they can't pay the royalty. This exposes digital music providers to significant liability if a songwriter or publisher later appears and asserts their rights. At the same time, songwriters get short shrift because they don't get paid when they are supposed to be. Streaming services play their songs and digital platforms offer their songs for download without paying the required royalties. As you can see, this is a complicated system. It is a bad situation all around.

That is where the legislation Senator ALEXANDER and I are introducing today comes into play. Our bill, the Music Modernization Act, creates a blanket mechanical license for digital music providers. This license, which will be administered by a mechanical licensing collective, will enable digital music providers to obtain a single mechanical license for the music they play rather than having to individually seek out songwriters and publishers. Services that obtain the license will receive liability protection.

Songwriters and publishers, in turn, will benefit from increased royalty payments. Among the mechanical licensing collective's duties will be establishing and maintaining a public database that identifies musical works and their owners. This will help reduce the number of unmatched works.

In addition, the Music Modernization Act provides that royalties for unmatched works will be distributed after a holding period of 3 years to known copyright holders on a market-share basis. This means that rather than going unpaid, royalties for unmatched works will go to existing copyright holders according to how active each copyright holder is in the marketplace.

Our bill also contains a critical update to the rate standard for mechanical royalties for songwriters. Current law requires the Copyright Royalty Board to consider a variety of statutory factors in setting mechanical royalties. These factors, however, do not accurately reflect market demand, with the result that songwriters are paid a below-market rate. Our bill revises this standard to instruct the Board to establish rates that reflect what a willing buyer and willing seller would agree to in the marketplace.

Lastly, the bill makes two changes related to public performance royalties for songwriters. As I explained earlier, this type of royalty comes into play

when a song is performed publicly, such as on the radio, at a concert, or over a digital transmission service like Pandora.

Public performance royalties for songwriters and publishers are administered through performing rights organizations, or PROs, the best known of which are ASCAP and BMI. ASCAP and BMI offer blanket licenses to radio stations, restaurants, digital transmission services, and others that allow licensees to play all songs in the PRO's catalogue. These blanket licenses are governed by 1940s-era consent decrees that require all rates under the licenses to be set or approved by a Federal judge in the Southern District of New York.

The Music Modernization Act makes two changes relevant to these consent decrees. First, it says that any judge in the Southern District of New York may hear a rate-setting case involving ASCAP's or BMI's license fees, not just the particular judge who oversees the consent decree.

Second, the bill revises current law to allow judges in these rate-setting proceedings to consider evidence of public performance royalties paid for sound recordings in setting public performance royalties for songwriters. The purpose of this provision is to better align public performance royalties for sound recordings with public performance royalties for the underlying musical work and to ensure that songwriters are properly rewarded when a song they write becomes a hit.

As I mentioned earlier, music licensing is an incredibly complicated subject. I have endeavored today to explain the Music Modernization Act in a straightforward way that individuals not steeped in this subject can understand. The key points are as follows. First, the bill will have to solve the problem of unmatched works so that digital music providers are protected from liability and songwriters receive the royalties they are due. Second, the bill will better align royalties for songwriters with royalties for recording artists and with market demand. It will also bring much needed transparency to our music licensing system by creating a public database that identifies musical works and their owners.

I am pleased to report that our bill has broad support across the music industry, which is a tremendous thing. One of the things that makes this legislation such a breakthrough is that we have been able to get the songwriting side of the industry—the songwriters and their representatives in all these matters in the publishing and PRO community—on board with the recording and distribution side of the industry—the record labels and digital music providers. Indeed, I don't think I have ever seen a music bill that has had such broad support across the industry. All sides have a stake in this, and they have come together in support of a commonsense, consensus bill that addresses challenges throughout the music industry.

I should also note that introduction is just the start of the process. Bills change as they move through markup and floor consideration, and there are some outstanding issues in the latter part of the bill that remain to be resolved with broadcasters. I am committed to working through these issues as the bill moves forward so that we have the broadest consensus possible.

I said at the outset that I am a songwriter myself. I have a deep and abiding interest in these issues. These matters are personal to me. They are also an important part of my legacy. I am relatively unknown, and I don't expect to make a lot of money out of the music industry, but I am deeply interested in this, in making sure that those who do create these wonderful musical subjects will be treated more fairly than they are today.

I have fought long and hard for strong copyright protections my entire time in the Senate. I have passed a number of landmark copyright bills, from the Copyright Term Extension Act to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act to the Family Movie Act.

The Music Modernization Act is another in that long line of landmark legislation. In fact, I view it as the capstone of my work on copyright. I say that because I want my colleagues to know how important this bill is, not just to me but to my friends, and I want my friends in the industry to know how important this bill is to me as well. I have less than a year left in this body, and one thing that I am dead set on is enacting this bill into law before I leave.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting and sponsoring this bill. The music we create in our country is an important part of our culture and of the message we carry to the rest of the world. Let's do everything we can to ensure we have a music licensing system that is fair, that rewards creativity, and that creates the right incentives to write, perform, and sell music. That is exactly what the Music Modernization Act will do.

I have a partner in this business of trying to get this bill through, the great Senator from the State of Tennessee, LAMAR ALEXANDER, who himself is a very accomplished musician. He is a great piano player, and he is a great friend, and he understands these issues as much as if not more than anyone else I know in the Congress of the United States. I just feel very indebted to him and blessed to have him as one of the people who will be working with me on this matter.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Utah for his leadership. He is not only the senior Republican Senator and former chair of the Judiciary Committee, which will hear this legislation, and chairman of the Finance Committee, he is a songwriter himself. He is not

just a songwriter; he has a platinum record, he has a gold record, and he has another one that might become gold. So he knows what he is talking about.

I think, for all of us in the Senate, when ORRIN HATCH says that in his 40 years or so here—more than any other Republican Senator—this is the capstone of his career in his work on copyright and it is personally important to him, that means something to the rest of us here. I think that means—among all of the other issues here—we are going to pay more attention to this, and we are going to work hard to pass it. I hope it also means something to those outside this Chamber—the songwriters themselves, the digital music companies, the music publishers, the broadcasters. This is something we intend to do. We intend to make this a law because it is right thing to do, because the songwriters aren't being treated fairly, and because it is important to Senator HATCH, whom we respect.

When Senator HATCH stands up on the floor and says: I have been working since 1977 on copyright issues—and we know how many important issues he has dealt with—and he says this is a capstone of all those issues, we should pay attention to that, and we should deal with it. I think we will be able to deal with it because we start off with very strong bipartisan support.

This afternoon, Senator HATCH and I will file the Music Modernization Act. We will begin with eight Members of the Senate, including Senator HATCH, as the lead sponsor; I will be there, in addition to Senator WHITEHOUSE, a Senator from Rhode Island, a Democrat; Senator CORKER, a Senator from Tennessee; and Senator DICK DURBIN, the Senator from Illinois.

DICK DURBIN is in Nashville nearly as much as ORRIN HATCH is in Nashville. He is not a songwriter, but he loves country music, and he loves songwriting and music, and he is the No. 2 Senator in the Senate, the Democratic whip. To begin to have that sort of co-sponsorship, in addition to Senator ISAKSON, Senator COONS of Delaware, and our newest Senator, Mr. JONES of Alabama—those are the eight of us in the Senate who are starting this bill. We hope others on both sides of the aisle will see the wisdom of it.

Italy has its art, Egypt has its pyramids, Napa Valley has its wine, and Nashville has its songwriters. Songwriters are the lifeblood of Music City. The mayor of Nashville was in my office today and we talked about that. We have thousands of songwriters in Nashville. We have a lot in Memphis too. We have many in Bristol and Knoxville in East Tennessee, where country music really started. They are waiters, they are bus drivers, they are teachers. They have other jobs as they build their songwriting careers. Their paychecks ought to be based on the fair market value of the work they create. Songwriters are paid when their songs are played. We want to make sure that

their hits that are heard around the world are felt in their pocketbook.

The arrival of the internet has transformed the music industry, but it has also meant that many songwriters simply aren't paid their royalties when their songs are played online. This is the first problem—the arrival of the internet.

The second problem is, when the songwriters are paid, they are not paid a fair market value for their work. Senator HATCH, as I have mentioned, has long been an advocate for musicians. He understands this.

We have worked together for over a year with Representative DOUG COLLINS in the House of Representatives on the Music Modernization Act, which eight of us will introduce this afternoon. It is bipartisan. It represents the first major consensus legislation that has the support of songwriters, music publishers, digital music companies, and the record labels. Senator HATCH and I are going to continue to work together to make sure it has the support of broadcasters as well.

More importantly, the legislation will have a real impact on songwriters in Tennessee and elsewhere. First, it creates a simple licensing system for direct music services, like Pandora and Amazon to reflect a changing music industry. Second, it will make it easier for the songwriters to be paid when their music is played or someone buys a song that they wrote. Third, it will allow them to be paid for the fair market value of their work.

Now, to give you an idea of what this really means, let me tell you a story about songwriting. I do not have the experience that the Senator from Utah has. He has written more than a hundred songs over the years and cowritten some of them with a number of Nashville songwriters, as a matter of fact, and he even has a song that is a platinum record. But a few years ago, I was in East Tennessee, in my hometown of Maryville. I walked out of the pharmacy, and I saw an older couple sitting in a pickup truck, and I asked them how they were doing. The woman said of her and her husband: "We're just falling apart together."

Well, that weekend my son Drew was having a songwriters' retreat at our home in East Tennessee. He is in the music business. So I told one of them, Lee Brice, about what the woman said to me: "falling apart together." Lee Brice said: I think I can do something with that. So he, Billy Montana, and Jon Stone, the songwriters, wrote a song called "Falling Apart Together." Lee Brice put that on one of his albums, and I got one fourth of the song rights. That is the way it works in Nashville. If you contribute anything, including just the song name to a song, you get a part of the royalty. Well, Lee Brice is a pretty well-known singer, as well as a songwriter, and he put the song on his album. You would think the royalty would add up to a lot of money, but in 2016, on my Senate fi-

nancial disclosure, I reported receiving \$101.75 in royalties from my one-fourth of the song "Falling Apart Together." If you are a songwriter living in Nashville, Memphis, Los Angeles, New York, or anywhere—or Provo or Salt Lake City—you can't make a living on \$101.75.

The other problem facing songwriters is that music is increasingly played online. Companies like Spotify, Pandora, Amazon, and Apple offer listeners virtually unlimited access to digital music libraries that they can play using the internet whenever they want. According to Nielsen, there are nearly 86 million paying subscribers to these types of digital music streaming services—86 million paying subscribers. In 2016, these subscribers listened to more than 252 billion music streams, including repeated songs. So in 2016, for the first time in history, streaming music services—songs played online—generated more than half the music industry's revenues. Digital music services such as Spotify, Pandora, and Apple Music generated the majority, or 51.4 percent, of the music industry's revenues.

So we know that the internet has changed our world. It has changed politics. It has changed newspapers. It has changed retail. We have seen the effect of it. It has changed the music industry too. One half of the music industry's revenues come from online songs that are played and, as Senator HATCH has said, our laws have not kept up with that and, as a result, our songwriters—the creators who have a right under our Constitution to be paid for their work a fair market value—aren't being paid. In many cases, when they are paid, they are not being paid a fair market value. Sales of compact discs fell below \$100 million in 2016, a 17-percent decline from 2015. This means that it is getting much more difficult for songwriters to make a living and Congress can't change the fact that the internet and other new technologies have changed the music industry, but we do have a responsibility to update our laws to keep up with what has happened.

So how did we get in this mess, and what laws are we talking about updating? In 1909, more than a century ago, Congress gave copyright owners of musical works the exclusive right to make, reproduce, and distribute their own musical work. At the time, the works were primarily piano rolls. So we are talking about laws that were created for player pianos. Congress sets a royalty to be paid to the owners of those piano rolls at \$0.02 per copy. The Copyright Royalty Board, a three-judge panel at the Library of Congress, still sets those royalty rates today. The current rate is 9.1 cents, and it is based on a below-market standard.

Another problem, as Senator HATCH mentioned, is that ASCAP and BMI, the two largest performance rights organizations, are subject to a 76-year-

old consent decree with the Department of Justice—that means an agreement agreed upon in 1940 or so—and ever since then, it has been governing these performance rights rates. These consent decrees never contemplated the internet, and today they are harming national songwriters. The biggest problem with these outdated consent decrees is that songwriters don't get paid the fair market value for their work.

Songwriters negotiate with radio stations for the right to play their music in exchange for “reasonable” performance royalty. If songwriters and the radio stations can't agree on the reasonable royalty, the songwriters have to go to a Federal rate court, which means their case is heard by district judges in the Southern District of New York. Under current law, the judge is not allowed to consider what the song's performer earns when he sets a reasonable royalty. The Music Modernization Act changes that by allowing ASCAP and BMI to present new evidence about the fair market value of the songwriter's work, like what a performer might earn, to a Federal rate court judge when there is a dispute about royalty rates.

The legislation also allows more Federal district judges to hear these types of cases. The music industry has changed dramatically in the past 109 years. It is time to update our music licensing laws to ensure that songwriters can continue to make a living.

Now, what the Music Modernization Act does to solve the problem is this. It creates a new simplified licensing entity to make it easier for the digital music companies—this is Spotify, Pandora—to obtain a license to play songs and ensure songwriters are paid when their music is played. Instead of Spotify and Pandora tracking down each songwriter or a songwriter's publisher to get permission to play his song, they will be able to submit one license and start playing a song right away. Transitioning to a blanket license for reproductions was recommended by the Copyright Office of the Library of Congress. In a February 2015 report on music licensing reforms, the Copyright Office recommended this blanket licensing approach that is included in the Music Modernization Act. The Copyright Office report concluded that “song-by-song licensing is widely perceived as a daunting requirement for new services and as an administrative drag on the licensing system as a whole.” The move to a blanket system would allow marketplace entrants to launch their services—and begin paying royalties—more quickly.

Another important point is that the new licensing entity will not be a new government agency, and the digital music companies will pay to set it up and keep it running, not songwriters. The new entity will be governed by songwriters and music publishers, giving songwriters a say in how their work is used for the first time. The new

entity helps songwriters because it will collect royalties each time a song is played, look for the songwriter, and hold on to the royalties for 3 years until they can be found. This helps songwriters because it ensures they are paid royalties for their work, whether they have a publisher or not. This helps digital music companies because it makes sure songwriters are paid and that means fewer lawsuits.

The legislation also improves transparency by creating a publicly accessible database for all music works, and it requires digital music companies to pay songwriters their royalties every month. Songwriters will receive usage reports on music that is played to make sure the money is all there. The new database is important because maybe a young aspiring songwriter co-wrote a song under an alias or moved or simply can't be located. The legislation allows songwriters to audit the licensing entity once a year, if the songwriter chooses.

Finally, the legislation requires the Copyright Royalty Board at the Library of Congress to use a fair market standard of what a “willing buyer” would pay a “willing seller” when the Board sets royalty rates. This helps songwriters receive a fair market royalty when their song is played online.

The Music Modernization Act, as Senator HATCH said, has broad support—unprecedented support. It is a consensus piece of legislation. It is supported by the National Music Publishers Association; the Digital Media Association; the American Society for Composers, Authors and Publishers, or ASCAP; Broadcast Music, Inc. or BMI; the National Songwriters Association International; and the Songwriters of North America. On January 8, these groups joined the Recording Industry Association of America, the Recording Academy, and more than a dozen music industry groups in endorsing the Music Modernization Act. It will help thousands of songwriters in Nashville, across Tennessee, and across this country.

Songwriters, music publishers, and digital music companies have reached a consensus. Now it is up to Congress to provide a result. That is why I am working in such a bipartisan way and am so glad to be working with such imminent leaders as Senator HATCH, Senator DURBIN, and others to pass the Music Modernization Act and give Tennessee and our Nation's songwriters the fair pay they have earned.

I want to thank Senator HATCH's staff, as well as my own staff, once again, because they have been working on this issue for some time. Senator HATCH was the original cosponsor of legislation in the 114th Congress, titled the Songwriter Equity Act. I am proud to work with him.

I want to thank Representative DOUG COLLINS and Representative HAKEEM JEFFRIES, who are the sponsors of the bill in the House of Representatives. They are leading the effort to get the

bill through the House Judiciary Committee so it can be considered by the full House.

Finally, I wish to thank Bart Herbison, with the National Songwriters Association; David Israelite, with the National Music Publishers Association; Beth Matthews, with ASCAP; Mike O'Neil, with BMI; and Greg Barnes and Chris Harrison, with the Digital Media Association. These individuals have all worked together and negotiated for months to try to produce consensus legislation to help songwriters and modernize the music licensing laws.

So let me end where I began. This is a bill to help songwriters. This is a bill to modernize a copyright system. This is a bill to help our laws keep up with the digital age, the internet world. This is a bill that has consensus among digital companies and songwriters and publishers for the first time. This is a bill to honor ORRIN HATCH, who has served in this body since 1977, who is a songwriter himself, and who has been our leader on modernizing copyright laws from the very beginning. I intend to work as hard as I can in a bipartisan way, both in the Senate and the House, to pass this bill for the good of our country and as a capstone of the career of our senior Senator, Mr. HATCH.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I can't express my appreciation well enough to thank the Senator from Tennessee for this wonderful set of remarks he has just given. He has outlined it as well as it could be done. Tennessee has always been very well represented, but LAMAR ALEXANDER is one of the great Senators here, and I am just grateful that he is standing side by side with me on this.

The songwriters of America have been mistreated for years and years and years, and it is time to change it. It is time to get some equity and some fairness into this system, and I think LAMAR has outlined that about as well as it could be outlined. I want to personally express my appreciation to the Senator from Tennessee for what he has said here today.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to thank Senator HATCH for his leadership on intellectual property issues throughout his distinguished career in the Senate. I was pleased to join him in securing the passage of the Defend Trade Secrets Act in the last Congress, which established a Federal civil right of action to protect this valuable form of intellectual property.

Likewise, I am pleased to join Senator HATCH as a cosponsor on the Music Modernization Act. This important piece of legislation will bring much-needed transparency and efficiency to the music marketplace and more fairly compensate songwriters for their valuable creative work. I note that there are some outstanding issues in the latter part of the bill that remain to be resolved with broadcasters and other

music licensees. Senator HATCH has indicated to me that he intends to work through these issues as the bill moves from introduction to markup so that we can have the broadest consensus possible for this legislation. I thank Senator HATCH for this commitment and commend him for his leadership on ensuring that the copyright laws stay apace with evolving technology.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my good friend, Senator COONS, for co-sponsoring the Music Modernization Act and for his engagement on this critically important subject. Like Senator COONS, I want this bill to achieve broad support so that it can move forward in a consensus manner. To that end, I intend to work with broadcasters to address their concerns as the bill moves from introduction to markup and look forward to a productive, successful dialogue on these issues.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have 6 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 COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 24, 2018, at 10 a.m., at Walter E. Washington Convention Center to conduct a hearing entitled "Driving Automotive Innovation and Federal Policies."

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 24, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "This is Not a Drill: An Examination of the Wireless Emergency Alert System."

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 24, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Daniel Desmond Domenico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, and Adam I. Klein, of the District of Columbia, to be Chairman and Member of the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 24, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hear-

ing entitled "Turning 65: Navigating Critical Decisions to Age Well."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 24, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, January 24, 2018, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Anna Bonelli, a detailee on the Senate Committee on Finance, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the Congress.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 25, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, January 25; 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; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the James nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 6:02 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, January 25, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES TAX COURT

COURTNEY DUNBAR JONES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES TAX COURT FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE JOHN O. COLVIN, RETIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

ALAN D. ALBRIGHT, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS, VICE WALTER S. SMITH, JR., RETIRED.
SUSAN BRNOVICH, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, VICE NEIL VINCENT WAKE, RETIRED.

DOMINIC W. LANZA, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA, VICE SUSAN RITCHIE BOLTON, RETIRED.
JOHN B. NALBANDIAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, VICE JOHN M. ROGERS, RETIRING.

MAUREEN K. OHLHAUSEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS

FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LAWRENCE J. BLOCK, TERM EXPIRED.

ROBERT R. SUMMERHAYS, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, VICE REBECCA F. DOHERTY, RETIRED.

JOSEPH L. FALVEY, JR., OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR VETERANS CLAIMS FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE ALAN G. LANCE, SR., RETIRED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be lieutenant commander

AUGUSTINO ALBANESE II
VICTOR M. ALMODOVAR
TIMOTHY R. ANDERSEN
LINA R. ANDERSON
RAPHAEL S. ANDERSON
TAYLOR S. ANDREWS
SAMUEL G. ANDRIESEN
CHARLES M. ARENA
JOELLEN M. ARONS
SEAN R. ARUMAE
OMAR S. ASTRERO
KENNETH AU
TODD J. BAGETIS
RYAN W. BALL
RAFAEL E. BATLLE
ROBERT E. BATLLE
BRIAN M. BEACH
KIRK J. BECKMANN
BEAU C. BELANGER
BRADLEY P. BERGAN
BENJAMIN J. BERMAN
PETER A. BIZZARO
STEVEN C. BLUM
DAVID J. BLUNIER
COLIN M. BOYLE
ROBERT L. BRAHAM
SCOTT M. BRANNER
MICHAEL R. BRASHIER
MARK J. BRASS
CARLON F. BRIETZKE, JR.
CHRISTOPHER M. BRIGGS
JEROME BROWN
MARGARET A. BROWN
ROBERT J. BROWN
JOSEPH P. BURGESS
ANDY J. CEELEN
JON E. CHAPLEAU
RYAN H. CLARK
CATLIN R. CLEMONS
DANIEL P. CLOONAN
MARK D. COBB
ALEJANDRO M. COLLAZO
MICHAEL J. COLLET
ANNEXA M. CORMIER
CASEY S. CORPE
JUDE COSTELLO
LEIGH G. COTTERELL
BIANN I. CREQUE
DALE T. CRESSMAN
DANIEL P. CROWLEY
LEE K. CRUSIUS
IAN A. CULVER
ALEXANDER B. CURRIE
ANDREW J. CZARNIAK
MICHAEL S. DAFFLER
LINDEN M. DALE
JONATHAN DALE
SAMUEL M. DANUS
CLAIRE P. DAVENPORT
DANIEL A. DAVIS
LISA M. DEPACE
RYAN N. DICKSON
NATHAN R. DOWNEND
ROY T. DUFF
CODY B. DUNAGAN
KEVIN J. EDES
TAYLOR K. EGGLESTON
LUCAS A. ELDER
JAMES W. ELLSWORTH
BRANDIE E. ELMORE
JASON A. ERICKSON
ROYSBEL ESTUPINAN
BRETT D. ETTINGER
MEGHAN J. FAIRHURST
DOUGLAS C. FALLON
JUSTIN C. FELLERS
MATTHEW J. FETZNER
RYAN M. FISH
BRIDGET J. FLORES
JOSEPH T. FORGENG III
IAN A. FOSTER
KENNETH J. FRANKLIN, JR.
RACHEL A. FRANKLIN
SCOTT R. FRESHOUR
ADAM R. FRYE
JOSHUA N. GALDOS
BRETT C. GARY
ROBERT S. GAY
JUSTIN R. GEAR
MICHAEL W. GIBSON
THOMAS G. GIBSON
MARY A. GILDAY
LAURA E. GOULD
LINSEY M. GRANGER
TONY L. GREGG
STEVEN M. GREY
RICHARD C. GUY
NATHAN HALL
DANIEL K. HAN