

Cassidy Hoeven
 Collins Hyde-Smith
 Cornyn Inhofe
 Cortez Masto Isakson
 Cotton Johnson
 Cramer Jones
 Crapo Kaine
 Cruz Kennedy
 Daines Lankford
 Duckworth Lee
 Enzi Manchin
 Ernst McConnell
 Feinstein McSally
 Fischer Moran
 Gardner Murkowski
 Graham Murphy
 Grassley Perdue
 Hassan Portman
 Hawley Risch

Roberts Romney
 Rounds Rosen
 Rubio Sasse
 Scott (FL) Scott (SC)

NAYS—33

Baldwin Heinrich
 Bennet Hirono
 Blumenthal King
 Booker Klobuchar
 Brown Leahy
 Cantwell Markey
 Carper Menendez
 Casey Merkley
 Coons Murray
 Durbin Paul
 Gillibrand Peters

Reed Schatz
 Sanders Cruz
 Schumer Daines
 Smith Enzi
 Stabenow Udal
 Van Hollen
 Warren Whitehouse
 Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The nomination was confirmed.
 The Senator from North Carolina.
 Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Madam President.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years.

Mitch McConnell, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Johnny Isakson, John Cornyn, Mike Rounds, Marco Rubio, John Barrasso, Pat Roberts, John Thune, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Richard C. Shelby, Roger F. Wicker, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoover	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
McConnell	McSally	Tillis
Cruz	Moran	Toomey
Daines	Murkowski	Wicker
Enzi	Paul	Young

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heinrich	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Jones	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaeheen
Brown	King	Sinema
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Udall
Durbin	Menendez	Van Hollen
Gillibrand	Cortez Masto	Merkley
Hassan	Duckworth	Murphy
	Feinstein	Warren
	Gillibrand	Whitehouse
	Hassan	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas are 53, and the nays are 46.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Tennessee.

CHINA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Madam President.

Today I received a letter from the U.S. Ambassador to China, Terry Branstad. Governor Branstad's letter said the following:

I am delighted to inform you that China's Ministry of Public Security announced China will make all forms of fentanyl a controlled substance effective May 1, 2019. If implemented effectively, this will fulfill the commitment President Xi made to the President at the G-20 last December in Buenos Aires. That commitment and this key development are direct results of your visit to Beijing during which you highlighted China's role in the global opioid crisis. Separately, I have asked my staff to share diplomatic reporting with you that addresses China's action in greater detail.

That is from Ambassador Terry Branstad, our Ambassador to China.

This is important news. It will save thousands of American lives. President Trump deserves great credit for persuading President Xi at their meeting in Argentina in December to do this, the one thing that our drug enforcement agents have said will reduce the flow of fentanyl into the United States more than any other single thing.

President Xi, the President of China, deserves the thanks of the American people for making this decision because our Drug Enforcement Agency is

convinced that this decision by China and its senior officials will save thousands of American lives.

The reason for this, we were told by our Drug Enforcement Agency personnel in China, is that, one way or the other, almost every bit of fentanyl that makes its way into the United States starts in China. These chemicals are made and mixed there. Then they come through the mail. They come through Mexico, through China, many different ways, but the chemicals start in China.

Every time China has made some form of fentanyl illegal, the availability of that form of fentanyl in the United States has begun to go straight down.

What President Trump and President Xi agreed to do on May 1 is to make all forms of fentanyl illegal. This means that if some clever scientist in China says: Well, this form of fentanyl is illegal, so I will make a different form that isn't, that clever scientist will now be out of business.

One thing the Chinese know very well how to do is to police their country. I would not want to be the Chinese person, after May 1, who is in violation of Chinese law that says all forms of fentanyl are controlled substances and illegal in China.

In October, I led a delegation of senior Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate to meet with the Chinese senior delegation. One would have thought that all we talked about was trade because trade was important to all of our States, but at Governor Branstad's insistence, in every meeting we had with senior Chinese officials, we said: Fentanyl is our biggest problem, and you can solve our biggest problem more than anybody else in the world. Instead of being our problem, why don't you be our solution? Why don't you let the United States point to China and say that you helped us solve a problem that is killing thousands of Americans on a regular basis?

China agreed to do that in December with President Trump. It has now been announced that on May 1, all forms of fentanyl will be controlled and therefore illegal.

We should watch and make sure it is effectively done, but what we should say today is: President Trump, we thank you for putting fentanyl on top of a busy agenda in December, and, President Xi, we are grateful to you for a decision we believe will save thousands of American lives. I might add, it is very helpful to have such an effective Ambassador as Terry Branstad in China because he knew how to focus the attention of many visiting delegations.

Our delegation wasn't the only one who carried this message; Senator PORTMAN and others have been there. But this is an example of China responding to an urgent American problem, and we ought to give both Presidents much more than a pat on the back for this important step.

HEALTHCARE

Madam President, I often suggest to Tennesseans that we should look at Washington as if it were a split-screen television. For example, last October, on one screen, you would have seen Senators throwing food at each other all month long over the Kavanaugh debate, but in another part of the Capitol, you had 72 Senators working together—Democrats, Republicans, three different committees from the Senate, five from the House—working together to enact what the President called the single most important law to deal with a public health epidemic ever passed, and that was the opioids bill.

While we are arguing—which we know how to do—on such issues as the border or the special counsel's report, on the other screen, you will see a lot of work getting done if you take time to look. That means there are bipartisan efforts. That means Republicans and Democrats are working together. It takes 60 votes to get most things done here. We are 53 to 47. So, as I learned to count in the public schools of Tennessee, I know I need to work with some Democrats to get up to 60. Usually, we find that when we do that, we get up to 70 or 80 or 85 because we can take even the most difficult issues and find our way through them.

Today, I want to talk about one of those efforts—a bipartisan effort to try to reduce healthcare costs. Healthcare and health insurance are often conflated. We often mix them up, both in Congress and in media stories. The President sometimes does that too. I want to be very clear that what I am talking about is a bipartisan working effort, that healthcare itself, not just health insurance, is too expensive.

Health insurance has gotten a lot of attention lately. The President tweeted earlier this week that “deductibles, in many cases [are] way over \$7,000, mak[ing] it almost worthless or unusable.” I agree. High deductibles tied to high premiums make healthcare inaccessible for too many Americans. I know the President is looking at ways to give Americans more affordable health insurance and to protect patients with preexisting conditions, and I look forward to hearing his plan. But the truth is, the cost of health insurance will not come down or even grow more slowly unless we lower the cost of healthcare. You can't have low-cost health insurance when you have high-cost healthcare.

My top healthcare priority this Congress is to enact legislation that will give all Americans an opportunity for better health outcomes and better health experiences at a lower cost. Democrats and Republicans are working together on that to get a result.

That is why Senator MURRAY, the lead Democrat on the Senate's Health Committee, and I are working with Senator GRASSLEY and Senator WYDEN, the senior leaders on the Senate Finance Committee, which shares jurisdiction over healthcare. We are work-

ing together on developing specific, bipartisan steps to help deal with the startling fact—which has come by way of experts who come before our Health Committee—that up to half of what Americans spend on healthcare is unnecessary. That is according to Dr. Brent James of the National Academies in testimony before our committee.

Last December, in order to help focus on reducing healthcare costs, after the Senate Health Committee held five hearings on reducing the cost of healthcare, I wrote a letter to the American Enterprise Institute, the Brookings Institution, governors, State insurance commissioners, doctors, patient groups, academic experts, and the public asking them to submit specific recommendations to Congress to lower healthcare costs. As of the March 1 deadline for response, we have received over 400 recommendations, some as many as 50 pages long.

I want to talk about some of those today. Before I do, it is important to know that the cost of healthcare, in effect, has become a tax on the budgets of families, employers, the Federal Government, and State governments. Warren Buffett has called the ballooning cost of healthcare “a hungry tapeworm on the American economy.”

Almost every day, I hear from Tennesseans who are concerned that healthcare is too expensive. For example, Sherry from Hermitage, TN, wrote me about her daughter's family and said:

They are new parents now and spend almost as much on healthcare premiums as they do on their mortgage payment. That doesn't include the out-of-pocket expenses, such as copays and deductibles.

Many people worry about a surprise billing, which is when a patient receives care at an in-network hospital, but an out-of-network specialist—like an anesthesiologist, for instance—also treats the patient.

Todd is a father from Knoxville, TN, who recently took his son to an emergency room after a bicycle accident. The son was treated. Todd paid a \$150 copay because the emergency room was in-network for his health insurance, and they headed home. Todd was pretty surprised when he received a bill later for \$1,800 because even though the emergency room was in-network, the doctor who treated his son was not.

I hear a lot about the high cost of prescription drugs. Shirley recently wrote me from Franklin saying:

As a 71-year-old senior with arthritis, I rely on Enbrel to keep my systems in check. My copay has just been increased from \$95 to \$170 every 90 days. At this rate, I will have to begin limiting my usage in order to balance the monthly budget.

I hear from doctors about administrative burden. Dr. Lee Gross, a Florida direct primary care doctor, testified at one of our hearings that insurance and government regulations were making primary care too expensive. Dr. Gross founded one of the first di-

rect primary care practices. This is where a patient might pay \$60 a month for an adult, \$25 for the first child, \$10 for each child after, and receive all their primary care—strep tests, vaccines, minor surgical procedures, and more. He calls it “NetFlix for healthcare. After you pay your membership, you don't have to pay for each episode of care.”

Dr. Atul Gawande, who is leading the Amazon-Berkshire Hathaway-JPMorgan healthcare venture, told me recently in a conversation that direct primary care doctors are a powerful group for driving improved outcomes in healthcare because the doctors take responsibility for the outcomes, the risks, and the cost to the patient.

I also hear that the place where medical procedures are performed can make healthcare more expensive. For example, Michael from Johnson City shared that he recently had an endoscopy of his esophagus—a fairly common, routine procedure. He had the procedure at an outpatient facility, which typically is less expensive than a hospital; however, the procedure was billed as being done at a hospital. Michael is on Medicare, and he wrote to me saying: “Not only am I charged a higher ‘hospital’ rate, but taxpayers are charged a higher rate, as well.”

I imagine that every Senator has heard similar stories from people in their States and wants to do something about reducing the cost of healthcare.

In addition to the more than 400 comments we received, the American Enterprise Institute and Brookings sent us a detailed list of 18 specific policy recommendations. The Senate Health Committee can work on some of these. Some of these fall into the jurisdiction of other committees, and some are steps the administration itself can take without congressional action.

My staff and I are still reviewing all of these recommendations, but I want to mention some of them today.

One reason healthcare is so expensive is that the cost is in a black box. Patients just don't know how much a particular test and procedure will cost. That makes it nearly impossible to adequately plan for future healthcare expenses, and because of that, the healthcare system does not operate with the discipline and the cost-saving benefits of a real market.

Congress has already taken some steps to increase transparency. For example, last Congress, we passed and the President signed legislation by Senator COLLINS of Maine to ban the so-called gag clauses in pharmacy contracts that prevented pharmacists from telling a patient that a drug was cheaper if they paid with cash instead of their insurance.

Now we have received recommendations on how to build on that first step. For example, patients shouldn't be prohibited from knowing the cost of a surgery or a doctor's visit in advance of scheduling the procedure or appointment. Insurers and employers should

not be prohibited from providing patients with information recommending lower cost options or higher quality providers.

Another recommendation—this one from AEI and Brookings—is that employers contribute claims data—which is information on how much a test or service costs and how much insurance paid for it—to what is known as an all payer claims database. Eighteen States currently have these databases so employers and insurers can see trends in healthcare spending. This would help break open the black box around the claims data for the 181 million Americans who get their healthcare on the job.

One of our new Health Committee Members, Senator BRAUN of Indiana, owns a manufacturing and distribution company. He employed over 1,000 people before he became a Senator. He was aggressive about helping his employees reduce healthcare costs.

Healthcare Bluebook, a Tennessee company that testified at one of our five hearings on how to reduce healthcare costs, recommended that we look at the clauses in contracts employers sign with insurers that block the employer from accessing de-identified claims data that they could use “for purpose of price and quality transparency.”

The Trump administration is also focused on transparency. For example, Secretary Azar has proposed a regulation to start requiring that advertisements for prescription drugs include the list price, and he has asked for feedback on the idea of requiring that the prices patients pay for medical services also be disclosed.

Another strategy for achieving better outcomes and better experiences at lower costs is to focus on the 300,000 primary care doctors in our country. Dr. Sapna Kripalani of Vanderbilt testified at one of our healthcare cost hearings that primary care providers are the “quarterbacks” of healthcare. By coordinating patients’ care, managing their chronic diseases, and providing other preventive care, primary care doctors are able to help patients stay healthy and out of the emergency room.

Adam Boehler, who leads the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation, told me that while primary care accounts for only 3 to 7 percent of healthcare spending, it can affect as much as half of all healthcare spending.

One recommendation we received came from Dr. Gilliam, a primary care doctor in West Tennessee who runs a direct primary care practice—the same type of practice I mentioned earlier that Dr. Gross runs. Dr. Gilliam said: “[Direct primary care] is the only model that is able to offer affordable healthcare with complete price transparency.”

One suggestion we have heard is to change Internal Revenue Service rules that block Americans from using their

health savings accounts to pay for the monthly direct primary care fee.

Then there is drug pricing. Many recommendations are focused on reducing what we spend on prescription drugs, which is about 17 percent of all healthcare spending.

One way is reforming prescription drug rebates, the discounts that pharmacy benefit managers negotiate with pharmaceutical companies. The Trump administration has proposed a new rule for the \$29 billion rebates on prescription drugs that the government pays for through Medicare Part D. One recommendation is to expand that to the estimated \$40 billion of rebates negotiated in the private market.

Another way to lower drug prices is to increase competition through generic drugs, which can be up to 85 percent less expensive than brand drugs when there are multiple approved generics. I have heard concerns about brand drug companies not providing generic companies the samples needed to make generic drugs and other ways that brands delay drug competition.

It was recommended that we increase competition for the generic versions of biologic drugs, which are called biosimilars. One way to do that may be with a bill Senator COLLINS introduced to ensure that biosimilar manufacturers have access to the information they need to develop and bring to market more biosimilars.

Then there is surprise billing.

AEI and Brookings also recommended we focus on helping to eliminate surprise medical billing, which is what happened when Todd, of Knoxville, took his son to the emergency room. AEI and Brookings said the issue is not that insurance companies have limited doctors and hospitals in their networks but that emergency departments and ancillary physicians, as well as hospitalists and ambulance companies, have a lucrative out-of-network billing arrangement that is unavailable to other providers, which encourages doctors to go out of network and send patients high bills. Senator CASSIDY and Senator HASSAN are leading the way to help eliminate surprise billing.

We received comments about the importance of the seamless exchange of information between electronic health records, which includes stopping information blocking.

A goal of the 21st Century Cures Act, which is a bipartisan bill that Senator McCONNELL said was the most important bill that Congress, was to make it easier for patients to access their health records and for doctors and hospitals to get the information they need to treat patients. Last month, the Department of Health and Human Services released two proposed rules required by the Cures Act to lead to better coordinated care and to less unnecessary health care. We held a hearing on those last week. We heard a story of the better experiences and outcomes that can happen when health records

are interoperable. Finally, there is the consolidation of healthcare.

We received comments on the decreasing choices and competition in the healthcare system, which is when hospitals merge with doctors’ offices or other hospitals, when insurers merge with other insurers, or when hospitals and insurers merge so that these hospitals or insurers have even more control over the market.

Some argue that the consolidation in healthcare can benefit patients and lower costs. Others say that it gives patients fewer options and that healthcare prices increase.

AEI and Brookings suggested that one way to address the potential negative consequences of consolidation would be to improve oversight of the 340B drug discount program, which has been found to incentivize hospitals to purchase physician practices or to employ physicians directly in order to bring in additional revenue from the 340B discounts. This echoes what we heard at our committee’s three hearings.

I am also asking for other Senators to continue to come forward to Senator MURRAY, to Senator WYDEN, to Senator GRASSLEY, and to me with their specific proposals as to how we can reduce healthcare costs. What I hope to do is to compile the proposals that fall under the jurisdiction of our Senate HELP Committee into a package of legislation that the committee will vote on early in the summer. We could then combine that with whatever the Senate Finance Committee passes and ask the leader to put it on the Senate floor and work with the House to send legislation to the President’s desk.

This morning, in a hearing before the Appropriations Committee, Secretary Azar reiterated his support and the President’s support for this bipartisan process to reduce health care costs.

My staff and I will continue to review recommendations and work with other Members to incorporate ways so that Americans like Sherry, Todd, Shirley, and Michael will have better outcomes and better experiences at lower costs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from Virginia.

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

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

MUELLER REPORT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, after almost 2 years, Special Counsel Mueller filed his report with the Attorney General. The Attorney General sent us a short letter that summarized the major findings of the report.

A summary is not going to cut it. The Attorney General’s own letter discusses the vast extent of the special counsel’s investigation. It mentions over 500 witness interviews, 2,800 subpoenas, 500 search warrants, 230 orders for communications records, almost 50 orders for pen registers, and actually 13

requests to foreign governments. This was an extraordinarily extensive investigation that yielded a rich collection of facts about Russia's attack on our democracy. The American people deserve to see the results so that they can judge the facts for themselves.

We know from court filings, news reports, and the Senate Intelligence Committee's own investigations that the Russians attempted to influence the Trump campaign in many ways. At least 17 individuals in the Trump orbit had over 100 publicly released contacts with Russian officials or intermediaries. Yet, with all of those 100 contacts during the midst of a campaign, somehow not one of those individuals—even those contacted with explicit offers of assistance from a hostile government—called the FBI to report those offers.

The Attorney General's four-page summary of this sprawling investigation—a summary that according to press reports may not even accurately reflect the Mueller report—focuses almost exclusively on the criminal portion of the Mueller probe and barely mentions the special counsel's counterintelligence investigation into these contacts.

The Senate Intelligence Committee—with the only bipartisan counterintelligence investigation still standing—has documented extensive efforts by the Russians to reach out to those around then-Candidate Trump. Here are a few examples:

We have documented in the public domain Candidate Trump's efforts to negotiate a business deal to build what was going to be called the largest building in all of Russia. He negotiated that deal throughout the whole primary process. According to his attorney Mr. Giuliani, it may have been negotiated all the way through the election. The deal itself may not have violated any laws. Yet, frankly, I think, if I were a Republican primary voter, I would have liked to have known that my potential Presidential candidate was still trying to do a deal with Vladimir Putin's government.

In our investigation, we also had exposed ongoing communications between the President's campaign chairman, Mr. Manafort, and Konstantin Kilimnik, who has ties with both Russian intelligence and oligarch Oleg Deripaska.

Our committee has made multiple criminal referrals to the special prosecutor based on what we have learned and witnesses' efforts to lie to us and to obstruct our investigation.

This is what a counterintelligence investigation is all about. We need to fully understand what the Russians were trying to do, and we need to be able to warn future campaigns and candidates about the lengths to which hostile governments will go and the new tools they will use to undermine our democracy. I believe we cannot make that full guidance to future campaigns without there being a full release of this report.

Some observers have said that the report cannot be released without its jeopardizing sources and methods. Let me be clear. As vice chair of the Senate Intelligence Committee, no one is more sensitive to those concerns than am I, but the resolution that we have specifically states that the report should be released to the public in accordance with the law. Clearly, sources and methods would not be released under this standard, nor would grand jury information.

What we are talking about here is basic transparency. Let's make sure the full Mueller report is released to Congress, including the underlying documents and intelligence. Then let's make sure the American people see as much of this report as possible and as soon as possible. Let's do it in a bipartisan way to protect sources and methods.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 24

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as in legislative session, the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 24, expressing the sense of Congress that the report of Special Counsel Mueller should be made available to the public and to Congress, and which is at the desk; further, that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, in reserving the right to object, I am all for transparency. I think we should know as much about this investigation into the President as we possibly can. We do know that we only know part of the story and that the Mueller report is only part of the story. What we also need to know is how this originated because I think it is very important that we not turn our country into this back-and-forth where each successive party tries to use the apparatus of government to investigate the previous President.

We do know now that the investigation of the Trump campaign reached to the highest levels of the White House, all the way up to President Obama. What we don't know is, was President Obama told that the evidence to get this investigation started was paid for by the Hillary Clinton campaign? We need to know that. That is not part of the Mueller report, but that is something that I am asking that we should attach to this resolution. We need to know, was President Obama told that this information came from the Hillary Clinton campaign?

We do not yet know whether John Brennan was involved and to what degree. We do not know whether John Brennan colluded with British spy agencies to spy on Americans. It is illegal for our CIA to spy on Americans. We don't yet know whether John Brennan was colluding with British spy

agencies and other spy agencies to get them to do his dirty work.

We do know now that John Brennan, who had the power to listen to every American's phone call and who had the power to listen to every person's phone call in the entire world, is a rank partisan. We now know that John Brennan has called the President a traitor, essentially saying the President should be put to death. This is the guy who was in charge of this investigation. This isn't an objective person. We need to know about all of the communications.

So I ask unanimous consent that we modify this resolution and that we find out about and gain access to all of the communications between Comey, Brennan, Clapper, the White House, and President Obama, because I don't want to ruin this great country with politically motivated investigations year in and year out.

This had to do with placing spies and infiltrating the Trump campaign. Do you really think that our intelligence Agencies should be infiltrating each other's campaigns?

I don't want this to happen to a Democrat. When President Trump came to the Hill a week ago, he said that this shouldn't happen to the next Democratic President. We should not misuse the power of our intelligence Agencies to have one party go after another. How can we get on with the people's business if we are allowing the government to be consumed with this kind of stuff?

I ask unanimous consent that we amend the resolution and look at the entire story—not just at the investigation but at how we got here. The media wouldn't even print this fake dossier because it was so scandalous and so unverified and has turned out to be untrue. Yet this was the basis for beginning the investigation. This was the basis for doing something extraordinary—implanting spies and informants into the Trump campaign.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST MODIFICATION—
H. CON. RES. 24

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we amend the resolution and that as the Mueller report comes forward, we also come forward with all of the communications between the people who got this started and we discover once and for all whether or not these people have misused their offices in starting this investigation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to modify his request?

Mr. WARNER. In reserving the right to object, I would simply point out to my colleague from Kentucky that the intelligence community, in its January 2017 report, reached a unanimous conclusion. That conclusion was that Russia massively interfered in our elections. Russia did it in the form of hacking into personal information and releasing it subjectively, and Russia did it in terms of at least touching the electoral systems in 21 of our States in

ways that, frankly, found a great deal of vulnerabilities. Russia also did it in ways that manipulated social media that, quite honestly, caught our Intelligence Committee and the social media companies off guard.

Our Intelligence Committee spent a year in its review of the conclusions of the intelligence community, and in January of 2018, it unanimously agreed that the intelligence community's findings were correct—that the Russians interfered and that they did it on behalf of one candidate, Mr. Trump, against another candidate, Mrs. Clinton.

For those reasons, I respectfully object to the request of my colleague from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, in closing, I hope we can move past this. The President himself has called for the release of the report. In a rare stroke of unanimity, the House voted 420 to 0. I think many in this body would like to move beyond this issue. The only way we are going to be able to move beyond this is to get this report released, to get it out to the American public, and to let those of us who are charged with the intelligence community's responsibilities see all of the report, including the underlying documents. I hope we can get to that point.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

NATO

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, yesterday NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg addressed a joint session of Congress—the first Secretary General ever to do so.

The Secretary General is in Washington this week marking NATO's 70th anniversary. Created after World War II, NATO is a political and military alliance of European and North American democracies.

Since its founding in 1949, NATO has been a bulwark for freedom, for peace, and for security around the world. For 70 years—70 years—NATO has been a bedrock of U.S. security.

The United States stands firmly behind NATO's collective defense outlined in article 5 of its founding treaty.

As a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate NATO Observer Group, I recently traveled to Brussels, Belgium, for meetings at NATO headquarters.

I met with Ambassador Hutchison and NATO officials to discuss ways to strengthen the alliance.

These briefings reaffirmed for me that now, more than ever, America needs a strong NATO alliance. For our safety, for the safety of our allies, we must support and we must strengthen NATO.

The alliance has expanded from an original 12 to now 29 member nations.

These allies are our friends in times of peace, they are our partners in times of turmoil, and they are our defenders in times of war.

In armed conflicts around the world, NATO serves as a force multiplier for all of its members. After the September 11, 2001, attacks, NATO allies sent tens of thousands of troops to fight alongside our U.S. forces in Afghanistan. NATO is helping the United States defeat ISIS in Iraq and in Syria, and its role in the global war on terrorism continues to expand.

At the same time, NATO members are working together in Eastern Europe to deter Russian aggression. NATO isn't just protecting Europe from Russian interference; it is serving U.S. security interests in the region.

Given the emerging threats around the globe, NATO must have the tools and the resources it needs to deter our enemies. This means that all members need to recommit themselves to NATO's mission and fully meet their pledges.

Secretary Stoltenberg has focused on meeting alliance targets through "cash, capabilities, and contributions." That is what we discussed in Belgium, it is what he discussed yesterday, and that has been his focus—cash, capabilities and contributions.

At the Wales summit in 2014, every NATO country agreed to spend a minimum of 2 percent of their GDP on defense. The United States continues to pay more than its fair share—about 22 percent of NATO's entire budget and more than 3 percent of our Nation's GDP.

President Trump, to his credit, has pressed NATO and our allies to bear the full share of their burden, both financially and militarily. NATO's Secretary General projects that the alliance will spend \$100 billion more on defense by the year 2020.

Now, 22 NATO nations have already increased their defense spending since the 2014 summit in Wales. In 2014, only three allies met the Wales summit spending target; seven met that target in 2018. Still, 22 allies are falling short of the 2 percent target. They must contribute more if the alliance is to meet its financial goals and provide a capable and credible deterrent.

This is especially important as NATO faces more formidable foes. It is critical for their contributions to fund military readiness, to develop new capabilities, and to improve alliance cohesion.

NATO allies and partners are increasingly involved in terms of doing more with their troop contributions as well. Allies and partners now contribute more than half the troops in NATO missions.

We have made real progress on burden sharing, and today we celebrate 70 years of NATO achievements. NATO has helped bring about the democratic and economic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe. NATO has enabled European and Canadian soldiers

to fight alongside U.S. forces on the frontlines of the war on terror. NATO supported U.S. sanctions against Russia and insisted on Russia's compliance with international law. Without a doubt, NATO is the most successful security alliance in our Nation's history.

The United States remains as committed to NATO's mission today as when it was founded 70 years ago. We want a strong NATO serving as a cornerstone of international freedom, peace, and security for another 70 years.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

NOMINATION OF MARK ANTHONY CALABRIA

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate invoked cloture on the nomination for the next Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency. The nominee is named Mark Calabria, and I just want to say he is an extraordinarily qualified and capable man. I hope this body will overwhelmingly confirm him.

He is a Ph.D. economist. He has tremendous work experience in the field of housing finance, which of course is the domain of the Federal Housing Agency. He has worked at HUD, the Banking Committee, and now he is the chief economist to Vice President PENCE.

I am certainly looking forward to working with Dr. Calabria on housing finance reform, the great unfinished work of the financial crisis, and I urge my colleagues to vote to confirm him later today.

UNREALIZED GAIN PROPOSAL

Mr. President, I also wanted to say a few words about an idea that has been floated by one of our colleagues. The idea has been floated by my friend—he is my friend, and he is a good man—Senator WYDEN from Oregon. He is the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee, and he is a very good man with a very bad idea, and I want to explain why I believe the idea that he has floated is so mistaken.

Fundamentally, his proposal is that we change our Tax Code so that we would impose taxes on unrealized investment gains every year.

Currently, we impose taxes on investments only when the asset is sold. If an asset is purchased, it is later sold at a higher price. The difference is the gain, and we impose what we call a capital gains tax on that gain—but only when the gain is actually realized.

Under Senator WYDEN's proposal, if an asset goes up in value, even though it hasn't been sold, the fact that it has gone up in value would require that increase in value to be taxed. The investor would have to pay a tax.

There is another element of his proposal, which is that these taxes that he wants to impose on these phantom gains would not be at the capital gains tax rate that is currently enforced but rather at personal income tax rates instead.

The current capital gains rate is 23.8 percent. That is the top. That is the

highest capital gains rate that is paid. The highest personal income tax rate in our Tax Code is 37 percent. So in some circumstances, this would be a huge tax increase.

Let me explain why I think both of these are very bad ideas—taxing unrealized gains and taxing all gains at ordinary income rates.

First of all, let's take the idea of taxes on unrealized gains. These are the paper gains. This is a market-to-market appreciation that is unrealized if the investor doesn't actually sell the asset. Well, there is a good reason that our system has never imposed taxes on unrealized gains; there are several, but one is the value of the asset could go back down.

One very widely held asset in America is stocks—stocks that you can buy on an exchange, a share of a company—and stocks famously go up and down. So I think it strikes most people as unreasonable to force people to pay a tax on this notional gain on a stock without having sold it when that stock could go back down. The gain could be completely lost, but you would still pay the tax.

There is another problem with this; that is, the tax would be imposed without a liquidity event for the investor. In other words, the investor hasn't sold the asset, doesn't have the cash. What if the investor doesn't have enough cash to pay the tax bill on it? This risk alone would have a chilling effect on investment. It would discourage people from making the investment in the first place because they would have to wonder and worry about what kind of tax bill they will incur even if they don't sell the asset.

Yet another problem with this is the complexity and difficulty of actually implementing this. It is pretty easy to determine the value of a stock, but there are other categories of investment that are much more difficult to value, like real estate or a small business.

So imagine an entrepreneur buys a small building and builds it out and creates a restaurant, and that is his business. He is operating a restaurant. It may be profitable; it may not be. But what if real estate values in that neighborhood happen to go up? Well, here you might have a struggling entrepreneur trying to make ends meet in his restaurant, and the IRS is going to come along and say: Oh, you owe us a whole lot of money because we think the land on which you are operating has gone up in value.

What good does that do for the restaurant operator or the people working for him, the jobs being created? It is not a good idea at all.

There is another aspect to Senator WYDEN's proposal, and that is that he would use a higher rate. He would like the top rate of 37 percent to be imposed, at least in some cases, on these capital gains, whether or not realized.

So the question is, Why do we have a lower tax rate on capital gains than we

have on ordinary income, other sources of incomes? Well, there are several reasons for that, as well—good reasons. One is we don't exclude from our calculation of an investor's gain the component of that gain that is attributable only to inflation. Think about it. If you make an investment in something and the inflation rate is just 2 percent a year, well, 10 years later, that is going to nominally be worth like 25 percent more than it was when you bought it, but you don't have any real gain; that is just a reflection of the fact that dollars are worth less.

So as a sort of rough justice for the fact that you nevertheless get taxed on the full gain, even the nominal gain, the gain that is not real, the gain that is just inflation, at least it is taxed at a lower rate to make up for that.

There is another factor, and that is most investments are in an asset that itself generates income, and that income is taxed. So, for instance, a stock—a stock is a share of a company; a company has to pay tax. So imagine an investor who invests in a company and that company makes \$100 of income. That is the profit for the business. Well, the first thing that business has to do is pay 21 percent of that to Uncle Sam. That is the tax on corporate income. Well, that leaves \$79 left over for the investors, and the investor has to pay 23.8 percent on that. That works out to about \$19. So at the end of the day, on a \$100 hundred gain, the investor is able to go home with only \$60. That is a 40-percent effective tax rate to the investor, despite the fact that the nominal rate applied on the investor's gain is only 23.8 percent. The combination—and that is what you really have to look at—is more like 40 percent. That is higher than any individual income tax rate that we have in our entire code.

Of course, a gain on such an asset occurs only when investors generally believe that the after-tax value has gone up.

So I think it would be a big mistake to go down this road. I think it would be a big mistake to tax unrealized gains. As it is now, gains are taxed. They are taxed at the time in which they are actually earned—they are actually realized—and it would be a mistake to raise the tax on this. Both of these ideas, and certainly in combination, would absolutely, certainly have a chilling effect on investment. They would diminish the willingness of people to invest in new businesses, in growing business, in startup business, and a chilling effect on investment means a chilling effect on economic growth.

So this proposal, I think, is misguided. It comes at a time when the tax reform that we have recently passed, which actually encourages investment, is clearly working. Our tax reform has generated a tremendous surge in investment in equipment, in technology, in new business. We have seen tremendous growth in our overall economy as a result.

In 2018, our economy grew at 3 percent—the best since 2005. With a strong, growing economy, we have seen terrific results for the people we all represent. Unemployment is at its lowest rate in 50 years. African-American unemployment is the lowest that has ever been recorded; Hispanic unemployment, the lowest ever recorded; youth unemployment, the lowest rate in many decades. Wages are now growing more rapidly than they have in over 10 years, and they are accelerating, and the wage growth is strongest among lower income workers.

Clearly, the reforms we implemented have been an incentive for more investment, and that has led to more growth. I sure wouldn't want to see us do anything that would disrupt the fact that we have created an environment where there is now so much opportunity and where work is paying so much more than it has before.

As I said, Senator WYDEN is a good man, but this is a bad idea. I certainly hope we don't move in this direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

NATO

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about a historic day, April 4. It was the day the agreement in Washington was signed to create the NATO alliance after the Second World War.

I want to start by repeating what President Truman said on that day. He said:

We hope to create a shield against aggression and the fear of aggression—all bulwark which will permit us to get on with the real business of government and society, the business of achieving a fuller and happier life for all of our citizens.

That agreement was signed on April 4, 1949. Since the 70 years that have followed, the alliance has gotten stronger. The alliance has grown. In fact, there are a number of countries that hope someday to also be a member of the NATO alliance. It has been important and what I believe is the most important alliance in the history of mankind.

This week is NATO Week. Yesterday we had the Secretary General speak to us before a joint session of Congress. The Secretary General was actually very optimistic about the future of NATO, and I am as well.

I was with a group a couple of weeks ago who were wondering about NATO and some of the discussions or disagreements we have among our NATO allies. I liken it to the kind of disagreements I have with family. I grew up in a family of six kids. It is a big family. All of us have very different views, are of very different ages and life experiences. I really believe the disagreements we have among our allies are like the disagreements you have among your family members, but at the end of the day, make no mistake about it, an attack on any one of us is viewed as an attack on every one of us, and every country takes that seriously.

In fact, in the 70 years since NATO was created—there is an obligation within article 5 of the agreement that if there is an attack on any one of us, then we consider it an attack on every one of us. It happened on 9/11. The only time in the history of the alliance that the article 5 obligation under the treaty has been exercised is when NATO countries joined with the United States in the War on Terror.

Many people may not realize it, but there was a huge human toll for living up to their commitment. Many nations sent their men and women into harm's way, and over 1,000 of them have died since 9/11. Many others have been gravely wounded, but they lived up to their commitment. It was the first test of the treaty. That happened only less than 20 years ago.

Senator SHAHEEN and I are now co-chairs of the Senate NATO Observer Group. I want to compliment Senator SHAHEEN for actually coming up with the idea to reconstitute the group because we need to make sure our partners, our allies, understand that Congress believes NATO is a very important alliance to ensure our mutual safety and security.

There was another interesting point that the Secretary General made in his speech yesterday before Congress. Some people have criticized President Trump for telling our partners that they need to pay their agreed-to fair share. The Secretary General said the President's call has actually been answered and that it was a positive step that he took to make these other nations recognize we must invest in our mutual defense and our mutual security. That can only come through innovating technologies that will defend the regions within the NATO alliance, making sure our troops are working together and working very well on a military-to-military basis, and we are doing that, but without that sustained commitment from our NATO allies, we could lose ground, and it is in their best interest to do it.

As I said earlier, NATO is growing. We have a long list of countries that hope they can meet the requirements to someday come into NATO. Many of them were within the sphere of influence for the Soviet Union before the end of the Cold War.

We all know Russia is the greatest threat to Europe. We all know Russia has done things that are illegal, according to international law. They have annexed the Crimean region of the Ukraine. Every week, Ukrainians are dying in a war that very few people know about. We have to make sure that we actually confront Russian aggression, and the best way to do that is to have a strong NATO alliance.

On this historic day, April 4, 70 years later, I believe the alliance is strong. I believe that is what the Secretary General talked about yesterday, and I believe every Member of Congress shares the view that the NATO treaty, the NATO alliance, is the most important

bulwark against aggression and threats to freedom.

I look forward to continuing to serve with Co-Chair SHAHEEN to make sure our partners know this Congress is prepared to support them and to make sure the alliance grows and remains strong.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF MARK ANTHONY CALABRIA

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise in opposition to the nomination of Mark Calabria. He is the wrong man for this job.

Sometimes I kind of can't believe this place. I see these people. I see the President of the United States, who never really experienced any of these challenges that homeowners in Cleveland, OH, or in Muncie, IN, face. He can't even get a loan from a local bank; he has to go to Germany to go to Deutsche Bank. That is really beside the point.

I just don't understand, when we have these academicians or people who work in government for a while, and then they go out and they do these writings, and over time—I look at someone like Mark Calabria. He seems like a genuinely nice fellow and an honorable guy, but some of the things he said and has written in his career—let me start with this. He questions the need for the 30-year mortgage. A lot of Members of Congress, a lot of people voting on this nomination, and a lot of people in the White House—the White House looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives. The majority leader's office down the hall has a stream of lobbyists going in and out from the banks and the oil companies and the gun lobbyists and all that.

Mr. Calabria has said he questions the need for a 30-year mortgage. Many of my colleagues here and in the White House don't really have to worry about paying their mortgage. They don't have to think about saving for retirement and planning for retirement and thinking: I have 7 years until I want to retire; I have 14 years to save money for my children to go on to college, to go to Lorain Community College, or to go to Dennis Center, or to Ohio State, or to go to Bloomington, or to go the University of Indiana.

Mr. Calabria's questioning of 30-year mortgages—most people can't afford to buy a house if they don't have a long-term 25- or 30-year mortgage. They can't put 50 percent down, like it was before Franklin Roosevelt, and then pay it off in 5 years. That is how we did homeownership in this country 70, 80, or 90 years ago. That is why there wasn't much homeownership then, and then we figured out how to do it.

Mark Calabria just wants to blow all that up and say: I don't really like the idea of a 30-year mortgage.

He is not being nominated for the Secretary of the Interior. He is not being nominated for the EPA. He is

being nominated for the Federal Housing Finance Agency. It is a critical job.

We know we have a housing affordability crisis in this country. Think about this. One-fourth of all renters pay at least half of their income in housing costs. That is one-fourth of people who rent. I assume it may be higher in Indiana, as it is in Appalachia, OH, or it may be higher in East Cleveland or in Gary than it is in some other places, but whatever the number, overall, one-quarter of renters in this country pay 50 percent of their income in housing. Do you know what that means? It means that if your car breaks down, you have to borrow money from a payday lender so you can go to work so you can keep making \$12 or \$14 an hour. It eventually means you may get evicted because you can't meet your monthly rent.

The homeownership rate among African Americans is at the same dismal level it was before Congress put those open housing, anti-discrimination laws in place, and now this administration is not even enforcing those laws.

Mr. Calabria doesn't think we need the current affordable housing goals. He thinks we should eliminate the GSEs, and—my favorite—he called homeowners who are underwater in their mortgages deadbeats.

I don't know if he has ever actually been to Ohio. He might have. He might have ties there, for all I know. I don't know that he does, but 8 years ago in Ohio, one out of five homeowners was underwater. You know what that means. It means they owed more for their house than their home was worth. It wasn't their fault. It is not their fault that in their community the worth of their home was dropping. It is not because they didn't keep it up, but it is because people were foreclosed on or homes were abandoned or they were evicted from those homes, and the value kept dropping so they actually owed more than their home was worth. He calls those people deadbeats.

Somebody who loses their job and can't pay their mortgage, does that make them a deadbeat? Somebody who gets hurt on a construction project, he or she is a carpenter or a boilermaker, and they can't work—he calls them deadbeats? This is the person we want in charge of housing?

He questioned the need for the Hardest Hit Fund. I know, in the Presiding Officer's State and in my State, that the Hardest Hit Fund really has mattered in helping clean up some neighborhoods and trying to get a floor under prices so they start going up again.

He said: Just let prices fall. It is easy for him to say to just let prices fall. How about the people who are affected by this?

My colleagues who support his nomination today shouldn't act surprised when he raises costs for borrowers, when he makes it more difficult to develop affordable housing, and when he cuts off access to homeownership for

American families, especially people of color.

That is what he has advocated his entire career. We should reject Dr. Calabria's nomination. We should tell the President of the United States to send us a new nominee who will take this job seriously and a nominee who will make it easier, not harder, for Americans to afford housing.

I ask for a "no" vote for the nomination of Mark Calabria to head the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

"MOVE OVER" LAW

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday in Warren, IL, a small town on the Illinois-Wisconsin border, mourners from near and far lined the streets and packed the town's high school to say good-bye to a local hero. They came to honor and bid farewell to an Illinois State trooper, Brooke Jones-Story, who was killed in the line of duty last Thursday.

Trooper Jones-Story had pulled over a truck a little after noon and was inspecting it on the shoulder of U.S. Highway 20 in Freeport, just west of Rockford, IL, when a semitrailer crashed into her squad car and the truck she had stopped. The squad car and truck she had pulled over burst into flames. Trooper Jones-Story, a devoted public servant, 11-year veteran of the Illinois State police, wife, stepmother, daughter, sister, lifelong fan of the Chicago Cubs, fan of Disney movies, animal rescuer, and a CrossFit workout enthusiast, died instantly. She was 34 years old. No one else was injured.

Sadly and unbelievably, Trooper Jones-Story was the second of three Illinois State troopers who have died this year after being struck by vehicles on the sides of roads and highways.

Three State troopers in Illinois were killed in less than 3 months. All told, 16 Illinois State Troopers have been struck by vehicles so far this year, several suffering serious injuries.

Let me tell you about the other two heroes we lost.

Just 2 days after Trooper Jones-Story died, Trooper Jerry Ellis was killed by a wrong-way driver near Libertyville, IL.

It happened at 3:25 in the morning. The driver was headed in the wrong direction on Interstate 94 in Green Oaks when he hit Trooper Ellis's squad car head-on. The driver who caused the crash was also killed.

Jerry Ellis was 36 years old. He had been an Illinois State Trooper for 11 years. Before that he had served his country in the U.S. Army in Iraq.

He and his wife Stacy are the parents of two little girls, Kaylee, age 7, and Zoe, age 5.

Chris Lambert, in fact, was the first Illinois State trooper killed this year. It was January 12. He had just finished his shift and was on his way home when he stopped during a snowstorm to help at the scene of a three-car accident on Interstate 294 in Northbrook.

Another driver, apparently trying to avoid the pileup, swerved onto the left shoulder of the highway, where Trooper Lambert was standing, and hit him and killed him.

Trooper Lambert was 34 years old. He, too, was an Army veteran. He served in Iraq and Haiti. He had been with the Illinois State Police since 2013.

He and his wife Halley were parents of a 14-month-old daughter, Delaney. The driver who hit him has been charged with felony reckless homicide.

What makes the deaths of these three public servants—these three heroes—even harder to bear is that our State of Illinois passed a law nearly 20 years ago that was supposed to make roads safer for police and other emergency responders.

It is called the "Move Over" Law or Scott's Law. It was named after the Chicago Fire Department lieutenant, Scott Gillen, who was killed in 2000 by a drunken driver while working on a crash scene on the Chicago freeway.

Scott's Law requires motorists to slow down, and, if possible, move over when they see a parked squad car, fire engine, or ambulance with flashing lights. If you can't change lanes, slow down and proceed cautiously. That is what Scott's Law says.

It was expanded in 2017 to include all vehicles stopped with hazard lights on, including tow trucks. Violators can lose their license and face stiff fines—up to \$10,000.

Every State has some form of Scott's Law. Police and other first responders in many States are working to draw attention to these laws and to enforce them.

I believe the Federal Government needs to do more. In the upcoming surface transportation reauthorization bill, I will be working not only to increase funding for highway safety grants to provide States with the resources they need to better enforce these laws but also to encourage people all across America to be sensitive to the men and women who are serving us in public capacities in law enforcement and other responsibilities. They deserve our respect and our caution.

Despite these measures, Illinois State Police have seen a troubling increase in incidents in which a squad car with its lights flashing has been hit by a passing car. In 2016, there were 5 such incidents; in 2017, 12; and last year, 8. Just a little over 3 months into this year, already there have been 16 such incidents, with 3 young troopers dead.

Two days ago, April 1, was Illinois State Trooper Day—a day set aside

each year to honor the dedicated men and women of the Illinois State Police.

As Brendan Kelly, now the acting director of the Illinois State Police said: "In 97 years, 69 men and women of the Illinois State Police bravely put on their uniforms to serve the citizens of this State and never returned home."

But this is the first time in 66 years that the Illinois State Police have lost three state troopers in 1 year, and the year is only a few months over.

State police are uncertain what is driving this deadly trend, but Lucy Kuelper—and I would like to show you her photograph here.

Mr. SCHUMER. I will hold it up.

Mr. DURBIN. Lucy Kuelper, a sixth grader from rural Rio, IL, hopes that she may have a way to stop the terrible losses.

I thank the Senator from New York.

Lucy is just 12 years old, but she knows the fear of watching someone you love go to work and the worry that you might never see them again. Lucy's dad, her hero, John Kuelper, is also a State trooper.

When Lucy learned about the number of State troopers who had been hit and killed recently, she asked her dad: What can I do?

Together, they came up with an idea. With help from her mom, Jessica, Lucy created a Facebook page to raise awareness about Scott's Law. She calls her page the Move Over Project.

She posted the photo, shown here, of herself standing next to her dad, holding up a sign that says hashtag "move over . . . for my DAD."

She asked other loved ones in the police force and other emergency services to post similar photos with hashtag "move over for . . ." and fill in the blank.

In 5 days, Lucy's Facebook page received more than 14,000 "likes." People have sent in photos from all over the country. They want people to move over for their dads, moms, sisters, brothers, uncles, and friends. There are photos of firefighters, police officers, EMTs, and tow truck drivers standing next to spouses, children, infants, parents, friends, and pets.

This week, the State of Illinois Commission on Volunteerism and Community Service honored Lucy with its Volunteer of the Week Award. She deserved it, but Lucy says the only reward she wants is for people to follow the law and move over, so her dad and others like him who do dangerous jobs will be able to come home to their families at the end of the day.

I want to thank Lucy for her efforts in starting the Move Over Project. Look at the faces and the families involved. Remember them the next time you see an emergency vehicle on a highway with its lights flashing parked along a roadway. Move over and save lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank my good friend the Senator from Illinois for those great

words. We have had police officers in New York hit the same way. There is a bridge in New York on Southern State Parkway that we named after an officer who died a few years ago in the same situation, and I thank Lucy for caring and pushing hard.

NOMINATION OF MARK ANTHONY CALABRIA

Mr. President, I rise in strong opposition to the nomination of Mark Calabria to become the Director of FHFA. I hope every Senator who has homeowners in their districts will pay attention here.

For decades we have had Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac providing mortgages at lower rates for people because there is a Federal guarantee. Because housing is such an important part of our economy, it stimulates jobs and the growth in the economy.

It is utterly amazing that, once again, we are in a sort of “Alice in Wonderland.” The nominations from this administration go directly in the face of what I bet almost every Member on the other side believes—that interest rates should be low for mortgages and that there should be some kind of Federal guarantee.

Well, here is what Dr. Calabria believes. First, he believes that the 30-year mortgage is not necessarily part of our Federal housing finance system. He believes that Fannie and Freddie guarantees should be no higher than \$200,000.

I would ask Dr. Calabria to visit some of the middle-class neighborhoods of New York—policemen, firemen, teachers, construction workers. Their homes would be put in jeopardy by this, and a home is the middle class’s piece of the rock.

What the heck are we doing around here?

President Trump doesn’t pay attention to who the nominees are. They are put forward by Mick Mulvaney, who believes in no government involvement in anything, and people get hurt.

What about the young couple with a new job, a new baby? They want to buy their first home. What about the person of color? Finally, when zoning laws and other things have changed, they can get a home. What about parents who are about to retire and want to sell their home so that they can move to smaller quarters and have a little bit of extra money? What about grandparents? To put in somebody who wants to undo the FHFA and undo our rock solid housing system would be ridiculous.

I hope my colleagues will listen. If you believe in homeownership, if you believe the middle class ought to have homeownership, you can’t support somebody who wants to eliminate Federal guarantees, who wants to lower the amount, and who wants to say that the 30-year mortgage, which has had such a success in America, should no longer be the bedrock of our system.

I hope people will look at who this nominee is and vote no. I certainly will.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BARRASSO. I ask unanimous consent that all time expires.

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

All postclosure time is expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Alexander	Fischer	Portman
Barrasso	Gardner	Risch
Blackburn	Graham	Roberts
Blunt	Grassley	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Rubio
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (SC)
Collins	Johnson	Shelby
Cornyn	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cotton	Lankford	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Wicker
Daines	Murkowski	Young
Enzi	Paul	
Ernst	Perdue	

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—4

Booker	Lee
Harris	Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I speak, I ask unanimous consent

that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action on the Calabria and Altman nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Since I made that unanimous consent motion, and I am going to be speaking for longer than 10 minutes, I ask unanimous consent to speak for whatever time I may consume, which will probably be in the neighborhood of 20 minutes.

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

PRESIDENTIAL TAX RETURNS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday the Ways and Means Committee sent a letter to the IRS requesting the President’s tax returns. Last night, I had a chance to read that letter, and I have to say that if you take it at its face value, it doesn’t make a whole lot of sense. Consider the reasons that are stated in that letter from the Ways and Means Committee for requesting the President’s tax returns. It states that the committee is conducting oversight of the audit process that the IRS uses to evaluate Presidential tax returns.

Currently, the IRS examines the President’s tax returns as a matter of policy—simple policy—but a review isn’t required by law. Democrats of the Ways and Means Committee have said they are now looking into whether the current IRS policies of auditing the President is enough or if congressional action may be needed. Democrats have even been talking about making IRS audits of the President’s returns mandatory every year, even though—now, I understand that—even though the IRS does that every year, and they have been doing it for a long period of time.

In a press release, a Democratic member of the Ways and Means Committee said he has a duty to examine whether congressional action is needed to require Presidential audits and to oversee that they are done correctly. Ask yourself why that member would be saying that.

I, for one, haven’t seen any evidence that the IRS has suddenly changed its policy under this President, meaning President Trump, or that it is conducting a less thorough review of President Trump’s taxes than it did of previous Presidents or that it hasn’t