



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JULY 18, 2018

No. 121

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who has been the hope and joy of many generations, thank You for giving us the power to seek You. We praise You for Your promise that those who keep on seeking will find what they seek. Inspire our lawmakers to seek Your wisdom in order to be guided by Your loving providence.

Lord, give them a clearer vision of Your truth, a great faith in Your might, and a deeper assurance of Your love. Teach them to labor and not to ask for any reward except that of knowing they are doing Your will.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will pro-

ceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 2 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week the Senate continues to confirm impressive nominees whom President Trump has asked to serve our country. We have confirmed two Assistant Secretaries to the Department of Education, Scott Stump and James Blew. We have confirmed a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, Randal Quarles. Now we will turn to the judiciary and consider nominees to the Fifth Circuit and Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

First is Andrew Oldham of Texas, the President's choice for the Fifth Circuit. Mr. Oldham has impressed the legal community in his years of public service, most recently as general counsel to the Governor of Texas.

Mr. Oldham has degrees from the University of Virginia, Cambridge, and Harvard Law. He clerked on both the DC Circuit Court and the Supreme Court. He carries the highest possible rating from the American Bar Association, "unanimously well-qualified."

He comes highly recommended by peers and colleagues from across the political spectrum. Judith Zaffirini is a Texas State senator. She is a Democrat. She wrote the Judiciary Committee to support Mr. Oldham's nomination "confidently, enthusiastically, and without reservation." She and the nominee have worked together on a number of important subjects. Through them all, she explains, "Mr. Oldham reflected the ideal qualities of a judge . . . open-minded, fair . . . thoughtful and analytical."

Lisa Blatt is a skilled litigator who argues frequently before the Supreme Court. She is also a Democrat. She wrote the committee too. Her letter describes Mr. Oldham as "a great listener" with "a brilliant legal mind, [and] a wonderful sense of humor and collegiality."

Her conclusion? He would "make a superb judge."

What about Mr. Oldham's own words? If confirmed, he explained to our colleagues during his hearing, he will "uphold the rights of all litigants—big or little—equally, and apply the law to all fairly."

He understands his responsibility, clearly. I look forward to confirming this nominee, and I urge each of our colleagues to join me.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. President, on another matter, it has been a year and a half since Republican majorities took their seats in Congress and a Republican President was sworn in. In 2016, the American people made it clear it was time to try something new. They were tired of a so-called recovery that focused overwhelmingly on big, wealthy metropolitan areas. They had seen enough of tax hikes and top-down regulations that held their communities back. They turned to Republicans to deliver a pro-growth, pro-opportunity agenda to create better conditions for working families, job creators, and entrepreneurs to rise together.

Eighteen months later, the results could not be clearer. Today, more people say it is a good time to find a job than at almost any point since the turn of the millennium. U.S. manufacturers are more confident than ever about the future of their businesses.

Here is a story from yesterday's Financial Times: "US retail sales rise for fifth straight month in June." This is a good sign for Americans all across the board. It shows our economy is healthy. It shows that families feel they have enough breathing room to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5027

make purchases, which of course then benefit the companies and workers who produce what they are buying. Of course, it is especially good for the 42 million Americans whose jobs are supported by the retail industry.

According to industry data, more than 6 in 10 Americans work in retail at some point in their career, so this continued prosperity is really significant. There is little question that tax reform is to thank for a significant portion of this progress.

For one thing, our middle-class tax cuts are directly boosting families' discretionary income. As the Wall Street Journal reported this week, "many households are experiencing less withholding from their paychecks thanks to the tax overhaul."

Analysts also point to the business side of tax reform, which is letting more U.S. employers expand and hire. That means more jobs for American workers, which means more income for American families, which means more money in the cash registers of American small businesses. The virtuous cycle goes on.

The American people and most fair observers are marveling at what our economy is delivering to workers and middle-class families, but I am starting to think our Democratic colleagues may have forgotten what a successful economic agenda looks like because even in the face of headline after headline and testimony after testimony from job creators we represent, they try to brush off this impressive growth as nothing serious, and they advocate for repealing or undoing the Republican policies that are helping to make it happen.

Fortunately, Republicans know full well how to cut taxes, trim back regulations, and get Washington out of the American people's way. It is just what we have done. It is just what we will continue to do.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday, President Trump went through a walk back. President Trump's walk back performance was pathetic. It was weak, insincere, and thoroughly unconvincing. The President read a scripted clarification yesterday like he was in a hostage situation. All you had to do was look at his face. He couldn't even fully commit to it, adding off-the-cuff that other people could also be responsible for election interference in 2016. That is hardly a walk back, and it was concerning only one particular comment. The President did not address his lavish praise for Vladimir Putin in Helsinki. Is he going to walk that back? He blamed both countries—the United States and Russia—for the sour relations between us. Is he going to walk that back? He said U.S. stupidity and foolishness, not Russian aggression, was the reason our relationship with Russia was so bad. Is he going to

walk that back? He did not address his brazen attacks on the FBI while on foreign soil. Is he going to walk that back?

Now, late last night and this morning, the President is back to celebrating his meeting with Putin. He is walking back the walk back. That is what he did this morning. This is like Charlottesville redux. We all know what the President really thought. We know what he thought at Charlottesville. The walk back was unconvincing, and he went back to his old ways. We know what he thought at Helsinki. The walk back was unconvincing. And now, with his tweets this morning, he is back to his old ways.

The only reason there was a walk back is that the President was forced by pressure from many of my Republican friends here, from his allies in the media, and his own White House staff. They all pressured him to give that temporary walk back. But it is clear from today's tweets that he doesn't mean it, that he doesn't believe it, and, frankly, neither does anybody else. It is clear that he still believes President Putin over the consensus of the American intelligence community, and that puts Americans' security gravely at risk.

The President's reluctant, ham-handed, half-hearted "clarification" yesterday—almost entirely reversed this morning—is woefully inadequate. His behavior in Helsinki continues to demand a response from Congress, and there are many things we can do. But later this morning, if anything is true to form, the President will hold a Cabinet meeting, and his advisers will shower him with thanks and praise—this is what he craves—and will provide, perhaps, another version of what happened in Helsinki.

Given what happened in Helsinki and given that the President's walk back was so weak, there are several things we as a Congress can and should do. Talking the talk is not enough. Walking the walk is what is so important here. We need to act, not simply say "tsk, tsk; bad President" and then go back to business as usual, because the American polity, the American security, and the view of America in the eyes of the world have taken a severe setback. It is up to us in the Congress to try to undo that.

I mentioned a whole host of actions this body can take to counter Russia's malign activity, punish Putin for interfering in our elections, prevent him from doing it again, and ensure that the President is doing what is necessary to stand up for American interests. The Senate is not powerless to take action in the wake of President Trump's indefensible performance at his summit with Vladimir Putin. Let me reiterate and suggest some things we should do, and I believe we should do all of these.

First, our Republican colleagues need to join us in demanding immediate public testimony from the President's

national security team—those who were in Helsinki and those who would have knowledge of what happened in Helsinki.

We need to have immediate public testimony from Secretary Pompeo, from DNI Director Coats, and from Ambassador Huntsman.

Above all, we need the translator who was present at the one-on-one meeting with President Putin to testify openly before Congress. That is not usually done, but there are almost always other people in the room, so you don't need the translator. But for some reason—a reason that Americans and the world are wondering about—President Trump wanted no one else in the room. Having the translator come testify and tell us what happened there is an imperative. It is so important. It is rare for translators to come before Congress, but in this case, it is warranted—A, because no one else was in the room, by the President's direction, and B, because what happened there might have been so important, given what happened in public a few short hours afterward. The translator works for the Federal Government, works for the taxpayers, and may be the only person who can accurately report what President Trump said to President Putin behind closed doors, what concessions were made to Vladimir Putin. We want to know. Did the President make concessions that hurt our national security? What did he agree to?

Congress has a duty to conduct responsible oversight of the executive branch, particularly after what the President did in Helsinki. The President's summit calls for oversight. Having these people—particularly the translator—come testify is important. I understand Secretary Pompeo will appear before the Foreign Relations Committee next week, which is good, but we need to hear from others, including the translator. I urge Leader MCCONNELL and his leadership team to immediately request a hearing of the people I mentioned.

Second, the Republican leadership should soon place on the floor—ASAP—bipartisan legislation, led by Senators BOOKER, GRAHAM, COONS, and TILLIS, to protect the special counsel from political interference. This legislation passed out of the Judiciary Committee with bipartisan support. It has four sponsors—two Democrats, two Republicans. If Leader MCCONNELL is serious about the checks and balances and if what he said in the last day or two were not just meaningless words, he will put this legislation on the floor. It will pass.

Alongside demanding testimony from the President's national security team, passing legislation to protect the special counsel is probably the most important thing this body could do to ensure that President Trump's recklessness does not precipitate a constitutional crisis.

Third, we should ratchet up sanctions on Putin and his cronies, not

water them down. The sanctions this body passed by an overwhelming bipartisan margin of 98 to 2—and I salute Leader MCCONNELL; he helped to bring it to the floor even though the President didn't like it—have not yet been fully implemented by the Trump administration. On our side, Senators MENENDEZ and VAN HOLLEN have some very good ideas about sanctions, and we should act on them.

Fourth, our Republican colleagues can and should insist that the President finally release his tax returns. We all know that the President broke decades of practice when he didn't release those returns—so damaging because his economic interests outside of the government are so large, complicated, and varied and so important because he deals with international finance in these situations.

There was no good reason not to release his tax returns then. Yet President Trump's inexplicable behavior in Helsinki has many Americans asking: What does Putin have over him that he is behaving in a way that is, basically, inexplicable by any rational, logical line of thinking? That is why his tax returns will be so important. We should pass legislation that requires the President to release his tax returns. It was important before, but it is much more important now, after Helsinki.

Fifth, the Republicans should demand with us that the President insist the 12 Russians who have been indicted for our election interference and information warfare be handed over. Putin may not do it, but at least we ought to show how serious we are as a country. The President ought to show how alarmed he is that this happened, and the best way to do that is for our Republican colleagues to join with us. They will have more influence than we will have in asking him to do so.

Finally, we should have bipartisan legislation on election security. Together, in a bipartisan way, with the help of my friend from Tennessee—a senior member of Appropriations—in the last omnibus bill, we passed \$380 million for election security. As I understand it, that money is now being sent out to help the States, but we have to do more. There is bipartisan legislation. Senators KLOBUCHAR and LANKFORD and Senators VAN HOLLEN and RUBIO have good legislation that could help beef up our election security. We ought to move on it.

Our country—our cyber networks and our election systems—is under constant attack from adversaries like the Russians. There is bipartisan consensus that we must harden our election infrastructure. This has led to the legislation I mentioned by KLOBUCHAR, LANKFORD, VAN HOLLEN, and RUBIO. There is other legislation by Senators HARRIS and WYDEN. I urge the Republican leader to let us move on one or more of these bills.

We should do all of these things, not just one or two—all of them. I can't think of a logical reason not to do any

of them other than out of fear of offending the President. Times like these call for us to do more. We have already heard some of our Republican colleagues say “let's move on” after what the President said yesterday—as I mentioned, his so-called walk back was not a walk back at all—and that if we cared about our Nation's security, we would move forward.

The final thing I would say to my Republican colleagues is this: This is a moment that will be remembered in American history. It is not going away. This is a moment that will be remembered next week, next month, in November of 2018, in November of 2020, and way beyond. The Helsinki summit is now an unalterable fact in American history—a moment when, unfortunately, an American President humiliated his own country and himself before a foreign dictator. It was a terrible sign of weakness by this President, and it, unfortunately, weakens the office he holds.

Yet it can be remembered as a moment when a bipartisan majority in Congress—Democrats and Republicans in their dropping all trappings of party—links arms and stands up for our country after our President has refused to do so. Let's hope it is. Let's hope it is.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. President, I know my colleagues are waiting, and I appreciate their indulgence as I have one final point on the Supreme Court and Brett Kavanaugh.

I just read in a very recent interview that Judge Kavanaugh was asked, if granted the opportunity, whether he would overturn precedent in any one case. Judge Kavanaugh initially declined to answer. He then paused and said, on second thought, he would overturn the precedent in *Morrison v. Olson*. That is the case that upheld the constitutionality of the independent counsel law. I will make two brief points on the subject.

First, Judge Kavanaugh's response demonstrates he is willing to answer direct questions about precedent—which precedents he agrees with and which precedents he would overturn. I hope, during the hearings, we will not suffer the tried-and-true verbal gymnastics of nominees who have refused to answer questions on existing precedent. Judge Kavanaugh had no qualms about that in that interview.

Second and more immediately, considering everything we know about Judge Kavanaugh's expansive view of Executive power and accountability, the fact that *Morrison v. Olson*—of all of the cases in the history of the Supreme Court—is the first case he would think of overturning is deeply, deeply troubling.

We already know he believes a President shouldn't be investigated while in office, that a President can't be indicted while in office, that a President doesn't have to follow laws that the President “deems”—his word—uncon-

stitutional. Clearly, Judge Kavanaugh's judicial philosophy incorporates an almost monarchical view of Executive power and accountability, animated by a belief that our Chief Executive gets to play by a different set of rules.

Judge Kavanaugh, particularly after this interview, needs to recuse himself from anything having to do with the Mueller probe given his record and the fact that he was nominated by the subject of the investigation he could very well end up ruling on.

Once again, I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TARIFFS

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I rise to discuss an issue that is of great importance to my constituents in Alabama and to many other people across the country. At issue is the health of our automotive industry.

Unfortunately, the health of my State's automobile industry is being threatened not by unfair competition or illegal practices but by significant tariffs proposed by the President. According to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, more than a half a million Alabama jobs are supported by global trade, meaning more than one in every four Alabama jobs is tied to trade.

One of the key reasons Alabama has such a robust trade posture is due to our automotive manufacturing industry. I am old enough to remember what it was like before auto companies came to Alabama in the 1990s, starting with Mercedes. At the time that Mercedes came, many of Alabama's manufacturing facilities were closing down and moving to other countries. Yet, one by one—from Mercedes, to Honda, to Hyundai, and now to Toyota and Mazda, which are breaking ground on a new plant very soon—these automakers came to Alabama and breathed new life into our State's economy. They support, today, some 57,000 Alabama jobs, and our auto exports topped \$11 billion in 2017. That doesn't even include the new Toyota-Mazda plant in Huntsville, which is going to add another 4,000 jobs and \$1.6 billion in economic development.

After having no automobile industry 30 years ago, Alabama has become the third largest exporter of automobiles in this country. In only the past 15 months, every major automobile manufacturer in Alabama has announced an expansion to total 5,400 jobs and \$3.3 billion in investments. This industry has been a phenomenal success in Alabama and, more importantly, for the men and women who rely on these very good-paying jobs to support their families and to build better lives.

That is why it is a priority for me and colleagues like my friend, Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee, to keep our States' automotive industry thriving. Yet, recently, this industry has come under attack. In May, President Trump threatened a 25-percent tariff

on imported cars, trucks, and auto parts under the pretext that these products somehow threaten our national security.

Let me be clear. While the United States faces any number of threats from adversaries on any number of fronts, foreign automobiles and auto parts are not threats to our national security. Do you know what is a threat? It is a 25-percent tax on the prices of these imported goods. The President's proposed auto tariffs have the potential to inflict serious damage on a booming industry in my State and in other leading auto-producing States, like Tennessee. We might call it a tariff, but we all know exactly what it is—a tax.

By definition, a tariff is a tax on a particular class of imports or exports. Any tariffs placed on products that come into the United States are taxes that increase the cost of those goods to American consumers. When other countries place additional tariffs, or new taxes, on American goods, it raises the purchase prices of American products overseas and hurts our ability to sustain competitive markets in those countries. So it is deeply troubling that the recent proposal from the President will threaten tens of thousands of jobs in Alabama and increase costs for American consumers.

Shortly after this tariff threat was issued, Senator ALEXANDER joined me in writing to Commerce Secretary Wilbur Ross, and we urged him to reconsider the auto tariff tax proposal. Between our two States, the automotive sector contributes more than 200,000 jobs to our economies. Numbers of autoworkers from our States are in town this week to tell their stories, firsthand, to the Commerce Department, and I commend them for their efforts in doing so.

Senator ALEXANDER and I understand the devastating blow these tariffs will represent to an industry that has literally rebuilt our respective States' economies from the ground up. Automakers and their suppliers can be found in every corner and in nearly every county of each of our States. We have found common cause in fighting these tariffs and protecting our constituents from the devastating impacts they will have.

There are already a few legislative solutions out there, including Senator CORKER's solution regarding tariffs. I know Senator PORTMAN is also doing a lot of good work in this space. Senator ALEXANDER and I are working together to propose a solution of our own as a complementary measure to halt these tariffs. We hope to introduce that proposal as early as next week after consulting with our automotive manufacturers and working with our colleagues to grow bipartisan support for this legislation.

I realize that folks who have been affected by these proposed tariffs are looking for a silver bullet to stop them dead in their tracks. Right now, the

only silver bullet in this case is for the President to change his mind and recognize how many jobs are at risk because of these proposed tariffs. Until that happens, we are going to fight to protect what our States and our workers have earned.

I want to thank my colleague Senator ALEXANDER, who is here today, for his continued partnership in this effort. I look forward to working with more of our colleagues to stop the urgent threat to American jobs.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Alabama for his remarks.

I come to the floor to discuss bipartisan legislation that he and I, as he said, plan to introduce as soon as next week to encourage the Trump administration to reconsider the dangerous steps it is taking to impose tariffs on imported automobiles and automotive parts.

I use the word "dangerous" because nothing has done more during the last 40 years to raise family incomes in Tennessee than the arrival of the auto industry, and nothing could do more damage to those family incomes than the proposed tariffs on imported automobiles and automotive parts, combined with the tariffs on imported steel and aluminum that the administration has already imposed.

We have heard the Senator from Alabama talk about his State. In my view, Tennessee is more likely to be hurt than any other State by these tariffs. Let me tell a short story to explain why I would make such a dramatic statement.

Forty years ago, I walked 1,000 miles across Tennessee in my campaign for Governor. In Rutherford County, outside Nashville, I spent the night with the Knight family. Mrs. Knight told me that her twin boys were bright but that she was sad because, as she put it, there are no jobs around here. She said: They are smart boys, and they will never get a job here, and I will never see my grandchildren.

Forty years ago, there were no auto jobs in Tennessee. We were the third poorest State. Our family incomes were the third lowest. Our low-paying textile jobs were fleeing outside of our country. Unemployment and inflation were high, and prospects were bleak. Then in 1980—just 2 years after that walk, when I was the Governor of Tennessee—Nissan from Japan arrived and came to Rutherford. Then General Motors, with Saturn, came to Spring Hill. Then Volkswagen came to Chattanooga. All had large manufacturing plants.

As the American automobile industry moved to the Southeastern United States, more than 900 auto part suppliers spread across 88 of Tennessee's 95 counties. Today, 136,000 Tennesseans—or one-third of our manufacturing

workforce—work in those auto plants. Those auto jobs have become the main driver of family incomes, which have now risen to a little above the national average. Our economy is booming, and unemployment is at a record low.

Today, Tennessee produces 6.7 percent of all of the cars and trucks produced in the United States. Tennessee exported more than \$5.5 billion worth of automobiles and auto parts last year. Tennessee has been the top State in auto manufacturing strength for 5 out of the last 8 years, according to Business Facilities.

Let me get back to my little story. Last year, one of those bright twins from Rutherford County—the Knight family—where I spent the night 40 years ago, Randy Knight, retired as the general manager of the Nissan plant, which is the largest and most efficient auto plant in North America. His brother works there, too, and so does one of those grandchildren whom the grandmother thought she would never see.

You can see why Tennesseans become very worried when anything threatens the auto industry that has transformed our State. Here is why the proposed tariffs do that.

As the Senator from Alabama said, tariffs are taxes. Tariffs are taxes on us, pure and simple. They make what we buy and sell more expensive. The laws of economics usually say that when you make what you buy and sell more expensive, you buy and sell less of it. If we sell fewer automobiles and automotive parts, there will be lower revenues, lower profits, fewer wage increases, and fewer jobs.

Since almost every one of the 900 auto part suppliers use steel and aluminum, lower revenues and smaller profits mean fewer wage increases and fewer jobs for the 136,000 Tennesseans who work in the more than 900 auto plants in our State. More expensive cars means fewer people in the United States buy those cars and fewer people overseas buy those cars—the cars we make. Fewer people buying cars and trucks means that 136,000 Tennesseans in America's No. 1 auto State are going to have a lower standard of living than they otherwise would and lower family incomes.

Why in the world would our government raise our taxes and destroy our jobs in this way? Well, the government's answer is that tariffs protect jobs in the steel and aluminum industry.

It is true that some steel and aluminum jobs might be saved, but in 2003, when President George W. Bush proposed steel tariffs, there were about 10 times as many people working in the steel-using industries as there were in steel-producing industries. Let me say that again. There were more people working in the steel-using industry than there were in the steel-producing industry.

President Bush dropped the idea after a year because the tariffs destroyed, as

I said, more jobs in other industries, including the automotive industry, than they saved in the steel-producing industry.

I know something about the aluminum industry. My dad worked most of his life at Alcoa's Tennessee aluminum smelting plant, which closed a few years ago because electricity was so much cheaper in other parts of the world. You use electricity—lots of it—to smelt aluminum. That is why those plants came to East Tennessee more than a century ago. But electric prices in the United States gradually rose over that century, and are still cheaper in other parts of the world. So today there are only eight smelting plants left in the United States. Seven of them are still in operation. Alcoa operates four and makes 46 percent—nearly half—of all of the aluminum produced in the United States. Alcoa opposes the aluminum tariffs because it also operates smelting plants in Canada and other countries that export aluminum to the United States.

The bottom line is this: The largest U.S. producer of aluminum, Alcoa, doesn't want the aluminum tariffs. The thousands of auto plants and other plants that use aluminum don't want the aluminum tariffs. So who is asking for the aluminum tariffs?

A second reason justifying tariffs is that other countries may have been unfair to the United States. There may be examples of that, but when did it become a good idea to solve your own problem by shooting yourself in both feet at once? It is hard to see how raising our taxes and destroying our jobs is a smart solution to unfair trade practices.

Then there is the question of whether tariffs help autoworkers. Raising taxes and prices and selling fewer cars wouldn't seem to help the American autoworker.

Will it cause foreign companies to build more cars in the United States? Well, that is already happening.

The foreign manufacturers have been doing exactly what we asked them to do. They have moved here. They produce cars and trucks here. They export many of those cars and trucks and auto parts to other countries. Today, about half the cars being built in America are being built by the so-called foreign manufacturers. Nissan's plant in Rutherford County employs 8,000 Tennesseans and is the largest and most efficient auto plant in North America.

I was with President Trump last year when he spoke in Michigan about all the autoworker jobs leaving the Midwest. Since 1994, 3.6 million of those jobs have left the Midwest, but they didn't go overseas; they moved to Tennessee and Alabama and other parts of the Southeastern United States, which gained 3.6 million auto jobs during the same period. Those new auto plants are in Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi, South Carolina, Kentucky, and Texas. Those are all States where

the President is widely admired and States that he carried heavily in his election effort.

Those plants moved primarily to the Southeast because our part of the country offered right-to-work laws and an environment that allowed companies to make quality cars at a lower cost and sell them competitively here in the United States and around the world. In fact, my own view is that the movement of the American auto industry to the Southeast saved the American auto industry because where it was 25, 30, or 40 years ago was stuck in the Midwest in an oligopoly where the United Automobile Workers and three big companies were producing big, expensive cars, and the little foreign cars were coming in and eating their lunch in the marketplace. So now we have strong and effective American auto plants in the Midwestern United States and in the Southeastern United States, and half of them are made by so-called foreign manufacturers.

I agree with President Trump on many things—taxes, judges, regulations, the economy, Keystone Pipeline, and others. He has helped create today's booming economy and low unemployment. I give him credit for helping to do that, but these tariffs take us in exactly the opposite direction.

These tariffs are dangerous. These tariffs are going to cost us jobs. These tariffs are going to lower our family incomes. These tariffs are going to undo much of the good the President and this Congress have done during the last year and a half to create this booming economy.

I respectfully suggest that the President reconsider his trade policy, drop the tariffs as a tool for implementing his objectives, and find other, more effective means to persuade other countries to do for us what we do for them.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

OPENING OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAIN REGIONAL VA MEDICAL CENTER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, this weekend, Colorado will be celebrating the opening of our new Rocky Mountain Regional VA Medical Center in Aurora. I am incredibly proud that we will be reaching this milestone this weekend after more than a decade of work and some significant hurdles, trials, and tribulations along the way. I commend my colleagues for the work they did funding this project.

The Rocky Mountain Regional VA Medical Center will be the crown jewel of the VA system. It wasn't easy to get here. A lot of people had to do a lot of work to make it happen, including the veterans, the leadership organizations in Colorado, our colleagues across the aisle, Congressman COFFMAN, Congressman PERLMUTTER, Senator BENNET—in fact, the entire congressional delegation for a number of years—Senator Salazar, Senator Udall, Senator Allard. They have all done incredible work to make this weekend a possibility.

Hundreds of millions of tax dollars were used for this facility. It did run over budget. It certainly ran over time. But we have learned a lot as a result of this facility, and the Army Corps of Engineers will now be taking over major construction projects like this. As a result of this facility, we have made changes on how designs are being made. It was a learning experience and unfortunately a costly one at that, but it doesn't change the fact that this will be a crown jewel in the VA system.

This is not the end of a project, it is the beginning of a promise to be fulfilled—a promise to our veterans on the care they will receive, a place where they will find healing, where they will find support, and where they will find a return to good health.

To our men and women in uniform who currently serve, know that you have a place in Colorado where you will find incredible care.

To those who have served our country, who live in Colorado, know that with great pride, we open this facility this weekend.

But we have more work to do. We have work to do to make sure that it is easier to hire doctors and fill the positions at the hospital that have remained open for months around the VA system. It takes too long to onboard medical professionals. We should cut down that time, figure out how to cut through the redtape and the bureaucracy. If you are qualified to practice medicine at Swedish Hospital in Denver, or any of our other great facilities, why can't you just go to work at the VA hospital as well? So these are things that we can do to do a better job.

On Monday, I met with the Secretary nominee, Robert Wilkie, President Trump's nominee to be the new VA Secretary, and I talked to him about the work we have to continue to do to make sure that veterans receive the best care possible. This Congress has passed legislation, such as the Choice Act. We have made great reforms over the last several months to reduce wait times and wait lists and to eliminate them and make sure that we can provide that promise of care.

This weekend in Colorado there will be a great celebration as we open this facility. So many people put in tireless years upon years of work, from the leadership of the State to the leadership of Congress. I am grateful that this weekend we celebrate as we open a facility that begins to fulfill the promise made a decade ago for veterans in the region.

I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join my colleagues in making it clear just how

high the stakes are when it comes to our Nation's highest courts—for our families, for our communities, for our country, and for our future.

Since the day he took office, President Trump has made one move after another to turn the White House and the entire executive branch into a tool for those who have the most power, the most money, and the most influence to get even more power, more money, and more influence. From our public schools to our public lands and more, it is hard to find any Trump administration decision where the bottom line didn't come first.

But it is not just his administration. President Trump has systematically worked to roll back decades of progress through our courtrooms, from the Supreme Court on down, which will have long-lasting impacts stretching far beyond his time in the White House.

I know some of my colleagues were here last night to talk about the absolutely egregious circuit court nominees who would do everything they can to whittle away at our rights and freedoms as Americans. I want to talk about that for a bit as well, but I want to take some time first to talk about a nominee who would sit above those circuit court nominees in our Nation's Supreme Court and who, if confirmed, would overturn *Roe v. Wade*, eliminate protections for patients with preexisting conditions, reverse settled law and precedent, and give these extreme circuit court nominees even more room to do damage to our Constitution, our laws, our freedoms, and our way of life.

It is telling that President Trump and his Republican and special-interest allies are desperately trying to make the case that Judge Kavanaugh isn't well outside the mainstream, far outside the bounds of reasonable, and deeply opposed to what people across the country want when it comes to their rights and freedoms being protected. They may try, but they will not succeed because the record is clear and the facts are clear. Judge Kavanaugh is an extreme pick who would be devastating for our country if he is confirmed, and we need to do everything we can to stop it.

So I am standing here right now, on behalf of the families in my home State of Washington and across this country, to be very clear about what is at stake if President Trump and his enablers continue to try to turn our judicial system into one that works for massive corporations and special interests and against regular families.

Earlier today, a number of my colleagues stood in this spot to sound the alarm on what is at stake for our environment and our public health if the balance of this Court swings toward President Trump and his extreme special interests. I want to expand on those concerns, and I want to talk about just a few of the many issues that Judge Kavanaugh would impact should he be confirmed and how awful this would be for our families, commu-

nities, students, and workers and for our environment, our elections, our country, and more.

But before I get into some other issues—and, again, just a few of many—I want to start with two that I believe are most important and that every woman, every man, and every family should be thinking very hard about: protections for patients with preexisting conditions and *Roe v. Wade*.

First, President Trump has broken promise after promise he made to workers and families on the campaign trail, but he has never once wavered in keeping promises he made to extreme, ideological, rightwing special interests.

President Trump said he would make taking away patient protections—like those for preexisting conditions—and gutting policies that have made healthcare more affordable for millions a top priority. He failed to jam a bill through Congress here to make those things happen. So he has done everything he can to attack patients' healthcare from the Oval Office.

His biggest attack yet is Judge Kavanaugh—an extremely conservative nominee vetted by those same rightwing special interests who President Trump is so determined to keep happy, a judge who those special interests picked because they know he will help them undermine affordable healthcare from the Supreme Court Bench.

I believed President Trump when he said he was determined to undermine patients' healthcare in order to satisfy rightwing special interests. Healthcare coverage, especially for people with preexisting conditions, is on the line with this nomination, and we cannot afford not to take this threat seriously.

That is not the only healthcare issue under threat. President Trump said he would appoint Supreme Court Justices vetted by these groups for their willingness to overturn *Roe v. Wade*. He said women should be punished for having an abortion. In office, he and Vice President MIKE PENCE have done virtually everything they can to restrict women's access to healthcare and to chip away at women's constitutionally protected reproductive rights. Unless women and men across the country stand up to stop them, they will succeed in putting another Supreme Court Justice who has the ideological rightwing's stamp of approval when it comes to striking down *Roe*.

There is no sugarcoating this. We are on the precipice of five men voting to overturn a historic ruling that has made women healthier and made them more equal and more free in the United States. We cannot let that happen.

Those are two issues that so many of us are focused on, and they are so important, but they are far from the only ones. Another key issue I want to briefly mention today is the rights and freedoms of our LGBTQ friends, coworkers, neighbors, and fellow Americans. We have made progress, but there are many questions and cases in this area

that will come before the Supreme Court in the coming years—whether it is questions regarding equality under the adoption laws for all couples or the rights of a couple to buy a wedding cake, whether transgender troops can serve their country, whether someone can continue being fired simply for being LGBTQ, and more. So there is a whole lot at stake. Anyone who cares about this issue or anyone who simply believes that everyone in this country should have fundamental rights and freedoms—no matter who they are or who they love—should join us in rejecting Judge Kavanaugh.

That is not all. We have known from day one that President Trump would be hostile toward our bedrock environmental laws, that he was eager to do the bidding of the coal, oil, and gas industries, that his slogan of putting America first actually meant that the United States would be dead last in the fight against climate change, and that Trump's economic agenda has more to do with rolling back rules that help to keep our kids safe from toxic pollutants, protecting our drinking water, or preventing health problems in senior citizens—the ones those special interest groups try to call pesky regulations and what the rest of us moms, grandmothers, and ordinary people call commonsense protections.

But it is apparently not enough just to attack our environment for the administration. If you really want to shape our Nation's environmental laws for generations to come, you put someone on the Supreme Court for life who will consistently side with the massive corporations and special interests that put profits ahead of the health and well-being of families, and, boy, did those CEOs and special interests hit the jackpot with President Trump's nominee.

You don't have to spend long looking at Judge Kavanaugh's record to see that, should he be seated, nearly five decades of environmental protection are at risk, including the protections enshrined in the Clean Air Act, which has significantly cut the smog, soot, and chemicals that choked communities prior to 1970 and prevented hundreds of thousands of premature deaths and cases of heart disease in the years sense.

Also at risk is the Clean Water Act, which, if erased, would take us back to the bad old days before commonsense protections—like when the Cuyahoga River was so polluted that it caught fire; when shellfish beds were closed in Puget Sound, nearly decimated by pollutants; or when an estimated 20 million gallons of sewage effluent flowed into Lake Washington every single day.

I could go on and on about the strides our country has made to keep our families safe, but the bottom line is that because of our landmark environmental laws—like the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act—our rivers are cleaner, our air is easier to breathe,

and families are better protected than ever before.

Though we have a lot of work yet to do, it would be a grave mistake to go backward, and that is just what so many people fear would happen with Judge Kavanaugh on the Bench, given his past rulings and given the test that President Trump applied and his commitment to only nominate someone screened and approved by the extreme right, especially his stance that could take decisions away from our Nation's scientists and nonpartisan professionals and put those decisions into the hands of special interests.

That takes me to another issue I want to run through briefly: making sure our elections in this country are free and accessible and that corporations don't have a louder voice in our process than ordinary voters. These are issues where our courts have failed to serve us well in recent years, but by confirming Judge Kavanaugh, we would be cementing this awful pattern for a generation and making necessary reform so much more difficult.

Judge Kavanaugh will continue his habit of ruling to make it harder and harder for citizens to vote and have a voice in this democracy. We know this. We saw how he ruled in favor of stricter voter ID laws—ones where the intention to make it harder for Americans to vote was clear and absolutely the wrong way to go. We cannot have a Supreme Court that continues to allow voter suppression.

So I ask my colleagues: If you believe that voting in our country should be open to all and that people shouldn't have less access to the voting booth because of where they live or the color of their skin, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who will protect our elections and our democracy. If you believe that Citizens United was an awful decision that perverted the First Amendment and put shameful amounts of power into the hands of the mega rich and the biggest corporations, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who would put our ordinary voters first.

If we can't stem the flow of dark, unaccountable money in politics, and reverse the tide of the wealthiest Americans and biggest corporations being allowed to have the loudest voices in our elections, we are going to keep running into massive challenges as a nation. Without a Supreme Court willing to do that, without rejecting Judge Kavanaugh and demanding someone else, we can't do that. Giving the most powerful among us an advantage in our elections is not the only way Judge Kavanaugh is working for those at the top, and I want to briefly discuss another.

Last month's Janus decision made it clear that workers and their unions need a fair voice on the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, Judge Kavanaugh has a long record of weakening worker protections, undermining union rights, and making it easier for corporations

and special interests to tilt the scales of justice in their favor.

I would urge my colleagues who claim to care about the rights and economic security of working families to join me in rejecting this nomination and put the power back into the hands of working families and the middle class.

This point is especially potent given the disgrace we witnessed in Helsinki. Every American should be deeply concerned about President Trump putting someone on the Supreme Court who is prepared to protect him from legal attack and do his bidding.

As we all watch, many of us in horror and dismay, as President Trump continues to do everything in his power to try and discredit the Mueller investigation, we cannot forget, for a moment, that his Supreme Court nominee suggested in a 2009 law review article that a sitting President should not be subjected to criminal investigation or civil or criminal litigation.

Does anyone think, for one second, this isn't something President Trump was looking for? Is there anyone who has seen how President Trump has acted, listened to what he said who thinks he is not thinking about what happens if something related to this investigation goes to the Supreme Court?

President Trump controls the White House. His Republicans control both Houses of Congress. The last thing we need, the last thing any American who truly cares about our country should want is to place the last remaining branch—the final branch intended to be independent, to put our Constitution first—into the hands of a Trump lackey. That would be awful. It would eliminate even the pretense of checks and balances. If Judge Kavanaugh is confirmed, with his record and given what we know about President Trump, that is exactly what would happen.

If you believe we should be taking the Russian election interference into U.S. elections seriously, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who would be truly independent and place an appropriate check on Executive power.

If you believe a President is not above the law, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who will take our Constitution and our judicial independence seriously.

If you believe Executive power is not unilateral and that real checks and balances are required, join me in rejecting this nominee and demanding someone who will clearly and unequivocally make sure that continues to be a reality.

Finally, I want to highlight Judge Kavanaugh's troubling record on commonsense gun safety. This is an issue that certainly hit close to home for far too many people in recent years. Churches, schools, concerts, it seems like no place is immune to the rampant gun violence happening in the country, which is why millions of Americans have taken to the streets in recent months to demand action.

Yet, at the same time, Judge Kavanaugh has taken a far more expansive interpretation of the Second Amendment and has vigorously argued that assault weapon bans are unconstitutional. His position is far more extreme than even the late Justice Scalia. It is no wonder the NRA immediately applauded Judge Kavanaugh's nomination and has pledged now to spend untold amounts to seal the deal on his confirmation.

Those are just a few issues weighing on so many people's minds right now. I could go on about what is at stake if President Trump turns his White House, and potentially now the judicial system, into one that favors the powerful few.

I would like to close by saying there are few things I take as seriously as a Senator than my duty to consider and vote on a Supreme Court nominee. In my time in the Senate, I have had the opportunity to consider nominees from Democrats and nominees from Republicans. I voted for some of them, I voted against some of them, each on their merits, and each based on how I think they would serve.

This time is different. We know exactly where President Trump's Supreme Court nominee will fall on the specific issues, no matter what vague answers Judge Kavanaugh chooses to deliver through this process.

Why do we know this? Because President Trump told us openly, publicly, and repeatedly. The President laid out specific tests and promised to only pick nominees from a prescreened list of people who would absolutely meet them.

Nobody should be fooled. Judge Kavanaugh is a rubberstamp. He will stand with special interests over families, and he will take our country in the wrong direction.

I urge my colleagues, stand with me in rejecting Judge Kavanaugh's nomination and join me in calling on President Trump to send us someone who would stand with women, with our workers, with our families, and who would truly commit to respecting settled law and the rights and freedoms we all hold dear and the longstanding protections that help keep our families safe and healthy.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

NOMINATION OF RYAN BOUNDS

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise to speak out in opposition to the nomination of Ryan Bounds to sit on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

I will be voting against his confirmation, and I ask all of my colleagues to do the same. My reason for this is not just the fact that in expressing his disdain for multicultural values in a series of college writings, he compared efforts to build tolerance and promote diversity to Nazi book burning; it is not just the fact that he advocated against policies designed to make

LGBTQ students feel welcome and crack down on campus rapists; it is not just the fact that when a bipartisan judicial selection committee asked him to disclose past controversies, he deliberately misled the committee and said there was nothing to worry about.

Now that his controversial writings have come to light, he refuses to retract or show remorse for his statements. Instead, he brushes them off as overbroad and overheated.

Ryan Bounds' writings show he does not believe in a tolerant and diverse America, where women and people of color are treated with equal respect. In my eyes, that alone disqualifies him from sitting on the Federal bench, but Bounds has not received the blue-slip approval of either Senator from his home State of Oregon. No judge in modern history has ever been confirmed without a blue slip from either home State Senator.

So a vote to confirm him is a direct attack on the Senate's constitutional responsibility to advise and consent. The blue-slip process is a critical function of the legislative branch. It gives every Senator a chance to have a say in the Federal judges who serve in their home State.

The nominee to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit will have a lifetime tenure. If confirmed, Ryan Bounds will have influence over our legal system for the rest of his life. Don't the American people and their elected officials deserve a say in whether he should be allowed to fill that seat?

This debate is not just about one unqualified judge and his racist ideas. It is about the duty of the legislative branch to serve as a check and balance on the President. Over the course of the Trump administration so far, we have seen an unprecedented attempt to undermine the blue-slip process and pack the courts with judges favored by corporations and special interests.

I urge my colleagues to take a stand against President Trump's attacks on our legal system. Protect the integrity of the blue-slip process and vote against Ryan Bounds' nomination. The power and independence of the legislature is at stake.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

CALLING FOR THE RELEASE OF PASTOR ANDREW BRUNSON

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I think last week or the week before, you were presiding when I did a speech that I promised I am going to do every week we are in session until justice is served in Turkey.

It is a speech about this man. His name is Pastor Andrew Brunson. He was arrested in Turkey in October of 2016. If you want to sum up his crime, it is for being a missionary. He has been in Turkey for about 20 years, has served the community well, has provided aid and comfort to Syrian refugees, has provided a place for people in

Turkey who want to come into a Christian church to do just that. He has a small church in Izmir. You can only seat about 100 people in it, and he didn't even have that when he started his missionary work.

I should say he is from the Black Mountain area of North Carolina. He was part of the same church that Rev. Billy Graham was a part of. He went to Turkey to really pursue his passion and serve in Christ through missionary work.

In 2016, after the coup attempt, President Erdogan implemented emergency powers, and he swept up thousands of people and put them in prison. Pastor Brunson was in a Turkish prison for almost 19 months without charges—about 17 months in a cell that was designed for 8 prisoners that had 21 people in it.

I was in Turkey about 4 months ago—when I first met Pastor Brunson personally—to visit him in prison to let him know that as long as I am in the U.S. Senate, I am going to work hard for his ultimate release.

Then I went back about 6 weeks later, and I sat in a Turkish courtroom for about 12 hours, and I heard some of the most absurd charges that could ever be levied against someone to keep them in prison for what will now be going on 2 years. I told Pastor Brunson I would be back, and I will continue to be back, until justice is served.

I don't want to get into too many of the details so I will tell you he was in a courtroom today for another 5 hours. If it bore any resemblance to the time I was in the courtroom, it goes something like this: The defense gets to say nothing. They don't get to introduce witnesses to testify on his behalf. You have secret witnesses, many of them in a Turkish prison, testifying against him about things like a daughter posting a meal she had on a social media application that the Turkish authorities believe linked her to terror because they believe it is a meal certain terrorist organizations like. It also happens to be a meal that a lot of people in the Middle East like, but that was a charge that suggested he was involved in a coup attempt or conspiring with terrorists.

Having a light on in a church—by the way, in a room that doesn't have a window—that was supposedly observed by one of these secret witnesses who are in prison, saying: Well, clearly if there was a light on in this church, nothing good could have happened because it was in the middle of the night. Maybe somebody just left the light switch on, but I am still trying to figure out how they actually saw it because I have been in that room, and there is not a single window. There is no way you could have seen it from the outside.

Those are the types of charges that have been used to keep Pastor Brunson in prison since October of 2016.

Today, he was back, as I said earlier, in a hearing in a Turkish courtroom for 5 hours. At the end of the 5-hour

hearing he was told that he is going to continue to be in prison until they have another hearing in October, and that hearing is scheduled for about 4 days short of 2 years that he has spent time in a Turkish prison.

He has been in prison for 649 days. He is in good spirits—as good as you can imagine for somebody who is enduring the trauma of being imprisoned, I think, unlawfully and unfairly.

His wife Norine is in Turkey. She refuses to leave because she is afraid if she leaves Turkey, Turkey will not allow her to come back into the country.

They have been separated from their three children for 2 years because they are afraid to have them come into the country and not be able to leave.

I am asking the Members of Congress to join with me to apply pressure on Turkey to have justice done. Justice is releasing Pastor Brunson and letting him come back home.

We have provisions in the National Defense Authorization Act that send a very clear message to Turkey that we are serious about this.

I have my own concerns about Turkey because they seem to be drifting away as a NATO ally and partner and more toward a position I don't quite understand. I certainly don't understand it in terms of our mutual interests as NATO allies or as economic partners.

But for right now, I want to focus on a man who has been in prison for 649 days. I want to focus on other people who worked with the Embassy who have been in prison for about the same time. I want to focus on a NASA scientist who happened to be visiting his family in Turkey—he is a Turkish American—who has been in prison for 2½ years. We have to educate the American people on a Turkey that has no resemblance today of what it was just 5 or 6 years ago.

I want to have a positive working relationship with Turkey. I want increased economic ties and increased military ties. But when you illegally imprison American citizens, no matter how important that strategic relationship is, at some point we have to question whether or not we can go further.

In the meantime, if any of you are planning on going to Turkey, I would think twice. Make sure that you don't take a picture of somebody that maybe Turkish officials think is involved in a coup, because that can sweep you up in it. Make sure that you don't eat a meal that other segments of Turkish society like, because that may make you a coup conspirator.

I hope that we solve this problem, but I will tell you that there are very few things that would ever take me away from coming to this floor and going into committee meetings and doing everything I can to put pressure on Turkey until Pastor Andrew Brunson is back in this country safe and sound with his family. Then I will

continue to work on all the other people who are being unfairly and unjustly held in Turkish prisons.

We need to have justice for Pastor Brunson. We need Turkey to be the ally that we want them to be, and we need President Erdogan to show the leadership and the compassion to bring Pastor Brunson home.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

TARIFFS

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about tariffs and their impact on Montana's family farmers and businesses. In Montana we have more than 27,000 family farms and ranches. Folks who farm and ranch these lands are descendants of homesteaders and pioneers, including myself. They are also young producers who may be preparing for their first harvest. Might I add that we don't have enough young producers in our State. The population of farmers is getting far too old.

These folks work 7 days a week, for long hours, to raise the food that feeds our families across this world, and they power our rural economies in this country. Farmers and ranchers are small business operators and owners who are always on tight margins and always are looking to make sure that they can make the books balance by being on the positive side of the ledger. Why? So they can keep their farms and ranches viable to be able to have the next generation take over their operation. Just like any other business—a local bar or a hardware store—you need to be able to make a profit to stay in business.

Producers need to make sure that they have predictability in input costs—we are talking about fertilizers, fuel, and seed—and predictability in markets, the places where we sell our grain, which has always been a challenge and which has become more of a challenge over the past 6 months. When farmers plant a crop, they need to know there is a market for that crop, because if there is not, it can put them in a world of hurt financially.

Unfortunately, in Montana, we are preparing to harvest winter wheat crops as we speak. Spring wheat crops will soon be coming, pulse crops will soon be coming, and oil seeds will soon be coming. The fact is that there is no certainty in any of those crops right now. Why? Because our farmers and our ranchers are being used as pawns in a trade war that I can guarantee not one of them asked for.

This trade war is eliminating access to foreign markets that have taken generations to develop and putting family farm and ranch operations in a financial pinch—such a severe financial pinch that we haven't seen anything like it since the 1980s, when we saw a mass exodus off the land due to bad ag prices.

The retaliatory tariffs against family farmers and ranchers is harming Mon-

tana's No. 1 industry, agriculture. Montana's grain producers produce about \$2 billion worth of wheat, barley, pulse crops, and oil seeds every year. Since the middle of June, the price of No. 1 Dark Northern Spring wheat in southeastern Montana has fallen more than 60 cents a bushel. That is more than 10 percent, and the same can be said throughout the State of Montana.

To put that in perspective, just think what would happen in your business if your prices were reduced by 10 percent right off the top. It would put you in a world of financial hurt, and that is where Montana's farms and ranches are today. If prices continue to plummet, some of these families who have been on the land for over 100 years will be forced to make some very difficult decisions in the next 6 to 8 months.

These tariffs are eliminating producers' access to foreign markets—markets that are in Asia and Europe and markets in Canada and Mexico. In Montana, we sell our grains and our beef to these countries and others: China, Japan, South Korea, Mexico, Pacific Rim countries, and European Union countries. These exports didn't just pop up overnight. They came to fruition after years of hard work, good faith and trust, and negotiations.

Negotiations and trust are being thrown out the window with these tariff fights. In some cases—Japan, for example—it has taken multiple generations to establish these export markets. If we lose them, it will take many generations to get them back. Countries such as Argentina and Russia are circling the markets like sharks, wanting to strike the minute we lose a grip on them to fill those voids.

Take, for instance, Mexico. Mexico is the largest importer of Montana barley in the world. For years, Mexico bought Montana's barley to be able to make beers, like Corona and others. These tariffs have put those markets at risk to the point that one Mexican barley buyer told one of the folks from the barley association of Montana: I don't know that we can depend on America to supply our barley anymore because these tariffs have put our markets at risk.

As a result, Mexico, which is a huge importer of American wheat, just this last spring turned toward Argentina for their wheat for the first time ever. They signed a contract for Argentine wheat to take the place of the wheat from this country, of which Montana is a part and will no longer be supplying.

The real question is, How long is this going to have to go on? We are faced with enough uncertainties in production and agriculture with weather, drought, hail, bugs, and disease. The list goes on. Unfortunately, this is a manmade problem.

I get it. I think the President is right when he talks about holding China accountable. They have stolen a lot of intellectual property. They manipulate their currency. But to put on tariffs where retaliation comes on ag products

is not the right direction to go. We can get their attention by other ways.

I would also say that these tariffs aren't just felt by farmers and ranchers. They are felt by other businesses too. For builders, for example, their costs are going up. In 2016, the voters of Missoula, MT, approved a \$30 million bond to build a new city library. They started the project, but tariffs on steel sent material costs soaring. Now the cost of rebar alone has increased the cost of the project by \$100,000. Library officials have told me that as a direct result of these tariffs, they are preparing with a need to go out and raise another \$500,000 to finish this project. The people of our State have to pay that price.

One of Montana's fastest growing industries is microbreweries. It is a real success story, employing a lot of folks and adding value to grains in our State. They are being hit hard by tariffs on aluminum. These emerging businesses have no other option but to pass that cost on to their patrons.

So we are paying both ways, folks. We are paying on the tariffs coming in, and we are paying on the tariffs being put on our products going out.

In agribusiness, for example, everything that is made of steel is going up and going up significantly. From I-beams to cattle guards, to posts for fencing, to metal for storage bins, anything made out of steel is going up significantly. Manufacturers who have been on the rebound since the 2008 financial crisis now have a hard time bidding contracts on materials. Less of their money is going into their pockets, if there is any left at all, because of these tariffs. Every sector of our economy is feeling the pinch of this escalating trade war.

Fair trade is really important. Getting manufacturing back to this country is really important, but it doesn't appear that we are doing those things. Instead, we are putting our existing businesses—whether it is in production or agriculture, construction or manufacturing—at risk with these trade wars.

We should have open markets. Those markets need to go in both directions, but we shouldn't be driving people into bankruptcy in the meantime. That is what is happening.

I ask: What is the end game? If this trade war continues, I had an ag banker tell me that family farms and ranchers have about 18 months before they have to start liquidating. That is the reality we are facing, and that is not very long.

That is the reason why this body needs to understand that we need to send strong messages to the administration that they can't use farms, ranches, and small businesses as bargaining chips. Their livelihoods are on the line.

Earlier this month, I hosted a roundtable discussion on tariffs at the Billings Chamber of Commerce. I was able to meet Montanans eyeball to eyeball,

and I heard their concerns. This is not a political issue. These tariffs aren't targeted toward Democrats or Republicans. They are targeted at everyone. Ag producers at this moment in time are probably carrying the majority of the load. It needs to stop before the damage is irreversible.

My grandparents homesteaded the land that we farm and lived through the 1930s. My folks, who took over the land, took the farm over in the early 1940s and lived through a lot of hard times themselves. My wife and I took the farm over in the late 1970s, and we saw what happened in the 1980s. We have seen what happens in agriculture, where so many of the folks can't make it on the farm anymore, and they have to have jobs off the farm to be able to make the books balance.

These tariffs are making things harder. We have been down difficult paths in this country before. I don't believe we can afford another punch to the gut in rural America. I will continue to fight for and defend the folks who put food on our table, but their bottom lines are being severely, severely impacted by this trade war.

Now look, the legislation we passed last week is a start. The Senate version of the farm bill provides a safety net, but I am here to state that if things continue to go south for our markets, we are going to be faced with a bill that dumps a bunch of money into production agriculture to keep these folks afloat. Why? Because of tariffs that are being put on ag products. It doesn't have to be this way.

We are an equal branch of government. I believe that both Republicans and Democrats can work on this issue in a commonsense way, especially in this body. The administration needs to understand that if they keep continuing down this war of who can put the most tariffs on products, we are going to have a hard time keeping our businesses afloat, particularly our family farms and ranches in this country. That will not help with food security for our country, and the long-term negative impacts of that are unacceptable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it has been a little more than a week since President Trump announced his nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh to fill the vacancy on the Supreme Court left by the impending retirement of Justice Anthony Kennedy. In that short period of time, we have seen some of our friends across the aisle run through an almost impressive set of rhetorical calisthenics in an attempt to tank Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation before it even had a chance to begin.

"He will overturn this case or this law," they claim. "He will not be a check on the President," they have tried to say. They have even suggested that he charged too much for baseball

season tickets on his credit card—horror of horrors. Multiple fact-checkers have debunked each of these claims, so they have moved on.

More recently, we have heard from some of our Democratic colleagues that they want to review every single piece of paper—every email, every memo, every document that has passed across Brett Kavanaugh's desk at any point in his career.

Reviewing relevant and important documents is a perfectly normal part of confirming a judicial nominee, but using that as an excuse to delay, foot-drag, and obstruct is not acceptable. We know that the effort to get every memo from the Bush White House during the time he served as Staff Secretary there is really laughable and is only a fishing expedition designed to delay his confirmation until after the Supreme Court begins its work the first Monday in October.

For example, as Staff Secretary, he would have had the responsibility to basically manage the paper flow across the President's desk. These aren't just documents that he, himself, has generated. In fact, I suspect that with the overwhelming majority of them, he would have had nothing to do with creating them. He wouldn't be the author. He wouldn't be making policy recommendations. Basically, he would have navigated all of the documents that went across the President's desk to make sure that they had been reviewed by the appropriate person and that they would have been checked for accuracy. The ideas that every single piece of paper that went across President George W. Bush's desk should be somehow relevant and that we should delay confirmation until we have all had a chance to read it are ridiculous. Is what President Bush had for dinner 14 years ago relevant to Judge Kavanaugh's fitness to serve on the Supreme Court? Obviously not.

Just as, in 2010, the committee quickly processed Justice Kagan, who spent many years in the Clinton White House, I am confident we can expeditiously and efficiently review Judge Kavanaugh's relevant background materials to make sure the vote on his confirmation occurs before the Supreme Court reconvenes in October.

Under Chairman GRASSLEY's leadership, the Judiciary Committee will work to produce as many documents as are relevant and possible so that every Senator can do their due diligence. An important part of our constitutional responsibility is to provide advice and consent, as the Constitution itself says.

The most important thing to remember is that unlike the Kagan nomination, we have 12 years of service on the bench by Judge Kavanaugh. He served on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals in what has often been called the second most important court in the Nation because it is located in the District of Columbia. Most of the major cases involving huge policy disputes confronting

the Federal Government have made their way through his court, and he has written opinions—majority opinions and dissenting opinions—which have all been reviewed by the U.S. Supreme Court. I submit that would be the best evidence of what kind of Justice he would be on the Supreme Court. What kind of judge has he been on the DC Circuit? That is the best evidence.

We shouldn't indulge requests for these fishing expeditions and paper chases that will lead to nothing other than delay. It is important that the vetting process be deliberative and thorough, and it will be. But the volume of documents requested shouldn't be just a pretext to draw this out for political purposes.

Here is an important factoid: Nearly half of the Democratic caucus has already said that they will vote no on Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation to the Supreme Court. Are they going to be requesting documents? Are they going to be saying "Well, I want to look at everything that came across his desk" when they have already announced their public opposition?

Five of them announced their opposition before Judge Kavanaugh was even named. In other words, they would oppose anyone who is nominated by this President. We saw an attempt to filibuster the nomination of Neil Gorsuch to the Supreme Court, which resulted in the change of the precedent. We lowered the number of votes to close off debate from 60 votes to 51 votes because we realized that some across the aisle were so determined to vote against any nominee of this President—no matter how well qualified—there was no way we could confirm a well-qualified candidate. So we changed that.

Both Justices Sotomayor and Gorsuch were confirmed just 66 days after they were nominated. In the case of Judge Kavanaugh, if that same timetable held up, we would be voting on his confirmation about September 13—well in advance of the October deadline when the Court reconvenes. We will have plenty of time to thoroughly vet this nominee in a similar timeframe, which is consistent with the confirmation process for both Republican and Democratic Presidents.

I had the good fortune to sit down with Judge Kavanaugh last week and to renew my acquaintance with him, which first occurred in 2000. As I have recounted here on the floor, when I was attorney general of Texas, I had the privilege to argue a case in front of the U.S. Supreme Court. As one of the best qualified appellate lawyers in the country, having clerked on the Supreme Court, as well, he was one of the lawyers who helped me get ready for that oral argument.

I had a chance not only to get to know him in 2000 but to follow his career on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. He has consistently impressed me with his thoughtfulness, his deliberativeness, his outstanding legal and

academic credentials, and, of course, his experience on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. He was candid and open, professional and impressive.

I hope all of our colleagues will meet with Judge Kavanaugh to see for themselves. I have been told that he has been making calls to some Democratic Senators' offices, and they refuse to see him at all.

He is an accomplished jurist who will fairly and faithfully apply the law as written and adhere to the text of the Constitution, as judges are obligated to do, and leave the policymaking and the politics to the Congress and the executive branch. I look forward to continuing our vetting process and voting to confirm Judge Kavanaugh this fall—well in advance of the October term of the Supreme Court.

On a separate note, Mr. President, this afternoon, we will vote to confirm another accomplished legal mind, Andy Oldham, to the Federal Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, which includes Texas.

Andy will join two other judges whom we have already confirmed in the Fifth Circuit earlier this year: Don Willett, a former member of the Texas Supreme Court, and Jim Ho, my former chief counsel, someone with impeccable legal credentials. They are already on the Fifth Circuit. I am delighted that Andy Oldham will be joining them.

As we like to say in Texas, Andy wasn't born there, but he got there as fast as he could. He grew up in Richmond, VA, where his parents instilled within him a sense of hard work. His father put himself through college, and his mother was one of the first women to attend the University of Virginia.

Following their examples, Andy attended the University of Virginia and was awarded the prestigious title of Jefferson Scholar. While he was at UVA, he helped found an advocacy group to prevent sexual assault. His group was particularly focused on educating young men on their responsibilities when it comes to sexual violence.

From there, he attended the University of Cambridge as a Truman Scholar, graduated with first class honors, and then went to law school at Harvard—very impressive academic credentials.

During law school, he helped represent a death row inmate in a habeas corpus petition and won a temporary stay of execution in the U.S. Supreme Court. Based on Andy's hard work, the then-Governor of Virginia, who is now a Member of the Senate, commuted the defendant's sentence to life without parole based upon Andy's legal representation.

After law school, he went on to clerk for Judge Sentelle on the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, which I spoke about in connection with Brett Kavanaugh. Then he served as an attorney to the Department of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel; that is, the lawyers for the lawyers at the Department of Justice's

Office of Legal Counsel, who issue authoritative guidance for the Department of Justice. And then, of course, he served as a law clerk for Justice Alito on the Supreme Court.

Following a period of private practice, the State of Texas came calling, and Andy became a deputy solicitor general in the office of the Texas attorney general; then it was Greg Abbott, whom he later followed to the Governor's office, where he now serves as Governor Abbott's general counsel.

On behalf of the State of Texas, Andy has argued two cases before the U.S. Supreme Court and filed countless briefs in support of the State. Because of his background and experience, Andy has earned bipartisan support, receiving recommendations from the general counsel to the Obama Foundation, as well as the Texas attorney general's office.

In his confirmation hearing before the Judiciary Committee, Andy spoke about his transition from a role as an advocate to that of a jurist. He explained how he views the role of a jurist as "fundamentally different," which it is.

He went on to say that "the oath of a jurist is simply to administer justice impartially, to do equal right by rich and poor, and to discharge justice in an equal and fair manner." This is exactly the type of judge we should want serving on our courts—someone who is impartial, not someone who will push for a particular ideology or political agenda on the bench. I believe Andy will follow this philosophy of impartially and fairly administering the law.

Andy spent all but 3 years of his career in public service, and he has advocated on behalf of Texans for many years. I am confident he will continue to serve them and the rest of the country well, and I look forward to supporting his nomination this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Utah.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the confirmation process for Brett Kavanaugh. By any honest measure, President Trump's nominee, Judge Kavanaugh, is exceptionally well qualified to serve on the Supreme Court. When he was nominated to the DC Circuit, he already had stellar credentials, a keen intellect, and an impressive knowledge of the law. He was confirmed to the DC Circuit Court in 2006, following years of Democratic obstruction. I have followed his work closely on that court for over a decade. His judicial record never ceases to impress.

A nominee with such a sterling reputation should receive wide bipartisan support. But over the years, I have seen firsthand the deterioration of the judicial confirmation process. When Justice Kennedy announced his retirement, I knew the Democrats would, again, play politics with the Supreme Court. It is what they have done for more than three decades. It is a matter

of grave concern to me, especially with an eminently qualified nominee. They are casting about looking for something—really, anything—to stop Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation.

Because Democrats want political judges, they politicize the confirmation process. This is what they did to oppose Justice Neil Gorsuch when he was nominated. They took a few cases out of the thousands he had decided and distorted what he had said. They attacked him as being unfit to serve. They said he was unqualified to be a Justice, but Justice Gorsuch had an unassailable record as a principled jurist on the Federal bench.

We fought back against the misrepresentations, the caricatures, and the exaggerations, and the American people saw through the Democrats' ruse. They saw the kind of Justice Neil Gorsuch would be—a Justice who says what the law is, not what he wants it to be, a Justice who respects the separation of powers, a Justice who will stand up to the executive and legislative branches when they overreach. I believe the American people will see the same thing when they look at Judge Kavanaugh.

The debate over Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation should be a debate over his qualifications. Does he understand the proper role of a judge under our Constitution? Does he have the experience needed? Will he respect our Constitution and the rule of law?

With hundreds of opinions, Judge Kavanaugh has built a reputation as being one of the most respected and influential judges in the entire country. His incisive reasoning has led the Supreme Court to adopt his positions in at least 12 cases.

Fidelity to the Constitution and to the rule of law are hallmarks of his opinions. Importantly, his vast body of work shows a deep commitment to the separation of powers. His opinions demonstrate his commitment to the principle that judges should interpret the law, not make it.

Judge Kavanaugh should be asked questions about his rulings and his approach to the law. As a judge, he has developed a reputation for his preparation in court. I have no doubt that he can stand up under the most rigorous questioning.

Yet what we have seen so far is a mix of hyperbole, mudslinging, and distortion. Attacks aimed at Judge Kavanaugh have not focused on whether he is qualified to serve. They have not focused on whether he understands the role of a judge. They have not focused on how he will interpret the Constitution and the laws passed by Congress. When it comes to what we should be asking about a nominee, what we have seen so far is not even in the ballpark.

After scouring Judge Kavanaugh's financial disclosure, progressives thought they had struck gold with a shocking revelation that would, surely, turn public opinion against him. So

what salacious scandal did they uncover? What damning evidence did they find that would dash all hopes of confirmation?

The Presiding Officer is not going to believe this, but they discovered that Judge Kavanaugh enjoys America's pastime. That is right. Judge Kavanaugh loves baseball—horrors. Honestly, I couldn't believe it either. But wait. It gets worse.

Not only does Judge Kavanaugh love baseball, but he was once a season ticket holder at Nationals Park. OK, but here is the real kicker. Judge Kavanaugh bought those season tickets with a credit card—with a credit card of all things. As was the Presiding Officer, I was speechless too. I have been racking my brain all week trying to figure out how a credit card-using baseball fan could slip through the cracks of the White House's vetting process.

Now, I am being facetious to prove a point. We are only 9 days into the confirmation process, and progressive opposition is already beyond parody.

Of course, this is nothing new. Everything we have seen so far comes directly from the Democrats' playbook. Throw every rumor, half-truth, and exaggeration at the nominee, and just see what sticks. When nothing sticks, double down on partisan attacks, take past statements out of context, mischaracterize his positions, and lob a hyperbolic Hail Mary if you have to. Do everything you can to denigrate, disparage, and dehumanize the nominee no matter his qualifications or character.

If Democrats continue down this path, we are going to lose all ability to debate matters of public importance. We cannot expect that all debate will be well reasoned, but opposition should, at the very least, be rational. It should never be hysterical. The rhetoric used to oppose Judge Kavanaugh crosses that line.

Just last week, when speaking about Judge Kavanaugh's impressive resume, I said you could not knock Yale, Harvard, or Georgetown. Maybe I spoke too soon. Shortly after the announcement that Judge Kavanaugh would be the nominee, Yale Law School released a statement with praise of Judge Kavanaugh from professors and administrators.

One professor even noted that "politics have deeply harmed our Supreme Court nomination process," but she lauded Judge Kavanaugh as being a "true intellectual," an "incomparable mentor," and a "fair-minded jurist who believes in the rule of law." She went on to say that "he is humble, collegial, and cares deeply about the federal courts."

The response from some Yale Law School students, staff, and alumni was swift, forceful, uncompromising, and completely ridiculous: "People will die if he is confirmed." As these Yale alumni were feverishly opposing the nomination, Judge Kavanaugh was spotted volunteering his time with a

local charity to distribute food to the poor. His decision to keep his commitment to volunteer the week he was nominated to the Supreme Court says more about Judge Kavanaugh than any letter could.

This overwrought reaction, sadly, comes as no surprise. Crying wolf is the left's trademark strategy in attempts to sabotage Republican nominees. Back in 1990, a group that opposed then-nominee David Souter warned that he was a threat to the "lives, health and livelihoods of millions of women and their families." It wasn't true then, and it isn't true now.

I hope that the Senate can raise the level of debate as we consider the nomination. In doing so, we should focus on whether Judge Kavanaugh is qualified.

I hope my Democratic colleagues can resist the temptation to politicize this nomination as they have with others in the past. Some of what we are seeing now has me worried.

We have also heard a lot from Democrats about how important transparency is to the confirmation process. Because of Judge Kavanaugh's long record of public service to our Nation, the executive branch has been asked to produce a large number of documents. Democrats have been demanding that they be given access to these documents as quickly as possible.

Some of my colleagues have expressed shock that Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein requested that assistant U.S. attorneys help to review these documents. The truth is that the Office of Legal Policy at the Justice Department always assists with nominations, and that Office is composed mostly of career attorneys. It is not uncommon for attorneys from other offices in the Justice Department to help with the review of nominations.

The government attorneys at the Department of Justice who work on nominations are extraordinarily thorough. Given the reportedly large number of documents, it makes sense that to facilitate this process, the DOJ would seek extra help.

When we spoke last week, Judge Kavanaugh said he was proud of his opinions, and he hoped people would actually read them rather than just read about them. I think those who do that will be just as impressed by Judge Kavanaugh's work as I am. I hope Senators will take the time to sit down with him.

Judge Kavanaugh has spent more than 23 years in public service. As a good man, a decent man, and an honest man, Judge Kavanaugh is the type of person we should all hope is nominated to a seat on the U.S. Supreme Court. That is why I am so pleased that President Trump nominated Judge Kavanaugh. I intend to do everything I can to support his nomination, and I hope that all other Senators will do the same.

We have to quit this mudslinging and mischaracterizing of people's characters. Judge Kavanaugh is one of the

finest people I know. He is also one of the smartest. He is conservative—no question about that—but he is honest. To me, these are some of the most important keys to these judgeship positions. I hope we get rid of the unjust representations against the judge. I hope we will start treating the Senate like the great deliberative body it really is.

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

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

(The remarks of Mr. BARRASSO pertaining to the introduction of S. 3229 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. BARRASSO. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last week, President Trump nominated Judge Brett Kavanaugh to serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. People have begun looking over his extensive record, and he has been getting rave reviews around the country. Just look at a few of the headlines we have seen across the country.

The New York Times, July 10: "A conservative stalwart wins praise for his intellect and civility." The New York Times—it is astonishing.

The Wall Street Journal said: "Trump's nominee will be an intellectual leader on the bench."

The Detroit News said his record suggests that "he will maintain a commitment to interpreting the law as it is written, and not how he may wish it had been crafted." That is exactly what Americans should be looking for in a Supreme Court Justice because a judge's job is to apply the law, not to rewrite it.

People looking at Judge Kavanaugh's record and reaching the conclusion that he knows the right way to approach this very important job.

It is not just newspapers that are saying wonderful things and singing the praise of Judge Kavanaugh; legal scholars are lining up to commend his independence and his wisdom as a judge. Some of them are extremely liberal people he has worked with over the years. They just respect him that much as a judge who they find has been devoted to the law and the Constitution. Imagine that. That is what we

should expect in anybody who serves as a Justice on the Supreme Court.

A law professor from Yale wrote an op-ed for the New York Times last week titled “A liberal’s case for Brett Kavanaugh.” The professor called Judge Kavanaugh “a superb nominee” and said that “it is hard to name anyone with judicial credentials as strong as those of Judge Kavanaugh.”

Another liberal law professor called him a “highly qualified mainstream conservative judge.” He cited Judge Kavanaugh’s reasoning as “an example of the judging ideal, setting aside ideology and party politics, and just trying to get the law right.” That is a liberal former law professor. He said Judge Kavanaugh gives “an independent judiciary the job it is supposed to do: Interpret the law.”

There are lawyers who have appeared before Judge Kavanaugh who said the same things. I am not a lawyer, I haven’t done these sorts of things, but I understand there are surveys of lawyers who appear before judges in court, people who have won cases and people who have lost cases. They put up their ideas about what they thought about the judge afterward.

Across the board, they called him “an excellent judge.” They said that he “has a history of excellent legal argument and analysis,” someone who can think intellectually, think clearly, and come up with a legal argument and analysis to make the assessment, to apply the law as written. One lawyer actually said: “It is daunting and humbling to be in front of that brainpower.” This was an anonymous survey of lawyers who appear before Judge Kavanaugh. I don’t know if they won or lost, but people get to put in their opinions, winners and losers, after cases in anonymous surveys. “It is daunting and humbling to be in front of that brainpower.” This wasn’t people just trying to kiss up to the judge to win favor in a case; these are results from people after the case who were just telling it like it is. “Excellent legal judgment,” they say.

If you look beyond the courtroom, people are just as willing to talk about Judge Kavanaugh’s character as a person, not just a judge. That is part of it—to look at somebody’s legal philosophy, their intellect, and their character—when trying to assess a judge who has been nominated, to say: Is this person the right person to be a Justice on the Supreme Court?

The Washington Post even ran a piece by a woman who knows Judge Kavanaugh because he coaches her daughter’s basketball team. She wrote that she was impressed by “his traits of personal kindness, leadership, and willingness to help when called on.”

There are three things I look for in a nominee for the Supreme Court: judicial philosophy, a strong intellect, and a solid character. What we are hearing is overwhelming evidence from people who know him that Judge Kavanaugh has all of these qualities. He is some-

one who takes the law and the Constitution at face value.

The Constitution is a legal document, not a living document, and it was built for certainty. He knows that a judge’s job is to “interpret the law,” not to legislate from the bench, “not to make the law or make policy.” That is what he actually said in a speech last year.

He has an extremely strong intellect, and I can’t imagine there is anyone out there who can deny that. “It is daunting and humbling to be in front of that brainpower”—this is what one of the lawyers who appeared before him said. And he is a person of solid character. That is what we are hearing from people who have known him over the years from being extremely active in the community. The New York Times summarized it: “A conservative stalwart wins praise for his intellect and civility.”

So what is there for Democrats to come to the floor and object to? Why are they objecting to all of this? Why are some Democrats already saying they oppose a judge known for his intellect and civility? They were actually saying it before he was even named by President Trump. Whomever President Trump names, they are going to vote no. It is astonishing to see Democrats making that decision. Then they are asking for reams and reams of documents after they have already said they are against Judge Kavanaugh. What are they looking for? It is amazing.

That is what I believe the big difference is between Republicans and Democrats in Washington: Republican Presidents choose judges and justices to follow the law; Democratic Presidents seem to pick judges and justices who are guaranteed to push liberal policies and liberal agendas, preconceived notions of how they should rule on a case before they hear the facts. They know the way they are going to go, maybe using things like emotion, sympathy, and empathy. The Constitution is a legal document.

Even though you have legal experts from around the political world and around the spectrum of all sides of the aisle who praise his intellect and civility, it is not good enough for the liberal activists in this country. They don’t even want to consider Judge Kavanaugh’s qualifications, and they have said it here on the floor of the Senate and on television, if you listen. They are already making opposition to his nomination a liberal litmus test for Democrats in this Senate, and I am sorry to say that more than a few Democrats seem to be playing along. We have seen Democrats in the Senate who have already said that they don’t care about Judge Kavanaugh’s intellect; they don’t care that he is “just trying to get the law right”; they don’t care that, as one lawyer said, “it is hard to name anyone with judicial credentials as strong as those of Judge Kavanaugh.”

When you have someone with these qualifications, Senators ought to be looking at his record. They should look at the 300 decisions he has written in 12 years on the bench. It is absolutely the right thing to look at. They should meet him and talk with him.

We have just begun this confirmation hearing process. I hope that more Democrats in the Senate will have an open mind about this nominee. I hope they will consider the kind of person we should have on the Supreme Court and then make their decisions about whether Judge Kavanaugh has those qualities. From what I have seen, he absolutely does.

I plan to continue to look into his record and listen to people who know him best. I plan to sit down and talk with him. Everything I have seen so far tells me that this is someone who is exactly the kind of Justice we need on the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, to my colleagues, let me just say that we must speak out and act.

President Trump’s appearance with Russia’s President Putin—a U.S. President capitulating to a strongman dictator, unprecedented in American history—compromised America’s national security and brings into question whether America can be relied upon as the leader of the free world.

With Mr. Trump standing with Mr. Putin while he discredited America’s investigation into Russian meddling—this is an American President, with a dictator, challenging the investigation being done against Russia—the President questioned the conclusions of U.S. intelligence agencies. He left unchallenged Mr. Putin’s lies and illegal military invasions.

In short, Mr. Trump did Mr. Putin’s bidding. In Russia, they are smiling; at the White House, they are scrambling.

Congress must speak out and act. Congress must repudiate the President’s actions to make clear to the American people and the world that Russia, directed by Mr. Putin, attacked our free election system in 2016 and tried to tip the scales in favor of Mr. Trump.

Russia illegally invaded the sovereign state of Ukraine and illegally annexed Crimea, which the United States must make clear we will never recognize. Russia, under Mr. Putin, murders its political opponents and journalists. Russia has interfered in the politics of several European democratic states.

Six months ago, I authored, on behalf of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Democrats, a report entitled “Putin’s Asymmetrical Assault on Democracy in Russia and Europe: Implications for U.S. National Security.”

I sent a copy of that report to President Trump and hoped that he would absorb it and use it in his meeting with

Mr. Putin. Unfortunately, he either didn't read it or didn't heed the advice in that report.

That report spells out in detail the asymmetrical arsenal that Mr. Putin uses. Yes, he uses his military, propaganda, and cyber; he supports organized crime and corruption, weaponizes energy, and supports fringe political groups, all to attack our democratic system of government.

The report spells out numerous recommendations for steps we should take to protect our national security against what Russia is trying to do to us. The report spells out several recommendations I just want to underscore today. We urge the President to assert Presidential leadership and launch a national response, an inter-agency response, so we make it clear that we will not tolerate this.

Mr. Trump has done just the opposite. He has downplayed any significance to what Russia has done, has not allowed us to have a coordinated effort with the executive branch, and has fought what Congress has tried to do in giving him additional resources in order to prepare us against what Mr. Putin is doing.

The report goes on to further recommend that we expose and freeze Kremlin-linked dirty money. The administration has not done that.

It goes on to say that we should subject state hybrid threat actors to an escalating sanctions regime. Here Congress did act. We passed the CAATSA statute, which requires—these are mandatory sanctions against Russia because of what they did to us in 2016 and what they did in regard to the Ukraine and their other activities. This administration has not fully utilized those sanctions that are available under the legislation we passed.

The report calls for publicizing the Kremlin's global malign influence efforts and building an international coalition to counter hybrid threats. Mr. Trump did just the opposite in his most recent foreign trip. In his performance in Brussels with NATO and then later in London, he not only took the opportunity to criticize two of our closest allies, Mrs. Merkel in Germany and Ms. May in London, England—the U.K.—but he also challenged the unity of Europe, weighing in with regard to Brexit and the politics of Brexit. That is not how the President brings unity among our allies in order to stand tall against the threats of Russia.

The report goes on to say that we need to build global cyber defenses and norms. Congress has appropriated funds; the administration has not fully utilized those funds.

We need to hold social media companies accountable. We see the infiltration of Russia into our social media platforms. Europe has already taken action to make sure that it identifies and is protected against infiltration of foreign entities getting involved in trying to influence policy in their country. The United States, under Mr. Trump, has not taken similar action.

First and foremost, we need to recognize Russia for what it is today—not the Russian people, but under the leadership of Mr. Putin, Russia is an adversary. They are against our system of government, and they are trying to bring down our system of government.

I saw the President's tweet this morning, and I just want to acknowledge that we want to have relations with all countries in the world. I want the relationship between the United States and Russia to be on a better plateau, but it has to be under our terms, not Mr. Putin's terms. That is the problem with what the President did in Helsinki. He allowed Mr. Putin to control the dialogue and allowed Mr. Putin to look as though everything he is doing is reasonable when it is not. If you give Mr. Putin space, he will push to fill it, and then he will go even further.

Ten years ago, Mr. Putin saw an opportunity. He saw an opportunity to put a wedge in regard to the NATO expansion and the growth of a unified Western Front. He saw that opportunity in the independent state of Georgia, and he took advantage of that. Russian troops invaded. They are still there today, and Georgia is still not part of NATO.

Mr. Putin's strategy paid off. The Western World gave him that open space; he took advantage of it.

In 2014, Mr. Putin, based upon his experience in Georgia—and also, by the way, based upon his experience in Moldova—said “Well, we can do the same in Ukraine,” and they invaded Ukraine. They took over Crimea; they illegally annexed Crimea, and guess what. Ukraine, today, is nowhere closer to being a NATO ally as a result of Mr. Putin's strategies.

It worked for him, not for us. That is not in our national security interest. The President gives him a pass.

They tried it in Montenegro. Russia financed operations of a coup to try to prevent the parliamentary elections from having a government that would ratify NATO. The people of Montenegro stood up and said no. They fought it, and they won. Now Montenegro is a NATO ally. We can't give this space to Mr. Putin.

Mr. Putin, not just in the United States, but in Europe, interfered in elections. But what happened in 2016 in America? This is a fact; this is not subject to debate. We know that Russia, directed by Mr. Putin, interfered in our elections. That has been confirmed by our intelligence community. It has been confirmed by our own Intelligence Committee here in the U.S. Senate. This is not something that you debate. We know that is a fact. We understand the President has tried to convince the public here in America that may not be true, but those are the facts. We know the facts. We are privy to the facts.

We know that Russia interfered in our elections, but the message from Helsinki, President Trump's message to President Putin, is: OK. Let's move

on. That gives space to Mr. Putin. His calculation: 2018 is fair game. I can do whatever I want in the U.S. elections. After all, I know the President will be on my side and will not hold me, Russia, accountable for interference in the U.S. elections.

That is certainly not in our interest. Congress must speak out and act. We have to protect this country. It is our responsibility. We are an independent branch of government. We need to speak out on behalf of our Nation.

Let me just lay out issues that I hope we will work on not only in response to the President's summit with Mr. Putin but also because it is our responsibility as an independent branch of government to speak out for America.

First, we need to protect the integrity of the Mueller investigation. I am not going to prejudge what the Mueller investigation will come in with. I have confidence that Mr. Mueller will do his work.

Mr. Trump has been openly critical over and over and over and over again about this investigation. It is outrageous that the head of the executive branch of government is trying to compromise the checks and balances in our own system, but we have to make sure that the checks and balances remain. We have to make sure that we protect the integrity of the Mueller investigation.

Congress needs to pass legislation, and there is legislation that has been recommended by our Judiciary Committee that would protect the integrity of the Mueller campaign. We should take up that legislation and pass it immediately.

I said that I will not prejudge what Mr. Mueller will come in with. We know there are people who have been indicted. We know that Russia has been engaged in the election. We know that some Americans were involved.

Was there collusion with the Trump campaign? It will be up to the Mueller investigation to give us those findings. But we do know from Helsinki that Mr. Trump openly colluded with Mr. Putin in regard to an orchestrated message coming out of Helsinki.

Secondly, Congress needs to exercise its oversight capacity with hearings. That is our responsibility.

I was pleased to see that Senator CORKER announced that Mike Pompeo, the Secretary of State, will be before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on Wednesday of next week. This meeting is long overdue.

Let me just remind my colleagues that this meeting is being set up to get our very first briefing on what happened in Singapore in the President's meeting with Kim Jong Un in North Korea. We haven't had a single briefing in Congress on the North Korean summit.

Now we have Mr. Pompeo coming up here for North Korea. I urge Mr. Pompeo and Senator CORKER to make sure that Mr. Pompeo is prepared and has the time not only to address North

Korea but also to address what happened in Helsinki. We have a right, an obligation, to find out.

While we are able to question representatives from the executive branch in regard to Helsinki, let's make sure that we have a chance to talk to Jon Huntsman, our Ambassador to Russia, to get his take, his assessment of what happened. We need to talk to our Director of National Intelligence as to his assessments. We need to have oversight hearings here in Congress.

Most importantly, we need to understand what happened in the room—where it happened—where Mr. Putin and Mr. Trump spent over 2 hours. We have no information about what happened in that room. We have a responsibility as Members of Congress to understand what discussions took place, what commitments in regard to our elections, in regard to Ukraine, in regard to Syria, in regard to North Korea, in regard to Iran. We have a lot of interest in knowing what took place, and we should get that information now. That is our constitutional responsibility. We need to speak out and act to carry out our responsibility.

This is not a partisan issue. This is a constitutional issue of what we do. We are a check and balance in the system. The public expects us to act that way and to get that information.

We should also strengthen the sanctions regime against Russia. I say that mindful that the bill we passed last year, the CAASTA bill—I worked very closely with my colleagues in drafting that bill—provides a whole array of options to President Trump to impose new sanctions against Russia for their activities. Many of these sanctions, by the way, are mandatory. The President has no discretion. I say that with some disbelief because these sanctions have not been imposed yet, even though they are mandatory sanctions.

So Congress needs to speak out and act. We need to speak out to make sure these sanctions are indeed imposed, and we have to make sure we strengthen the sanctions regime, if the President needs more of a reminder or needs additional tools in order to act against Russia. One thing we want to make crystal clear is, we don't want to see the weakening of any of these sanctions. I think many of us know about conversations that took place in the past about Mr. Trump's thoughts about easing up some of these sanctions. We have to make sure that, in fact, they are not.

It was interesting that during the summit, there was a conversation against Mr. Browder about the Magnitsky sanctions that have been imposed by Congress. Browder worked with Senator MCCAIN on that legislation. We have to make sure those sanctions remain in place and are strengthened, not weakened. That is our responsibility to make sure that takes place.

We must also make sure that we protect the integrity of our election sys-

tem. We have appropriated funds for this. There is legislation that is pending by Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle. We now know we are even more vulnerable. We have seen some indictments of late that point out what Russia could be doing in the 2018 elections, which are only less than 4 months away.

One of the fundamental principles of our democracy is our free and fair elections. We have a responsibility to make sure they are free from international tampering and the influence Russia may try to play in this election cycle. We need to take concrete steps to make sure that is done.

Lastly, I suggest that the Senate go on record repudiating President Trump's actions in Helsinki. The Republican leadership should bring to the floor of the U.S. Senate such a resolution. It is our responsibility to consider such a resolution.

By passing such a resolution, we can restore confidence to the American people and to the world that the United States, indeed, is the leader of the free world.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I oppose the nomination of Andrew Oldham to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Oldham is only 39 years old. He checks the Federalist Society box, having been a member since law school of that rightwing legal group that vets all of President Trump's nominees. Mr. Oldham has spent much of his career litigating on behalf of Republican elected officials in Texas State government, where he worked on challenges to the Affordable Care Act, the DACA and DAPA programs, the Voting Rights Act, Fair Housing Act regulations, "Ban the Box" regulations on job applications, and Clean Air Act regulations, among many others.

Mr. Oldham's extreme ideology is apparent from statements he has made in his personal capacity. At his nomination hearing, he refused to say that the landmark Supreme Court case *Brown v. Board of Education* was correctly decided. That was an astonishing moment. Every Supreme Court nominee who has been asked this question has said he or she believed *Brown v. Board* was correctly decided. In recent hearings before the Judiciary Committee, nominees have answered yes to this question without hesitation; yet Mr. Oldham wouldn't answer.

If a nominee refuses to say that *Brown v. Board* was correctly decided, it certainly raises questions in my mind about the nominee's judgment, but that is not all Mr. Oldham has said.

At his hearing, he refused to say whether he agreed that voter discrimination still exists in the United States.

He gave an interview in 2016 where he described the Supreme Court as "the most dangerous branch" and said "they often fail to enforce our sacred rights that are in the Constitution, while creating rights that are not." Keep in mind, this is a Supreme Court where the majority of justices were appointed by Republican Presidents.

He gave a speech to the Federalist Society in 2016 where he said, "I have particular things that I think are illegitimate in the way that we conduct modern American law." He went on to say, "It's not that I disagree with a particular Department of Labor regulation or a particular IRS regulation; it is the entire existence of this edifice of administrative law that is constitutionally suspect."

He also wrote in a law review article that "the Sherman Act, as it is currently understood, is unconstitutional." The Sherman Act is one of our foundational antitrust laws; it prohibits monopolies and restraints of trade.

Mr. Oldham's views are clearly outside the judicial mainstream. His own words and writings show an extreme ideological agenda.

Of course, like all of President Trump's nominees, he has promised he would cast all his views aside if confirmed and simply follow the law. But time after time, we have seen these nominees get confirmed to the bench and then start interpreting the law to produce outcomes that align with their preexisting, Federalist Society-approved views and side with corporations and wealthy elites over working Americans.

Mr. Oldham is ideologically extreme, he has shown instances of terrible judgment, and he has said things that would make litigants question whether he could be a fair and impartial judge. I oppose his nomination.

Mr. CARDIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise to speak to the integrity of the character and the career of Andy Oldham, the President's nominee to be a circuit judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Andy represents the best of what Texas's legal community has to offer to our Federal courts. Andy Oldham was born to high school sweethearts. His parents, like his grandparents before them, knew struggles and knew hard work.

Andy's father was raised in a trailer with four other siblings, and Andy's grandfather spent years away from his family, first fighting in World War II and then in Korea. His mother was raised by her divorced mother, and Andy's mother helped manage the household starting at age 8.

Growing up in these humble beginnings taught both of Andy's parents the value of hard work. His father drove a cement truck and cleaned deep fryers in restaurants to pay his way through college. His mother was one of

the first women to attend the University of Virginia. Together, both enrolled in the Medical College of Virginia, where his father became a doctor and his mother became a dentist.

Andy's parents had enormous student debts to pay, and so Andy learned what it was like to grow up with little as well, but he likewise learned the value of an education from his parents.

Andy went to the University of Virginia on a full academic scholarship, graduating with a perfect 4.0 GPA and at the top of his class. He then became a Truman Scholar and went on to attend Harvard Law School.

Andy graduated from Harvard Law magna cum laude and clerked for Judge David Sentelle on the DC Circuit, one of the most respected Federal appellate judges in the country, and then clerked for Justice Samuel Alito on the Supreme Court of the United States.

He then worked as an attorney advisor for 2 years in the Office of Legal Counsel in the U.S. Department of Justice under the George W. Bush administration.

Andy then went into private practice at Kellogg Hansen here in Washington, DC. From there, Andy went to the Texas solicitor general's office to serve as the deputy solicitor general of Texas. I can state that office is usually a pretty tight ship.

After that, he joined Governor Abbott to serve as his legal counsel. He is now the general counsel for the Governor and has spent all but 3 years of his career in public service.

If I may say, it shows a depth of character and a devotion to his country that Andy would stay in public service for so long, so dutifully, while forgoing the great rewards that come with private practice. He is devoted to the practice of law, and over the years, Andy has displayed a keen understanding of the Constitution and how it applies and guides us to this very day.

I am confident Andy will not substitute his own policy preferences, his own opinions for the rule of law, but he will instead serve the people of Texas and the American people by respecting the law as written—as written in the Constitution and as written in Federal law—passed by this Congress and signed by the President. Our courts and our country are well-served by judges with this dedication, wisdom, and forbearance.

In his career, Andy has argued across the country in State and Federal courts. He has appeared and argued numerous times before the Fifth Circuit, and he has argued twice before the U.S. Supreme Court.

He has earned widespread praise from both Democrats and Republicans, and he was recommended to the Judiciary Committee by esteemed legal voices from both the left and right. Andy is respected across the political spectrum. I know my colleagues in the Senate will return the same respect when they vote today to confirm Andy

Oldham as a circuit judge of the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Andy will be the fifth judge we have confirmed for the Fifth Circuit, one of the finest courts in the country—a court I have been privileged to argue before many times. Andy will be the third Texan and fifth circuit judge in the last year and a half, and that, I think, is one of the greatest legacies of President Trump and this Republican Senate; namely, the confirmation of principled constitutionalists to the Federal court; judges who will be faithful to the Constitution and Bill of Rights, who will stand steadfastly to protect our fundamental liberties, to protect free speech and religious liberty, to protect the Second Amendment, the right to keep and bear arms, to protect the Tenth Amendment, the fundamental liberties of the people against ever-expanding Federal power.

This is a legacy that was front and center as to why the American people elected this majority, and it is a legacy that will benefit Texans and Americans for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, as we all know, in this country, in 2016, the Russian Government weighed a covert, multifaceted criminal campaign to interfere in our elections. We now know it was intended to help then-Candidate Donald Trump win the Presidency. We don't know the full impact of Russia's interference, but it is beyond debate that it happened.

Russia, as we now found out, used inflammatory propaganda—it actually was fake news—attempting to suppress Democratic turnout and boost support for Donald Trump. They also stole communications belonging to the Democratic National Committee and the Clinton campaign, which were then strategically released to maximize their impact. They were released at times when they could counter negative news stories about Donald Trump.

Just last week, 12 Russian intelligence officers were charged with hacking campaign officials' emails and State election boards. In just over a year—in what may rank as the most productive special counsel investigation in our Nation's history—32 people and 3 companies have been charged or pled guilty as part of the Russian investigation. We likely will not know the full extent of Russia's interference until the special counsel's investigation is complete.

But what is clear—and this is what should concern Republicans and Demo-

crats alike—is that our democracy, our great country, was attacked by a foreign adversary. And two days ago, on an international stage, standing shoulder to shoulder with Vladimir Putin, our President sided with that attacker.

Instead of forcefully condemning Russia's attack on our democracy, its role in annexing Crimea, poisoning individuals with chemical weapons on the soil of one of our closest allies, Russia's downing of a passenger airline with nearly 300 innocent civilians onboard, or undermining democracies around the world, our President offered only praise for the authoritarian President Putin. He then repeated his conspiracy theories about the FBI and called the Russia investigation a “witch-hunt”—denigrating our law enforcement institutions, while standing beside the foe they work so hard to protect all Americans from—Republicans and Democrats alike.

In my 44 years as a Senator, I have never seen anything like it. I can think of no Republican President and no Democratic President who would ever do this. I never thought it would be possible in our country before President Trump took office.

Yesterday, the President attempted to walk back his decision to side with Russia over our own intelligence agencies. He attempted to do it because of the criticism he got from both Republicans and Democrats, but as many of my colleagues told me would happen, President Trump walked back his walk back. He reiterated that the interference “could have been other people. There are a lot of people out there.”

This morning on Twitter—where apparently he does his deepest thinking—he claimed that people at the higher ends of intelligence loved his press conference in Helsinki. I do not think anyone here doubts that the President meant what he said and said what he meant in Helsinki. And, after their two-hour private meeting in Helsinki, I do not think President Putin has any doubt either.

We have to know that Russia shares neither our values nor our interests. Russia is not our friend. Of course, we want to see improved relations with Russia on Syria, on nuclear proliferation, and on many critical issues, but for that to happen, Russia needs to respect our democracy and values. We must not slouch down to theirs.

The United States is the leader of the free world. The free world is under threat, as it has so often been. But these threats are not supposed to come from within.

Just moments ago, when asked if Russia is still targeting the United States, the President inexplicably said “no.”

That is not the truth.

Russia is still targeting the United States. This is despite his Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, confirming just last week that Russia is, indeed, still targeting our digital infrastructure and interfering in our democracy. Director Coats compared it to the

warning signs that emerged prior to the 9/11 attacks, but the President denies it is happening.

I know Director Coats. I served with him when he was a Republican Senator in this body. I know he would not say this if it were not so. Notwithstanding the President's saying that Russia is not targeting us, his own Director of National Intelligence says they are. We can't trust this President's judgment when it comes to Russia.

Remember, the President takes an oath to protect and defend our Nation. When it comes to Russia, it appears he does not intend to abide by his oath to defend and protect our Nation. This Congress is going to be derelict in its duty if it takes no action.

All of us have to speak with a single voice in this moment—Republicans and Democrats alike. We should all condemn the President's actions, which were as dangerous as they were shameful.

These condemnations are important, but words are not enough. Remember, Congress is a coequal branch of government. Remember that the Senate is supposed to be the conscience of the Nation. Let's act like it.

The President, obviously, can't be trusted to keep his hands off of the Russia investigation. By denigrating it at every opportunity and by dismissing its lead investigator last year, he has repeatedly failed the test.

The Senate Judiciary Committee recently passed legislation with a strong bipartisan vote. Republicans and Democrats alike voted to protect the special counsel's investigation. That legislation is before the Senate. Let's enact it into law. Let's take what Republicans and Democrats together said in the Judiciary Committee—that we will protect the special counsel's investigation. Let's vote up or down. Let's do it and enact it into law.

It is often said that the only thing President Putin responds to is strength. Let's show him that here in the Congress, we stand united in opposition to his ongoing attempts to attack our democracy. Believe me, they are ongoing right at this moment. Let's pass stronger sanctions targeting him and the oligarchs who enable him, who continue to help him because they become billionaires by doing it. Let's pass a resolution making it clear that if President Trump chooses to stand with President Putin, then he stands alone. The European Union is not our foe. And President Putin is not our friend. Our allies around the world, especially those that have stood with us since World War II, are looking at us at this moment. They are questioning whether the United States will be a reliable partner in the face of creeping authoritarianism, both at home and abroad. Let's show them where we stand.

This is not about politics. It is not about Republicans or Democrats. This is about who we are as a country and what we stand for as Americans—

whether we stand for democracy; whether we stand for freedom, including the freedom of the press; whether we stand for the rule of law; whether we stand for truth; and whether we stand for America. As a Vermonter and a Senator, I know where I stand. It is time we stand together.

BLUE-SLIP TRADITION

Madam President, I believe I have colleagues on the floor who are going to make a unanimous consent request, but before they do, I feel obliged to speak up about the steady erosion of the norms and traditions that protect the Senate's unique constitutional role with respect to lifetime appointments to our Federal courts.

We should all be alarmed by the Judiciary Committee's abrupt change in course when it comes to respect for blue slips, which allow home-State Senators to have a word in what happens. This should concern us all. For much of this body's history, blue slips have given meaning to the constitutional requirement of "advice and consent." They have protected the prerogatives of home-State Senators, and they have ensured fairness and comity in the Senate.

When I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, under both the Bush and Obama administrations, not a single judicial nominee received a hearing without first receiving both home-State Senators' positive blue slips. Regardless of who was in the Oval Office, I steadfastly defended blue slips because I firmly believed in both their constitutional and institutional importance. I also firmly believed in the prerogatives of home-State Senators and the need to ensure that the White House works in good faith with those Senators.

My decision to defend blue slips was not without some controversy. I faced significant pressure from my own party's leadership to hold hearings for President Obama's nominees who had not received positive blue slips from Republican Senators. I was criticized by liberal advocacy groups and major news outlets like the New York Times, but I resisted such pressure because I believed then—and I still believe now—that certain principles matter more than party.

All of us, whether Democrat or Republican, should care about good-faith consultation when it comes to nominees from our own States. The reasons for this are both principled and pragmatic. We know our States. We know who is qualified to fill lifetime judicial seats that will have a tremendous impact on our neighbors and communities.

This week, the Senate will vote whether to confirm a nominee to the Ninth Circuit, Ryan Bounds, opposed by not one but both of his home-State Senators. Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY were cut out of the nomination process entirely. The White House interviewed Bounds and fast-tracked his nomination without consulting ei-

ther senator. If Mr. Bounds is confirmed, it will mark the first time in the history of the Senate that a judicial nominee is confirmed despite opposition from both home-State Senators.

My concern is not about a mere piece of paper. My concern is that we are failing to protect the fundamental rights of home-State Senators, and we are failing in our constitutional duty to provide our advice and consent on a President's nominees. That should concern all of us. The Senate should never function as a mere rubberstamp for nominees seeking lifetime appointments to our Federal judiciary.

Without blue slips, nothing prevents a California nominee from being appointed to a Texas court. Nothing prevents our State selection committees from being completely ignored by the White House. That is what we are seeing today. The Oregon bipartisan judicial selection commission overwhelmingly voted that Mr. Bounds—who misled the commission about his controversial writings—did not deserve its recommendation.

Some may dismiss these warnings, but I have served in the Senate long enough to know that winds tend to change direction. Inevitably, the majority becomes the minority. The White House changes hands. I suspect Republicans will rekindle their love of blue slips if they find themselves in the minority under a Democratic President, as they did under President Obama and during my chairmanship. That is precisely why maintaining a single, consistent policy with respect to blue slips is so critical.

That is why I will vote against Mr. Bounds. If we abandon our longstanding traditions to change partisan expediency, that provides only fleeting advantage and inflicts lasting harm in this body. We are better off when we follow the tradition we always have. We foolishly hurt ourselves and our individual States when we allow ourselves to step away from it. I would urge all Senators to ensure that home-State Senators are provided the same courtesies during the Trump administration that they received from both Republican and Democratic Judiciary chairmen during the Obama administration. I ask my fellow Senators to oppose Mr. Bound's nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I am about to engage in a brief colloquy about a unanimous consent request with my colleague, the Senator from California.

I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the previous order, I be able to have 5 minutes to do that prior to the vote.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 118

Mr. LEE. Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No.

297, S. 118; that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I rise today to express concern with S. 118, the Reinforcing American-Made Products Act, because it would preempt California's strong "Made in America" labeling standards.

California requires that at least 90 percent of a final product be composed of American-made parts to use the label—the strongest standard in the Nation.

This bill would undo California's tough standard, setting instead a watered-down national standard. Companies could then confuse consumers by flooding the market with products sold under the "Made in America" label that were built using more foreign-made components. That is why the California attorney general and the Consumer Federation of California support keeping California's strong standards in place.

The "Made in America" label should promote U.S. manufacturing and give consumers confidence that they are supporting American jobs. Consumers want to know that products bearing the "Made in America" label are truly made in America. Because this would undermine that confidence and preempt California's strong standards, I believe this bill should not move by unanimous consent. Regretfully, for those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments made by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from California.

When Americans see a "Made in USA" label on a product, it is a source of great pride. It represents the American virtues of innovation and industriousness. It is a symbol of support for American manufacturing jobs and high-quality products across the board, and it often spurs American consumers to buy those very products.

The Federal Trade Commission currently enforces a difficult standard for products to claim the "Made in USA" label. It requires that all or virtually all of a product must be made in the United States, and it has issued lengthy guidance documents establishing the rules. However, one State holds a different standard—one that is nearly impossible for businesses to meet. Under California's law, if more than 5 percent of the components of a product are manufactured outside the United States, even if that means just a few bolts or a few screws, then that product cannot be labeled "Made in USA."

While companies could legally boast this claim in 49 of the 50 States under the Federal standards set by the Federal Trade Commission, they are often unable to do so because of the flow of interstate commerce. Most manufacturers sell wholesale to national and international distributors who then disperse products throughout the country. As a result, companies must label products according to the most rigid definition in order to protect themselves from costly litigation. In short, one State—one single State—is effectively governing how interstate commerce is conducted with regard to "Made in USA" labeling throughout the country.

The Reinforcing American-Made Products Act would solve this problem by ensuring that the current Federal definition is the supreme labeling law in interstate commerce without weakening the strong "Made in USA" national standard. In addition to upholding the Constitution, which empowers Congress—this body—to regulate interstate commerce, this legislation would provide clarity and consistency, which would help American companies avoid unnecessary hardships and frivolous lawsuits.

In the global marketplace, it is increasingly difficult for small American companies to stay afloat, let alone to compete. This reform would ultimately encourage manufacturing in America and use American tools and resources. It would also help so many of the small businesses and ordinary American workers who are currently being left behind, and helping them ought to be our goal.

This bill passed unanimously out of committee, and it has broad bipartisan support. I am disappointed that it is being blocked by the few people who do not support it when it could benefit all 50 of our States. We should exercise this authority, and we should open the flow of interstate commerce.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander
Barrasso

Blunt
Boozman

Burr
Capito

Cassidy	Hatch	Portman
Collins	Heller	Risch
Corker	Hoeven	Roberts
Cornyn	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cotton	Inhofe	Rubio
Crapo	Isakson	Sasse
Cruz	Johnson	Scott
Daines	Kennedy	Shelby
Enzi	Lankford	Sullivan
Ernst	Lee	Thune
Fischer	McConnell	Tillis
Flake	Moran	Toomey
Gardner	Murkowski	Wicker
Graham	Paul	Young
Grassley	Perdue	

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

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 Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Bob Corker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, 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. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 161 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Alexander	Flake	Paul
Barrasso	Gardner	Perdue
Blunt	Graham	Portman
Boozman	Grassley	Risch
Burr	Hatch	Roberts
Capito	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Corker	Inhofe	Scott
Cornyn	Isakson	Shelby
Cotton	Johnson	Sullivan
Crapo	Kennedy	Thune
Cruz	Lankford	Tillis
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 49. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 572

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 572; that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Oregon.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3227

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this moment hardly seems the time for the Senate to engage in debating rhetorical phrases of praise for the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency when that agency—better known as ICE—is deeply mired in the scandal of separating children from their parents. It is ICE that partnered with Border Patrol and Health and Human Services in this

diabolical situation. It is ICE that holds the parents in detention camps. It is ICE that has failed to arrange for the knowledge within the system of which parents go with which children. It is ICE that often has prevented individuals from having access to counsel, from being able to even phone their children, and charged them for using the phone.

In this situation, some 2,500-plus kids have been torn out of the arms of their parents, and this particular resolution would engage in nice phrases of praise instead of addressing itself to solving the problem.

We should right now be considering Senator HARRIS's act, the REUNITE Act, which would accelerate the reunification of the children, would ensure that family separation never happens again, would coordinate actions between ICE and the Border Patrol and Health and Human Services, and would set up a family case management system that worked, according to the IG of Homeland Security, to deliver 100 percent of the time when individuals had a date for a hearing—100 percent of the time.

That is why I ask my colleague to modify his request so that the Committee on the Judiciary, instead, be discharged from further consideration of S. 3227, the REUNITE Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Montana so modify his request?

Mr. DAINES. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Is there objection to the original request?

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. I strongly object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I live in a State—the State of Montana—that has a northern border. ICE agents keep our border secure, and I want to thank them for the very important work they are doing.

Far too many people are coming into our country illegally and putting the safety and security of American citizens at risk. In fact, in Montana, the effects of unsecured borders are very personal. All across our State, communities at this moment are torn apart by the meth and opioids that are trafficked through the southern border. In fact, just last year, ICE seized nearly 50 tons of narcotics, nearly a million pounds of heroin, fentanyl, and other deadly drugs that criminals and cartels are smuggling into our country.

At a time when America is suffering from a drug epidemic, how many more lives would be lost if ICE agents were not protecting our borders? How many

more innocent Americans would be harmed or murdered if we did not have ICE agents to arrest illegal immigrants with criminal convictions? These are the questions that those who call for the abolishment of ICE should be asking.

It is outrageous. It is irresponsible to call for abolishing one of our country's most critical security measures. Abolishing ICE would give terrorists, gang members, drug dealers, and other criminals a field day.

I stand for protecting American security. I stand for upholding the rule of law. That is why I stand with ICE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, this resolution being offered by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle is a partisan political stunt to distract the American people from the crisis created by Donald Trump's zero tolerance policy.

Almost 3,000 children were ripped from the arms of their parents and traumatized by the President's cruelty.

Yesterday, the Senate Judiciary Committee had a closed-door briefing with officials from the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Department of Homeland Security. The American people deserve to hear from these officials in public and under oath. All these officials provided at this briefing—not under oath—was more obstruction and obfuscation. The witness from Immigration and Customs Enforcement even claimed that they “did not mess up here.”

Separating almost 3,000 children from their parents, not meeting judicially set deadlines for reunifying these children—the trauma continues. Is there anybody in America paying attention to this issue who actually believes there was no mess-up?

We need a public hearing to hear from these officials under oath.

Donald Trump is weaponizing fear to pursue his anti-immigration agenda, and we are not going to be party to that. We should be focused like laser beams on reuniting the children with their parents.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator from Hawaii yield?

Ms. HIRONO. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to thank the Senator from Hawaii for joining in this statement about the agency of ICE, which is in the Department of Homeland Security.

There are certain things that I think Democrats and Republicans can come together to agree on. Let me tell you what I think they are. Border security—the United States needs security at its borders. There is no question about that, whoever the President may be.

The second thing we agree on is, nobody who is dangerous should be allowed to come to this country. Anyone

here who is undocumented and dangerous should leave, should be removed. We all agree on that, do we not?

The third thing, which 68 Senators agreed on, is comprehensive immigration reform. Our immigration laws are a mess—an absolute mess. That is why we continue to debate the topic, and 68 of us came to vote on a bipartisan measure 5 years ago to fix the whole system. It passed the Senate and died in the House.

Where are we today? We are here today debating on the floor the future of ICE. There are parts of the function and responsibility of this agency of ICE that all of us would agree on. ICE has important responsibilities combating serious criminal activities, like smuggling, bulk cash, drugs, weapons, human trafficking, violent criminals and others who would do us harm, and enforcing immigration laws against terrorists. There is no argument about that. But what has become controversial is the Trump administration's new immigration policy.

You see, we don't have the resources to deport 11 million undocumented people nor do we have the resources to arrest all who present themselves at the border. What this administration has done, though, is say that they are going to criminalize—charge as criminals—everyone who shows up at the border. By doing that, they take limited resources and focus them on a mass of people, most of whom are no threat at all to the United States, instead of focusing their resources on the drug smugglers, the traffickers, the would-be terrorists. Those are our priorities for the safety of our homes, our families, and our communities, are they not?

Here we have this resolution that was brought to the floor to commend ICE in all its functions. I can just tell you, I don't join in that resolution. I specifically don't join in it when it comes to the President's zero tolerance policy.

It became the policy of the Trump administration and the U.S. Government to forcibly remove 3,000 children from their parents. That is bad enough, is it not? The notion that you take a baby out of the arms of a mother—a toddler, an infant—separate a young child—we did it under President Trump's zero tolerance policy.

Now let me state what added insult to that injury. At that point, there was no effort made to make certain we could reunite the parents with the children. Time and again, we would meet downstairs for a briefing from ICE and other agencies, and they would tell us: We don't know where the parents are. We really don't know where the kids are. We are going to have to go looking.

Imagine separating up to 3,000 children from their parents, and the U.S. Government did not keep a record of what happened to those kids. Ship something by UPS—they give you a tracking number. Go online, and you

can track that package wherever it may be. Order a pizza from Domino's. Call them after 15 minutes and ask: Where is the pizza? They will tell you. Check your coat at a restaurant before you go to the table. When you come back and hand them that little piece of paper, they give you your coat. It is pretty simple, is it not? But when it came to children and families, this agency, ICE, along with other agencies of this government, lost them. In one agency in Chicago, they told me that the search for the parents of the little kids they had was like a scavenger hunt. They just started calling right and left to try to figure out where the parent might be.

Yesterday, we had a briefing, and finally these agencies came up with some numbers. There are 2,550 children still in our custody who are not reunited with their families; 1,800 parents we haven't linked up with their children. And we want to put a resolution on the floor to commend this activity—to praise them for their great work? Not me.

They do good work in a lot of important areas, and I will be happy to join in that chorus. But we stand here and ignore the obvious—that this zero tolerance policy has given our Nation a black eye, has raised questions about our values as Americans, has created situations we cannot morally defend, such as separating children from their mothers.

Do you know what the American Academy of Pediatrics tells us? The doctors tell us it is an institutional form of child abuse to remove these children.

I have seen them, these poor kids, 5 and 6 years old in these settings. The place I visited in Chicago was doing its best to help the children, but two little girls walked into the room where I was sitting. They were holding hands—cute little kids. It was my opportunity to meet about 10 or 12 kids who were separated from their parents under the zero tolerance policy.

These two little girls were holding hands, and I thought they were sisters. We asked in Spanish. “No, amigas,” she said. They had become friends to one another.

It turns out that the one who was 5 years old was from Guatemala and the one who was 6 years old was from Chiapas, Mexico. They were holding on to one another. All they had was one another because our government had separated them from their mothers.

Now this agency is struggling to find these mothers. In some circumstances, they cannot even link up the children with their parents.

No, I am not going to join in a resolution of congratulations for the work they have done. Many of the things they have done have been courageous and important for the security of this country, but when it comes to the zero tolerance policy, it is not.

I do want to make one last point. Listen to what the top agents at ICE's

Homeland Security Investigations agency, which focuses on serious transnational criminal activity, had to say. Last month, a majority of the agents focusing on transnational criminal activity wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security, Kirstjen Nielsen, asking that Homeland Security Investigations be removed from ICE because of “the political nature of civil immigration enforcement.”

These are men and women who are focusing on serious crimes, and they asked to be removed from ICE. They are tired of the politics. I am weary of it as well.

We need to start solving these problems—border security, dangerous people kept out of this country and removed, comprehensive immigration reform. And for goodness' sake, reunite these children with their parents.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise in support of the brave men and women of our Immigration Customs Enforcement agency. These are law enforcement officers who risk their lives every day to keep this country safe.

Rising in support of law enforcement used to be a bipartisan issue. It used to be an issue that brought us together, that unified us. Sadly, as we have seen in the preceding minutes, that is no longer the case.

I rise today to urge my Democratic colleagues to say no to the reckless and radical voices within their party that are pulling their party so far out of the mainstream and so far out of touch with the American people that it is barely recognizable. For a long time, when Democrats were debating immigration issues, they used to say “Well, of course, we support enforcing the laws,” almost as an obligatory throw-away. Instead, we are here today, debating the abolishing of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, the exact antithesis of where most congressional Democrats claimed they were. All of this started because a few weeks ago, a longtime Democratic incumbent, a Member of the House, found himself beaten in a primary in New York State by an avowed socialist. As a result, many of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle are suddenly terrified of their left flank. Because her campaign focused on abolishing ICE—abolishing the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, more incumbent Democrats have said that they, too, are open to abolishing ICE.

I call on this body to pull back from the abyss. On immigration there are areas of good-faith disagreement that this body has debated and will continue to debate. I have long characterized my views on immigration as being able to be summed up in four words: legal, good; illegal, bad. I think the vast majority of Texans and the vast majority of Americans agree with that. There

are a host of immigration policies that ought to be commonsense bipartisan policies.

The Presiding Officer has shown great leadership in fighting against sanctuary cities, fighting against jurisdictions that defy Federal immigration law and that release violent criminals without being willing to turn them over to immigration officials. Those violent criminals, in turn, go on far too often to commit even more violent crimes.

I am the author of Kate's Law, a commonsense proposal which says that aggravated felons who repeatedly enter the country illegally should face a mandatory minimum prison sentence. It was named for Kate Steinle, a beautiful young woman, 28 years old, murdered on a California pier by an illegal immigrant who had been deported over and over and over again and had been in and out of jail over and over and over again and had multiple felony convictions. Yet, because San Francisco is a sanctuary city, they released him yet again, and he committed murder.

Kate Steinle would be alive if we could come together on Kate's Law, if we could come together on ending sanctuary cities. Yet it turns out that in today's hyperpolarized world, even that is not extreme enough for the modern Democratic Party. Multiple leaders of their party are advocating abolishing the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency.

What does ICE do? ICE men and women—I have met with a great many of them in my home State of Texas. I have met with a great many Border Patrol agents. I have joined them on their midnight muster. I have gone out on patrol with them as they risk their lives securing our border and risk their lives keeping us safe in the interior.

Criminal aliens arrested by ICE in fiscal year 2017 were responsible for more than 76,000 dangerous drug offenses; yet many Democrats are saying: Abolish their role. They were responsible for over 48,000 assault offenses. They were responsible for over 11,000 weapons offenses. They were responsible for over 5,000 sexual assault offenses. They were responsible for over 2,000 kidnapping offenses, and they were responsible for over 1,800 homicide offenses.

Yet the approach of the modern Democratic Party is not to find a reasonable, commonsense common ground. It is, instead, to say: Abolish the agency that has arrested criminals responsible for over 1,800 murders.

When it comes to drugs—the volume they are dealing with in fighting the narcotics traffickers—ICE in fiscal year 2017 seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics. ICE seized approximately 2,370 pounds of fentanyl, approximately 6,967 pounds of heroin. Yet, today, too many elected Democrats are afraid that they, too, might face a socialist primary and that their far left is so angry, hates President

Trump so much, that their position is not that we should enforce the immigration laws; their position is not that they will stand with law enforcement. Their position has become to abolish the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency, the agency charged with enforcing our immigration laws.

This is not a reasonable position and a public policy debate upon which reasonable minds might differ. There are many of those in the immigration world. This is not one of them. This is a radical and reckless position.

Yet, this resolution—by the way, this resolution says not a word about the issue of family separation. We have heard some of the speeches from my Democratic colleagues focused on family separation. I can state that every Member of this body, Democrat and Republican, agrees that families should not be separated.

Indeed, I have introduced legislation to prohibit family separation, to ensure that children stay with their parents—the best place for a kid is with his or her mom or dad—but to do so in a way that also respects the rule of law, that doesn't return to the failed policy of catch-and-release that only encourages more and more illegal immigration, that only puts more and more children—little boys and girls—in a position of being physically and sexually assaulted by human traffickers.

No one who cares about humanity, no one who cares about compassion should want to incentivize putting little children in the control of global, transnational drug cartels and human traffickers.

For the past several weeks, I have been negotiating with Democratic Members of this body, trying to see if we could reach common ground to unite and say that we will not separate families, but at the same time, we will respect the rule of law and not return to catch-and-release in a way that incentivizes illegal immigration.

We will find out if any Democrats are willing to find common ground. All 100 could join together on ending family release and ending it today, but too many on the Democratic side want to condition ending family release on essentially mandating the release of every illegal alien in custody—those apprehended with children, mandating their release. That is not a reasonable position. That is not a position the American people support, and, critically, this resolution before the Senate says not a word about it.

This resolution does not address that question. Instead, this resolution says that those ICE agents—the ICE agents who right now may be kicking down the door on a meth house and facing violent drug lords, firing weapons at them, risking their lives to keep us safe—we stand with those law enforcement agencies, even if we may disagree on the parameters of illegal immigration.

I am one who believes we should welcome and embrace legal immigrants—

those who follow the rules and wait in line like my father in 1957, when he came as an immigrant from Cuba seeking freedom. Those are debates we can have.

We ought to be coming together in the spirit of bipartisan agreement to stand with law enforcement. I call upon the responsible members of the Democratic Party—and, surely, there must be some left. Surely, in the Democratic Party, there are some voices that are willing to stand up to the reckless and radical left and say: No, we should not abolish the agency charged with enforcing our immigration laws, charged with protecting us from vicious and violent criminals.

The fact that Senate Democrats are today objecting to this resolution shows just how captive they are to the fury that rages against President Trump.

Everyone in this Chamber has, at one time or another, had something the President has said or done that we all disagreed with. That is part of the political process, but the rage and fury on the far left is a qualitatively different matter. It is a rage that is demanding Democrats to go after, to undercut, to attack law enforcement agents who keep us safe. That is a mistake. It is a disservice to this institution. It is a disservice to the legacy of many distinguished Senators and a disservice to the American people and the Constitution that we are sworn to protect.

I urge this body to pass this commonsense resolution, standing with law enforcement, enforcing our borders, and stopping violent criminals, murderers, kidnappers, and rapists that ICE arrests every year. Abolishing law enforcement puts all of us at peril. I call upon my Democratic colleagues to reject that radical and reckless position.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, this Senator came to talk about trade, and I am going to do that, but I think what we have is an example of extremes in politics that is on display before us.

I think, on the one hand, political points are trying to be scored about the abolition of certain law enforcement organizations. On the other hand, there are the political points that a government, especially our government, should not have a policy of separating children from their parents, unless the parents have committed a crime and need to be incarcerated for the purpose of that crime.

Here we have the extremes again going to either side, when, in fact, if there were good will, if there were not such a highly polarized, highly charged, partisan atmosphere, in part, as we say in the South, egged on by various Members of the leadership in the Congress as well as the Executive—if we didn't have all of that, we could get a lot more done.

The genius of American politics is for us to be able to come together, to respect each other, to understand the

other fellow's point of view, and then work out our differences.

It is the same thing on the international stage. That is why we see it is so difficult to reach international agreements when people have gotten hardened into positions because of race or religion or political balance.

So if you note a tone of sadness in this Senator's voice, then you are correct because, again, we are seeing the polarization of American politics.

Why can't we have a law enforcement organization that also doesn't have to operate under a policy of separating children from their parents? That is the commonsense point of view, but, no, we devolve into these extremes.

TARIFFS

Mr. President, I came to talk about trade.

Is the United States taken advantage of by other countries? You bet and especially China. We have been letting them get away with it for years, but you don't try to correct that situation by suddenly saying, I am going to impose a tariff, as the President has, on imported steel and aluminum: 25 percent on steel and 10 percent on aluminum.

What happens then is, for the people who use those products in manufacturing, whatever their business is, that is going to cause the cost of those goods to go up. The consumers are going to be the ones who get hurt. By the way, what that is going to do, again, is the extreme. If you do this, the person who is offended is going to do this and do it more.

That is exactly what is happening in this trade war that is suddenly starting to hurt all of us. In reaction to steel and aluminum tariffs that the United States has imposed, good friends of ours, major trading partners of ours—I am keeping China in a different category. I am talking about the European Union; I am talking about Canada, one of our closest friends; and I am talking about Mexico. In retaliation for what we are doing to them, they are now retaliating and putting tariffs on other goods. They are putting tariffs on everything, not only for steel and aluminum but from washing machines to lobster, whiskey, and cheese.

We are starting to see the consequences of these moves. People are starting to hurt. This Senator has heard from many businesses in his State that are starting to get hurt. In Florida, we are seeing the harmful effects of these tariffs. Mind you, it is not just the Budweiser Brewery that I visited several months ago in Jacksonville that produces 3.3 billion aluminum cans a year. Of course, the cost of those cans are going to go up, and it is going to be the consumer who pays, but it is going to affect others in the restaurant industry, the medical device industry, the marine manufacturing industry, and the auto parts industry.

Let me tell you about the cost of these auto parts that we have to im-

port and those made here domestically. Because of the increased costs of steel or aluminum, the cost of those parts are going up. Maybe the dealer that services your car and replaces parts is one thing, but what about the individual entrepreneur, like the auto mechanic shop that has to buy its parts that all of a sudden has to charge more? The big guys that deal in many more automobile repairs can spread that cost over a lot of people, but that poor individual auto mechanic shop is getting hurt. It is happening right now, and they are losing business.

Take, for example, the marine manufacturing industry. Manufacturing boats is a big industry in Florida. It is worth \$121 billion a year in Florida, which is 650,000 jobs in Florida and tens of thousands of downstream jobs in Florida and nationwide. The industry in our State alone provides over \$10 billion in annual economic activity. All of those businesses are really getting hurt because the European Union, Canada, and Mexico—three big export markets for the boat manufacturers—are getting orders cut because of the retaliatory tariffs of 25 percent from the European Union. They are not going to sell any more boats to European customers if they have to pay an extra 25 percent. They will go elsewhere where they can get it cheap, and that means 10 percent extra costs in Canada; 15 percent in Mexico.

What is that going to do? There are jobs in that boat manufacturing industry that will go away. They are brands that you might recognize like Nautique, Bryant, and Bass Cat. They are all brands of one company, Correct Craft, that I visited in Orlando this week. They manufacture boats and engines in factories across the country, with their headquarters in Orlando.

The President's tariffs have increased the production costs considerably because of the cost of aluminum and steel that goes into those boats. To add insult to the already existing injury, they are being hit with these retaliatory tariffs from other countries where they sell their goods.

There is no sugarcoating it. We are in the midst of a full-blown trade war. If this thing gets out of control, it can take us into an economic recession like the Smoot-Hawley tariffs did in the recession that led to what is known as the Great Depression. If we continue down this path without an exit strategy, we are going to regret it.

Already, our boat manufacturers in Florida have lost tens of millions of dollars in canceled orders. Regal Marine Industries had \$4 million worth of orders fall through. The company estimates it will lose \$13 million this year because of these tariffs, and that will wind up costing people their jobs. It is no small thing.

This is what happens when you get excessively extreme, when you get partisan, when you act like you know it all, when you improvise your way through a complicated world and don't

have a well-thought-out plan of how to get out of this mess. Again, with bipartisan consensus, it is the nature of the politics that we have to rein in.

There is also the story of Micro Stamping, which is the sole supplier of high-grade surgical equipment. That equipment is used in the treatment of breast cancer. Micro Stamping is contemplating shutting down because the President's trade moves are stopping it from getting the specific type of steel it needs to manufacture the equipment.

What about Hale Products? It is up in Ocala. It is also being crushed by the tariffs. It makes fire suppression equipment. Since the cost of the tariffs is passed down to the end consumer, it says the tariffs will make it harder for municipal fire departments—that are already facing stiff budget constraints—to buy the new, lighter weight lifesaving firefighting equipment. This will have repercussions beyond the company's immediate business needs.

It is worth noting that what is going on is doing lasting damage to our strategic alliances. The U.S. Government—this executive branch—is treating our friends like enemies and is giving comfort to our adversaries. This is no way to run a country. We should be working with our allies to address our global challenges. We ought to be advancing our shared interests, not just in trade but in national security and a range of things.

Before we escalate these things and they get out of hand, we need to think a little bit more about what we are doing, why we are doing it, and if we are doing it the right way. This Senator is saying we are not doing it the right way. What we are doing is sending a message that America is closed for business. I don't think that is what we want to do.

I urge my colleagues to join this Senator in shining the light of day on the hard truth of what happens when you go along and make things up without having a clear plan for success, which is exactly what this trade war right now is a product of. That kind of approach doesn't work for the USA; it doesn't work for Florida; and it doesn't work for the vast majority of hard-working everyday Americans. I think it is time to come to our senses.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Missouri. COMMEMORATING THE NEGRO NATIONAL LEAGUE

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, last night, the Major League Baseball All-Star Game was hosted in Washington. In conjunction with that game, the Negro Leagues Baseball Museum hosted an event to honor the Homestead Grays, which was one of the teams from that league. There were great teams in that league. The Homestead Grays had won the Negro League World Series in 1943, which was 75 years ago. They had a great exhibit here in town about that team and about the history of that league.

The museum, which was founded in 1990, is located in Kansas City, MO. It is dedicated to highlighting and preserving that important part of our sports history—the history of African-American baseball. Bob Kendrick runs that museum, and it is a museum I would encourage all of my colleagues to visit as the All-Star Game was in Kansas City a few years ago, and it was one of the venues for Major League Baseball.

When people are in Kansas City, playing the Royals, managers and coaches often take their players there—players who haven't been there before and players who want to go back—just for them to have a sense of what it was like when there was the segregation of baseball and also some of the great players who played there. The chairman of the board, Stewart Myers, was here yesterday, and the vice chairman, Adam Sachs, was here yesterday.

The museum is actually expanding and building the Buck O'Neil Research and Education Center on the Paseo in Kansas City. Buck O'Neil was a great Kansas Citian, but he had also been a great part of Negro Leagues Baseball. In June of this year, vandals broke into the YMCA, on which a lot of money had already been spent. It was where that part of the museum, the research center, was going to be housed. The vandals did more damage than they should have been able to do, and, unfortunately, there was some water damage in the building. Yet that effort continues.

The Negro National League was created there in 1920 at that Paseo YMCA. There was an owners meeting, and the owners decided, It is time we really put more of a structure into this league. So they established a league. Before 1920, these African-American teams barnstormed around the country and played whomever they could play. After 1920, they could still barnstorm, but there was a league, there was a league championship, and there was a structure they had not had before.

In 1947, as every baseball fan knows, the Brooklyn Dodgers decided to integrate baseball, and Jackie Robinson, who had played for the Kansas City Monarchs, was the first player to step into that challenge of integrated baseball. The league lasted another 13 years or so. I think the last team finally folded in the early 1960s.

Some of the greatest baseball and the most exciting baseball ever played was played in this particular league—names like Satchel Paige, who said about himself that he was so fast he could turn off the light in the bedroom and be in bed before it got dark. He was a great pitcher, and he was a great runner. Buck O'Neil, Satchel Paige, Cool Papa Bell, Jackie Robinson, and 100 other names in that last 3 years of the 1940s who joined the Major Leagues are all part of that story.

Missouri teams were an important part of that story. The Monarchs

played for 37 seasons, and I already mentioned that Jackie Robinson played briefly for the Monarchs before he went to the Dodgers. They won a dozen league championships. They sent more players than any other team to the Major Leagues. The St. Louis Stars, who were on the other side of our State—originally the St. Louis Giants—played 12 seasons. They won the league championship in 1928, in 1930, and in 1931.

The real focus of the exhibit here this week was on the Homestead Grays. Now, where did the Homestead Grays come from? I think I already mentioned they were celebrating the 75th anniversary of winning the Negro League World Series in 1943. The Homestead Grays were originally based in Homestead, PA, just outside of Pittsburgh.

In 1940, in 1941, and in 1942, they played at least half of their games here in Washington. When the Washington Senators were traveling, the ballpark would be available, and the Homestead Grays would play games there. By 1943, they were playing about two-thirds of their games in Washington and generally had more people at their games than the Washington Senators had at their games. They won nine consecutive league pennants from 1937 through 1945.

There was even an effort, when the Nationals team was brought here, to call the Nationals the Washington Grays because of that tremendous team that had played here. The team owners chose the Nationals because it was one of the Washington Senators' official nicknames. That is an important part of our history right there, and we are going to be celebrating the 100th anniversary of that league in 2020.

I and Congressman CLEAVER, who is on the other side of this building, are looking at ways to draw more attention to this great part of our story. It is sad because of the segregated elements of it, but it is a great story because of the entrepreneurship and the sportsmanship and the competitive nature of that league.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BLUNT. I can tell the Senator is interested. I am pleased to yield.

Mr. NELSON. Indeed, this Senator is interested. Would you believe that a lot of those retired players who are still living happen to live in Florida?

Mr. BLUNT. Right.

Mr. NELSON. Further, as the Senator correctly pointed out, once Jackie Robinson was able to break into the majors in 1947, it would be another 11 years—1958—before the last team in the Major Leagues integrated. Would you believe, for all of that period of time, these great baseball players who have contributed so much had no pensions?

Further, it was years later in this Senate—in the last decade—that, finally, the Commissioner of Baseball was brought in front of the Commerce Committee in order to face the music

about the fact that the retired players who had not played in Major League Baseball but in the old Negro leagues in America—because they couldn't get into Major League Baseball, even while the rest of the teams were being integrated, which took 11 years—had no pensions. Would you believe that Major League Baseball, through Bud Selig, finally agreed to give them onetime pension payments?

This Senator is so grateful because that has helped so many of the residents in my State who are these great players. Senator BLUNT has so accurately described their considerable talents on the baseball field.

Mr. BLUNT. I think that is an important part of the history.

There were a couple of players there last night who had played in the league, and of course there are fewer of those players all the time. I have had a chance, as you have had, to meet and talk to them over the years—to talk about the excitement of that kind of baseball and their ability to entertain both with their sportsmanship as well as just with their talent as sportsmen.

I think it was a great league, and it is a great story. I don't know if the Senator has had a chance to go to the museum in Kansas City, but as a guy who knew those players and appreciates what that league was all about, I would certainly love to go there with the Senator sometime.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator will yield, as a matter of fact, I am looking forward to seeing that museum.

It was one of the Senator's players on the Kansas City Monarchs—"Peach-Head" Bob Mitchell, retired, who was living in my State—who brought to the attention of his Senator the inequity that had occurred in their never getting pensions, even though they were certainly capable of getting into Major League Baseball but, because of segregation, could not.

Mr. BLUNT. I am looking forward, along with others, to celebrating that century of history. It is an important part of the story to be told, and I am glad the Senator has helped add to it here today.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, I also want to talk for a few minutes about the importance of getting the appropriations bills to the Senate floor, and I want to do that by talking about the opioid epidemic.

Our annual opportunity to look at that is legislative—legislative in terms of deciding how to spend money as we try to deal with this epidemic that claims more lives than any other single accidental cause of death. For a long time, car accidents predominated that list, but in virtually every State in the country, more people die now from drug overdoses than die from car accidents.

There are people of every age, such as the high school cheerleader in my hometown of Springfield, MO, who hurt her leg and got medicine for that leg injury. I think it was after 3 years of

struggling with addiction that her mother found her dead in the bedroom from an overdose.

Every age, every race—there are stories of incredibly successful people who received from the doctor or the dentist more pain medicine than they needed. It is not because that is what the doctor or the dentist intended to do. Doctors and dentists in the 1970s and 1980s were told: This is nonaddictive. There is no reason for people to have pain.

People could take these opioid-based painkillers and not have pain. That part was true. The part that wasn't true was the nonaddictive part. And the part that wasn't true was what you would do when the doctor was no longer giving you that medicine or you could no longer act like you were getting the medicine because of pain when, by then, you were getting it for some other reason.

The appropriations bill that our committee has voted out and that we are eager to get to the floor includes \$3.7 billion targeting the opioid epidemic. It is a 1,300-percent increase over where we were 4 years ago. Congress has become more aware of not only how widespread the epidemic is but also the incredible human cost of the epidemic.

The bill includes almost half of that money, \$1.5 billion, for State opioid response grants. One reason we are doing this with grants is we really don't know all of the options yet, and we haven't been able to evaluate the best ways to deal with this. We do feel in our committee and in Congress that it is unlikely that the best way to deal with this in one place is necessarily the best way to deal with it in other places.

My State of Missouri received \$10 million last year. We will receive \$28 million this year if this grant funding is approved, and other States will go up proportionately, exactly as we did.

What did we do with that money in our State of Missouri to see how we could deal with this epidemic? More than 1,700 people have received evidence-based medical treatment for opioid-use disorder; 1,700 people in the last 12 months or so have received that. More than 4,300 kits of naloxone, which is what you take when you overdose, have been distributed. That is less effective sometimes than it used to be because of fentanyl, and people don't have any idea, when they are trying to help you with what you put into your system—and you don't either—so, occasionally, you will get that shot to relieve you from the overdose and think that has helped, and then suddenly what you have put into your system overwhelms even that normal cure if you get it on time. “Cure” might be the wrong word because all it does is save you that one time.

Around 4,000 people have received training on what to do in the event of an overdose. About 10,000 people have received training in our State on topics from treatment to prevention to recovery.

For a State like ours, the rate of opioid deaths has increased; opioid overdose deaths have more than quadrupled in the past 15 years. That would not be an unusual number for States to see.

Senator CAPITO from West Virginia and I were here on the floor talking about this earlier this year. This is not necessarily an urban problem. In fact, in most cases, it is more of a rural problem per capita than an urban problem per capita. We have set aside money targeted for those rural communities. There is \$135 million set aside for rural communities based on different things that appear to be needed more in rural communities than in any other communities.

A couple of hundred million dollars goes into community health centers to support people who have behavioral health concerns and mental health concerns. If you don't have a mental health problem before you get addicted to opioids, you have one once you have gotten addicted to opioids. So those funds go there to try to deal with that.

Senator STABENOW and I introduced a bill a few years ago, the Excellence in Mental Health Act, and eight of our States now have a situation where they are treating, in that eight-State pilot, behavioral health problems like all other health problems. That particularly steps up if someone with an opioid addiction problem has a behavioral health problem they wouldn't have had otherwise. And there is no limit. Just as there would be no limit if you had kidney dialysis, there is also no limit in those eight States for your behavioral health problems. There is no limit where, if you haven't whipped this in 28 days, you are going to have to deal with this as a unique problem. Dealing with mental health and behavioral health in the same way matters in all cases, but it particularly seems to apply as people try to beat addiction.

The Department of Labor and Health and Human Services bill includes \$60 million for child abuse prevention and treatment programs to support what happens in families when someone in that family gets into a situation of abuse.

The number of people who become addicted needs to change, but also how we deal with pain needs to change. So there is some unique money available to the National Institutes of Health to try to develop a pain medicine that is nonaddictive; \$500 million went toward that effort.

In all of these cases, we feel as though we have produced a good bill out of our committee. It has about one-third of the money in it after defense is taken off the table. It is a big bill that covers a large jurisdiction.

Everyone in the Senate deserves a chance to be part of this debate. Everyone in the Senate deserves to look at how the appropriators—I think it was 33 to 1 that they voted for this bill—have decided to spend the money. It

may be the way everyone decides to spend the money, but everyone ought to have a chance on this floor to say “No, I think this money would be better spent here and here, better spent this way and that way.” Every single Senator ought to be able to be part of that discussion.

If we continue this process that we have been in for a few years—one big bill that nobody ever gets to vote on—that means the Senators who aren't on the Appropriations Committee will not have a say in establishing our national priorities. It is time to do that.

These bills are all out of committee and have been for almost a month now. We have had three of them on the floor already. I think we plan to have four of them on the floor next week, and maybe Defense, Labor, and HHS not too long after that.

These are big issues that every Senator should have a say in, and the only way that will happen is if these issues are decided right here on the floor. Hopefully we will set some records, at least, of having these bills on the floor and debated.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I want to reflect on some of the data that has been coming in on our economy in response to our tax reform and deregulatory push.

Before I do, I want to commend my colleague from Missouri and thank him for his leadership and work on the incredible crisis of opioids we are dealing with. It is not a uniformly national crisis; it is more concentrated regionally, and my State of Pennsylvania is affected as badly as any place in the country.

I am pleased we have been able to take a number of constructive measures, but we have a lot of work yet to do as we try to deal with this scourge. I want to thank him for that.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on tax reform, before I get into some of the macro and statistics that are really, really incredibly encouraging, I just want to touch on a couple of constituent companies and their employees and how our tax reform is affecting them.

One is a company called Glass & Sons Collision Repair. They are located in Reading, PA, which is in the eastern part of our State. They recently announced that they will be paying \$1,000 tax reform bonuses to all of their employees—\$1,000. This is a small business. It is a father-and-son business. The owners, Charles and Trevor Glass, made the decision to pay the bonuses right after they met with their accountants and learned how much they are going to save as a result of tax reform. The first thing they did is say: We are going to share this with our employees. It is a terrific development for everyone involved.

There is another company on the other side of the State, in Somerset,

the southwestern part of the State. It is a company called Guy Chemical. They recently announced that not only are they increasing wages and bonuses, but they are also making all new investments, including buying a new forklift, updated computer equipment, new software, and they are building a new lab for research and development that will be five times the size of their old lab. They are doing this because of tax reform and the confidence they have in the economic growth that is occurring in this reformed environment.

It is not only individuals who work for companies that have been able to pay higher wages and bonuses who benefit from tax reform; it is just about everyone. About 93 percent of all of the folks I represent and all of the folks we all represent—when they file their tax return for this year's income, they are going to pay less in Federal income taxes.

According to the Tax Foundation, the direct savings for a Pennsylvania family with an income in the \$50,000 to \$70,000 range—it will be about \$1,400 in savings.

In addition to the direct savings from a lower Federal tax bill, because of the savings that Pennsylvania utilities have on their Federal tax bill, they are required to pass that on to their customers, and that is exactly what they are doing. So far it is a combined \$320 million in annual savings to Pennsylvania consumers in the form of lower utility bills as a result of our tax reform.

There is no question that there are tremendous, direct personal and individual benefits across the board. Related to that is the fact that the economy is just taking off. The economy has been on fire. This year it has been tremendous.

Nothing reflects the strong economic data better than the employment picture. It is fair to say that the employment picture in America may never have been this good. I know that is making a very bold statement, but stay with me here as we go through some of this data.

In the month of May, we had the lowest unemployment rate since 2000—the lowest unemployment rate in 18 years. The African-American unemployment rate hit an all-time record low. It has never been measured as low as it was in May, at 5.9 percent. Likewise, the Hispanic unemployment rate hit an all-time record low, at 4.6 percent in June. Small business optimism was at the second highest level on record ever, this past month of May.

Dividends paid from overseas subsidiaries of U.S. multinationals, dividends paid back home—money that is sitting overseas and invested back in America—reached an all-time record high in the first quarter because we changed the rules to diminish the penalties we used to have when an American company brought income that was earned overseas back home.

Well, one of the things we wanted to have happen as a result of our tax reform was that we wanted to see more capital expenditures—more companies putting money to work buying plants, plant equipment, technology, and tools. Guess what. For the first quarter of this year, there was tremendous growth in capital expenditures by American businesses. It is up over 7 percent, well above even the ambitious estimate that came out from the Congressional Budget Office late last year.

I think one of the most amazing statistics about this whole employment picture is what happened in March. We saw that in the month of March—again, the first time ever that I am aware of—the number of job openings in America, meaning the number of available jobs that need to be filled, was greater than the number of people looking for jobs. Think about that. There are more jobs available in America than there are people looking for jobs in America. That is terrific for people who need work. The jobs are out there.

The National Federation of Independent Business, which is America's largest network of small businesses, were surveyed in June. Sixty-three percent—almost two-thirds—of these small business owners reported that they were hiring or trying to hire. That is the highest level we have seen since 1999. And 87 percent of those who are trying to hire, or are actually hiring people, are concerned that there are just too few people out there available to be hired.

So, in a way, the economy is growing so robustly and the job opportunities are expanding so quickly that we have a shortage of workers. We have too few people available to meet the demand for all of these jobs. It is the right problem to have.

So what happens as a result of that? It is exactly what we predicted. People who have decided to leave the workforce, to give up on work—people who are of working age and are healthy but decided, for whatever reason, not to work—are coming back into the workforce. They are coming back in big numbers. In the month of June, over 600,000 Americans who had worked in the past but then had stepped out of the workforce for whatever reason came back into the workforce. The biggest proportion of these folks are people who have never gone to college, but they have a renewed confidence and optimism about the economy. They have confidence in opportunities available to them, despite the fact that they don't have a college income. They have decided that they are going to reenter the workforce and, in the process, start to improve their standard of living.

By the way, the labor force participation rate rose really across, I think, all ethnic groups, including women, men, African Americans, and Hispanics. It is up across the board.

So far this year, over 1 million workers who had left the workforce are back

in it. That compares to about half a million workers in the first half of last year and about 600,000 in 2016. So there was a big surge in the number of workers coming back into the workforce, and they are finding jobs. It has improved our overall population, our overall percentage of working-age people who are, in fact, working. As I say, it is across all demographic groups and contributing enormously, first and foremost, to improving the quality of their lives and their family's lives but also our overall economic growth.

What else did we get from the June jobs report? In June—in the month of June alone—there were 213,000 jobs added. That is a very, very rapid pace. Oh, by the way, these numbers are always provided subsequently. So in June we got the revision for April and May, months that had good job growth. It turns out that it was even better than we thought. All together, there were 37,000 more jobs when we revised the April and May numbers than we had originally figured.

There was a modest uptick in the unemployment rate, but don't be fooled by that. That is because with so many additional people entering the workforce, we are counting far more people now in how we determine that.

One of the truly exciting things about this is that for many, many years, we have had stagnant wages. Wages just weren't rising very rapidly. It is because productivity wasn't growing. That, I think, was being driven by the fact that there wasn't considerable growth in capital expenditures. Now that we have changed that dynamic and capital expenditure is growing, productivity is growing and wages are starting to grow. I am not satisfied with the growth yet, but it is very encouraging that the direction is positive.

Based on the employment cost index, wages grew about 2.9 percent in the first quarter. That is the fastest pace in a decade—the fastest pace in 10 years. Average hourly earnings for nonmanagers rose at their fastest pace in 9 years.

In June, interestingly, pay for workers who switched jobs rose at 3.8 percent, which is a clear indication that employers are forced to bid up wages because they need to hire workers, and they are having trouble finding the workers.

This whole dynamic is very, very encouraging. It means wages are growing and are likely to grow more.

I should also point out that there is a feature in the arithmetic that suggests that it could mask the extent to which wages are growing. What I am referring to is when I say that average wages are growing by 2.7 percent. That is true, but let's keep in mind that when we get a surge of new people into the workforce, most of those people are coming in at the lower end of the wage spectrum. Maybe it is their first job or maybe they have been out of work for a long time, or maybe, as I pointed out,

they don't have the same level of education and skills of people already in the workforce. So they are starting at a lower-than-average wage. So all else being equal, that would tend to bring the average down. So despite that, when you have growth, that tells us that people who have been continuously employed are getting an even bigger growth in their wages.

So this is very, very encouraging. I think it is likely to continue. It is exactly what we were hoping would happen as a result of our tax reform.

But there is another whole development that is not directly about wages, but when you think about it, it makes a lot of sense. With all of these people finding work, with all of these opportunities for work and people coming back into the workforce, guess what. There is a reduction in dependency on government programs because people are able to earn the income to support their families.

So, for instance, in the 4-week average of unemployment benefits claims, one of the things we monitor closely, the number of people who are collecting unemployment hit a 45-year low of 213,000 in May—45 years. You have to go back 45 years to find so few people who required unemployment for an extended period of time. It is really amazing, when we consider how much bigger a country we are today, that we have gotten down to a number that was matched only 45 years ago—amazing.

We can look at the disability benefits. According to the Social Security Administration, fewer Americans applied for disability benefits last year than at any time since 2002, 16 years since we have had a number this low.

We can also look at the food stamp program. Two million people have come off of food stamps because they are working and they are earning enough that they either don't need it or they don't qualify anymore.

So these are very, very encouraging trends. As I say, because the driver is a new set of incentives that is encouraging capital expenditure and, therefore, productivity growth, I think this is really likely to continue.

The macro GDP numbers reflect this as well. The Congressional Budget Office last year estimated that growth for 2018 would be about 2 percent. As a result of tax reform, they revised that up to 3.3 percent.

As for estimates for the second quarter—the quarter that just ended—we don't have the numbers yet. It is still a couple of weeks away, but the estimates are that growth was probably equal, maybe even more than 4 percent.

So we have had tremendous growth. We already had a great first quarter relative to other first quarters, and the second quarter is probably very, very big.

All of this, of course, means that if this growth is sustained, which I think it is likely to be, not only will we continue to have good employment numbers like we have had, but we are also going to have good budget numbers.

The Federal Government budget is driven more than anything else by how strong our economy is and how many people are working. Everybody working is paying taxes. Every company that is making money is paying taxes. So revenue coming into the Federal Government is likely to be very strong.

So I am very optimistic. I think it is very clear that the combination of pushing back on excessive regulation and a tremendously pro-growth tax reform has led to this growth.

I should warn that I think there is a bit of a cloud on the horizon. I hope it doesn't develop into a big storm. Right now it is just a cloud, but that cloud is trade policy that could really start to hinder economic growth.

It is interesting. We had testimony at the Banking Committee just yesterday from Fed Chairman Powell. I pointed out that the minutes for the June meeting of the Federal Reserve's Open Market Committee had a disturbing reference. I will quote briefly: The FOMC minutes for June stated: "Some Districts indicated"—they refer to the various districts around the country—"that plans for capital spending had been scaled back or postponed as a result of uncertainty over trade policy."

That is a warning. That is a warning to us. If we spiral down into a full-blown trade war—and we certainly have a lot of skirmishes going on—and if this spirals out of control, business will start to pull back. They will lose the confidence they have had, and that could lead to diminished capital expenditures, which will start to really diminish the tremendous growth that we have seen.

So far for this year the economic picture has been extremely encouraging. Benefits are very broad-based. Economic growth is broad and strong. There are employment numbers that we haven't seen in decades. I believe this can continue. It is much more likely to continue if we avoid a damaging trade war.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am grateful today to be joined by Senator KING, from the great State of Maine, to speak about the troubling changes that we are seeing in the oceans and how climate change is reshaping our States' fisheries.

The Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations recognizes that "climate change imperils the structure and function of already stressed coastal aquatic ecosystems." For the record, Maine and Rhode Island are indeed aquatic.

The oceans have absorbed approximately 30 percent of the excess carbon dioxide that we have pumped into the atmosphere since the Industrial Revolution began. That is changing the ocean's chemistry. The oceans have also absorbed roughly 90 percent of the

excess heat trapped in the atmosphere by those greenhouse gases. As a result of that excess carbon dioxide and that excess heat, our oceans are warming, and they are rising. They are losing oxygen, and they are growing more acidic. This puts marine life, coastal communities, and the global ocean economy all in jeopardy.

Commercial fishing is an important economy in the United States, and both Maine and Rhode Island celebrate our longstanding fishing traditions. According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, over 9.6 billion pounds of wild seafood, valued at \$5.3 billion, was commercially landed in the United States in 2016.

Across New England, American lobster was our most valuable fishery. We had lobstermen bringing around \$663 million—two-thirds of \$1 billion—worth of lobster to shore. Sadly, Rhode Island's lobster fishery is badly knocked down by warming ocean waters. NOAA notes: "The lobster industry in New York and southern New England has nearly collapsed." Maine dominated the catch, bringing in nearly 85 percent of the lobster landed in the region.

According to NOAA, from "1994 to 2014, Maine's landings surged 219 percent to more than 124 million pounds." The lobster population is shifting north, away from Rhode Island, New York, and Connecticut, as waters warm, leaving Rhode Island and other southern New England lobster traps empty. But Mainers are taking notice, too, as warming waters are driving lobster even farther north along their rocky coast. A recent study of 700 North American marine species predicted that lobster populations could move 200 miles northward by the end of the century as waters continue to warm. Senator KING can report what 200 miles does to the coast of Maine.

Lobster is not the only fishery feeling the heat in New England. A 2017 study of global warming found that the greater Northeast region is anticipated to warm faster than other regions of the world. According to the "Climate Science Special Report," a Federal report that will form the scientific basis of the Fourth National Climate Assessment, "the Northeast has warmed faster than 99% of the global ocean since 2004." We have a global ocean hotspot off our coast. The Northeast is also expected to see higher than global average sea level rise, putting our ports, fishing docks, and coastal infrastructure all at risk.

Fishermen have noticed. They are keenly aware of the myriad ways climate change is altering the waters that generations of their families have fished, and they see the difference. Fishermen in Rhode Island have told me: "Sheldon, things are getting weird out there."

"Sheldon, it's not my grandfather's ocean."

They share anecdotes of catching increasing numbers of tropical fish early in the summer season and seeing fish

that rarely frequented Rhode Island waters until recent years. As new fish move in and traditional fish move out, fishermen are left with more questions than answers.

In Southern New England, black sea bass has become the poster fish for shifting stocks. As we can see in this graphic, the 1970s had a hub of black sea bass here, with this as the center and then a slight reach upward but basically off the mid-Atlantic coast. This is 2014. The center of activity has moved up closer to Rhode Island. We are right here. Of course, black sea bass populations in our region have increased concomitantly.

This commercially valuable fish, the black sea bass, can help Rhode Island fishermen replace traditional species that are growing more scarce, like winter flounder—the fish my wife studied for her graduate work—which has crashed as winters warm.

The current fisheries' management structure, however, forces Rhode Island fishermen to toss the increasingly abundant and valuable black sea bass overboard. NOAA scientists saw this northward transit of the sea bass coming years ago, but regulatory catch limits did not keep up. They are generally based on historical catches. And States are hesitant to give up quota even after the fish have moved northward and left their shores, so State-specific quotas badly lag the changing distribution of the fish.

A former Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council scientist acknowledged that fish like summer flounder are moving north and told NPR that "some of the Southern states are having trouble catching their quota, and states to the north have more availability of fish."

Dave Monti is a friend who is a charter boat captain out of Wickford Harbor in North Kingstown, RI. Dave said:

There's no doubt the waters have warmed and black sea bass have moved in. The quotas haven't done a good enough job at figuring in climate change yet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Providence Journal describing the changes that Captain Monti sees and our local efforts to deal with these changes.

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

[From the Providence Journal]

FRONT LINE OF CLIMATE CHANGE: BLACK SEA BASS SURGE OFF R.I.

(By Alex Kuffner)

PROVIDENCE, R.I.—Scientists tell us that some fish will be winners and others losers as oceans warm.

In Rhode Island, count lobster, silver hake and winter flounder among the losers, their numbers plummeting as climate change drives water temperatures higher. On the list of winners so far are squid, summer flounder, butterfish.

And black sea bass. The population of the dusky-colored fish with striking blue accents has historically been strongest off the mid-Atlantic Coast, but over the past decade or

so its numbers have spiked off New England and it is becoming a more important catch for the region's fishermen.

In a telling sign of black sea bass's surge in Rhode Island, the state Department of Environmental Management last month loosened regulations governing the recreational fishery for the species, extending the season by 31 days and increasing the fall possession limit to seven fish per person per day, from five.

It may appear to be a small development, but the rules change resulted from a heated debate among state and federal regulators about how best to manage a species whose distribution and abundance has gone through a striking shift that few would have imagined a generation ago.

The back-and-forth over the fish also signals more difficulties to come as regulators struggle to respond to the impacts of climate change on the marine environment. Similar issues are already playing out with summer flounder, another warm-water fish that is becoming more common off the north Atlantic coast.

How they are managed will have important implications not only for those fish but for lobsters and other key species in the ocean ecosystem.

"We're in an adaptive mode right now," said Bob Ballou, assistant to the director of the Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management and chairman of the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission's black sea bass and summer flounder boards. "It's occupying all our time to think through all the approaches to better manage these resources."

One of the key assumptions that the nation's fishery management system is built upon is that species don't move between general geographic regions.

That traditional regulatory framework held up for a long time, but rising water temperatures and the resulting shifts in species distribution and abundance are forcing the beginnings of change.

In the case of black sea bass, it's not that the population of the fish is simply relocating north. Numbers are still decent in the southern portion of the fish's range, but they are much stronger now off the coasts of New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Massachusetts—places where the waters used to be too cold to support large populations.

In Rhode Island, water temperatures in Narragansett Bay have risen about 3½-degrees Fahrenheit since 1959, according to weekly monitoring done by the Graduate School of Oceanography at the University of Rhode Island. Warmer winters, in particular, have allowed black sea bass to thrive this far north.

In the 1980s and 1990s, a fish trawl survey conducted by the DEM rarely caught a single black sea bass in Rhode Island waters, but incidence of the species has risen steadily, especially over the past decade, and now each trawl nets about two black sea bass on average.

Because black sea bass move between federal and state waters, the fish is managed jointly by the federal government, through the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and states, including Rhode Island, through the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission.

Although scientists have long known that concentrations of the fish have been shifting north toward the Gulf of Maine, it wasn't until 2016 that regulators started to factor in the change.

That year, a new stock assessment for black sea bass formally recognized for the first time two distinct populations of the fish, a northern group around New England and a southern group from New Jersey to the Carolinas.

The growth in the northern group more than made up for the southern group's mediocre numbers, and the assessment determined the total population of the fish to be nearly two and a half times higher than the minimum stock threshold set by regulators.

"That was a really big step forward," said Jason McNamee, chief of marine resource management for the DEM. "The science is now catching up to what's going on with the environment."

But despite the robust overall picture for the fish, the ASFMC's proposed quotas for this year called for a 12-percent reduction in the northern region's catch to allow the southern region, the historic center of the black sea bass fishery, to increase its share.

Rhode Island, New York, Massachusetts and Connecticut filed an appeal, and on May 3, the fisheries commission relented, allowing what amounts to a four-percent increase for the northern region.

The stakes are high for Rhode Island, which is experiencing deep changes to the composition of its marine species because of its location, at the junction of what ocean scientists call the Boreal Province—cold waters that include the Gulf of Maine to the north—and the Virginian Province—warmer waters of the mid-Atlantic to the south.

"We're right at the front lines of these changes," McNamee said. "These mid-Atlantic species are our most important species now."

Dave Monti reeled in another black sea bass.

Like the five others caught in Narragansett Bay on a recent morning, at less than 15 inches long, it was too small to keep. So Monti started working the hook out of its mouth.

"You've got to be careful of the dorsal fin," he warned. "It'll stick right into you."

As regulators have tightened catch limits for striped bass and other saltwater game fish that were historically abundant in Rhode Island waters, black sea bass has filled the void, said Monti, a charter boat captain who docks his boat in Wickford Harbor.

"They've saved my charters over the past couple years when other fish aren't around," he said.

Seas were too rough to visit his favorite place to fish for black sea bass, a patch of waters in the open ocean near Brenton Reef off Newport, so he steered his 44-foot boat the Virginia Joan to a few spots in the Bay between Jamestown and Narragansett.

Black sea bass is a reef fish that likes rocky bottoms and patrols the waters around jetties and pilings for prey. It's a hermaphrodite—some fish switch sexes as adults. The species can be found off Rhode Island year-round, typically coming inshore to the Bay in the spring to spawn and wintering farther off the coast.

Just south of the Jamestown Verrazzano Bridge, Monti reached for a rod from a holder overhead. He called it his "sea bass slayer." It was fitted with a shiny, red-tinted lure and he baited the hook with a slice of squid and a little fish called a silverside. A few minutes later, the first black sea bass was caught.

It doesn't take much work to find the fish these days, said Rick Bellavance, president of the Rhode Island Party and Charter Boat Association.

"Black sea bass are a charter boat operator's dream," he said. "They're pretty prevalent, they're easy to catch, and they taste great."

On a recent charter to Block Island, the six clients on Bellavance's boat caught only two striped bass and one bluefish between them, so he started setting lines for black sea bass. They promptly snagged 20 of the fish that were big enough to take home.

Although he applauded the new regulations, he said the changes have been slow to come and haven't gone far enough. He'd like to have the current six-month season extended year-round and the per-person daily limit raised to 10 fish.

"We need to recognize that the stock has shifted to the north and to the east," he said. "Rhode Island is closer to that epicenter than it used to be."

Monti, who is vice president of the Rhode Island Marine Fisheries Council, which advises the DEM on state fishing policy, agreed.

"There's no doubt the waters have warmed and black sea bass have moved in," he said. "The quotas haven't done a good enough job at figuring in climate change yet."

About half the morning's catch on Monti's boat were black sea bass. Among the rest were other warm-water fish that are becoming more common in Rhode Island: scup and summer flounder.

After Monti freed the little black sea bass from the hook, he held it in his hand. As the fish age, their scales become more blue. This one had yet to develop the bright coloring, but it was still striking.

"Pretty, isn't it?" Monti said as he dropped it back into the Bay.

Not everyone loves the fish.

Black sea bass have voracious appetites, hunting on the ocean bottom for crabs, clams and shrimp. The fish don't have teeth but will swallow crustaceans whole.

Lobstermen complain of pulling up their traps and finding black sea bass inside that have gobbled up their lobsters.

"I see it everyday," said Lanny Dellinger, a Newport lobsterman and board member of the Rhode Island Lobstermen's Association. "Everyday, every trawl. It doesn't matter if it's mud bottom, hard bottom, deep water, shallow water. There are so many black sea bass, it's unbelievable."

The rise of black sea bass is coming at the same time that the lobster catch is on a steep decline in Rhode Island, falling from 8.2 million pounds in 1998 to 2.3 million pounds in 2016, according to the National Marine Fisheries Service.

Lobster is a cold-water species that is moving north as Rhode Island's waters warm. The higher water temperatures have made the lobsters that remain more susceptible to shell disease. Dellinger and others believe that predation by black sea bass is also pushing down the lobster numbers.

Black sea bass could be contributing to the decline, but the fish is probably not the primary cause, said Jon Hare, science and research director at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's Northeast Fisheries Science Center in Woods Hole. Crabs and other crustaceans that the fish eat aren't feeling similar impacts, he said.

McNamee agreed, saying that the fish generally prey on smaller juvenile lobsters, leaving the bigger ones alone.

As part of a larger study of black sea bass, the Rhode Island-based Commercial Fisheries Research Foundation is analyzing the gut contents of fish caught by nine participating commercial and recreational boats.

"We know that black sea bass do eat lobster, but we just don't know if the rate of consumption is having an impact on the size of the lobster population," said Anna Malek Mercer, executive director of the foundation.

One lobsterman sent her photos of a 2½-inch long lobster found inside a black sea bass in a trap.

"When they end up in lobster traps, there usually aren't any lobsters inside," she said.

Dellinger wants loosened regulations on both the recreational and commercial sides to allow fishermen to catch more black sea bass. He likened the fish to coyotes that

need to be culled or to rodents afflicting farmers.

"It's like owning a corn bin full of rats and nobody's allowed to get rid of them," he said.

Despite the recent changes, scientists and fishermen in Rhode Island say that the management system for black sea bass is still outdated.

Tellingly, none of the New England states has a seat on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council—one of the two key decision-making bodies for the species—even though much of the fish's population is located off the region's coast.

That has meant that allocations remain high for fishing boats in states like Virginia and North Carolina that must sometimes travel half a day north to find the fish, while Rhode Island boats are forced to discard their catch because, local fishermen say, their quotas aren't high enough.

The southern states don't want to give up their share because black sea bass fetches a good price—more than \$3 a pound on average—and the commercial fishery is growing in value—tripling since 2009 to more than \$12 million.

The black sea bass study being done by the CFRF is using different gear types—from gill nets to trawls to lobster traps—to gather more data on the species and strengthen stock assessments that may be missing some fish.

Malek Mercer said that scientists are getting a better understanding of the fish's changing population, but managing the species is the problem.

"For better or worse, science is not going to fix that," she said. "But if we get our management there, I do think we can have a really strong black sea bass fishery here."

McNamee described the management system as "deliberative and slow by design." He acknowledged the frustration felt by Rhode Island fishermen who have seen the state's traditional groundfish stocks drop off while black sea bass proliferate.

"There's still way more fish to catch than fishermen can get access to," he said.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, we have to fix this. To use the black sea bass example, the species is co-managed by the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council and the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission. Rhode Island only has a seat on the Atlantic States Commission; it does not have a vote on the Mid-Atlantic Council. That means that my State is not fully represented in the decision-making process, and perfectly good black sea bass keeps being thrown into the sea by fishermen who ought to be able to bring that catch home.

In 2016, NOAA scientists assessed the vulnerability to the effects of climate change of over 80 commercially valuable species in the Northeast. So this is not just a story about black sea bass or about lobsters; this Northeast climate vulnerability assessment ranked species based on climate risk and sensitivities to changing ocean conditions.

Here is the climate risk factor graph. As we see, all 80 species scored in the high or very high risk of climate exposure categories. All 80 commercially valuable species they studied faced high or very high risk. This is a red flag for our fisheries.

Maine is the place for lobster. In Rhode Island, squid is king. In 2016, 56

percent of the longfin squid caught on the east coast was landed in Rhode Island. According to NOAA, this catch was valued at over \$28 million, accounting for nearly 30 percent of our landings value in 2016. But climate change is putting our calamari at risk. Warm waters may actually open more habitat for the species, but its carbon cousin, ocean acidification, is the hazard. Like its shellfish brethren, squid require calcium carbonate—for squid, it is to grow the hard beaks they use to feed. Acidic waters decrease the availability of this necessary compound in the seawater and can even dissolve calcium carbonate organisms' shells under extremely acidic conditions.

On the west coast, shellfish farmers have been dealing with ocean acidification since the mid-2000s. Dr. Richard Feely is the researcher who first identified ocean acidification as the cause for oyster spat failures in the Northwest back in 2005. He noted in a recent NPR article that the acidification problem is only going to get worse. "The acidification water welling up from the ocean floor now contains carbon dioxide gas emitted 50 years ago." Carbon emissions are worse since then. Some hatcheries in the Northwest are already moving operations to less acidic waters off Hawaii, and others are looking to buffer the water with seagrasses to absorb carbon and lower acidity. Shellfish farmers in Rhode Island are facing the challenge of acidifying waters as well.

At the same time, marine species are also facing deoxygenation, increased harmful algae, and other consequences of a warming and acidifying ocean. The symptoms of climate change in the ocean are everywhere.

A recent study in Global Change Biology warned that reduced oxygen availability could limit the growth of fish and other species. Fishermen can't make a living off sick and tiny fish.

California's lucrative Dungeness and rock crab season was cut short in 2015 to 2016 due to a harmful algae bloom.

Our Great Lakes have been hit too. I went out on Lake Erie after the horrible algae event there, and the fishermen who took me out sounded like Rhode Islanders. One of them said: "Everything I've learned from fishing a lifetime on this lake is worth nothing now, because it's all changing so fast."

If we have an opportunity to have an open, bipartisan debate on a strong Magnuson-Stevens Act reauthorization, I urge my colleagues not to overlook the toll climate change is taking on our fishing industry. The changes that are happening in our oceans do not care whether you believe they exist. The physics, chemistry, and biology driving these changes will happen anyway, and our fishermen are depending on us to give the scientists and the managers the tools and resources they need to meet the challenges climate change is bringing to our shores.

I now yield to my friend from Maine to give the perspective from his rocky shores.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I first want to thank Professor—I mean Senator WHITEHOUSE for the information he shared. It was compelling, important, and very worthy of our deep consideration.

To talk about renewing the Magnuson-Stevens Act without talking about the effects of climate change and the effects on the water itself would be an enormous missed opportunity.

First, I commend Senator WHITEHOUSE, the Senator from Rhode Island, for his longstanding commitment to the issue of climate change, the well-worn “Time to Wake Up” poster, and the work he has done over the years to force us to pay attention to this issue.

I am, as he indicated, going to talk about what is going on in the Gulf of Maine, but I want to broaden the discussion just for a few moments to talk about the issue of climate change as a broader question before us.

This isn’t some environmental dream. It is not something that was invented by someone. It was discovered by scientists, and it is dollars and cents. It is the most practical problem that we have to deal with.

I am on the Armed Services Committee. We are talking about military bases all over the world—some as close as right down in this region and then down toward Norfolk, VA—that are under a severe threat from rising sea levels and that are going to cost us billions, if not trillions, of dollars to upgrade and maintain because of rising sea levels. This isn’t something abstract. This is something that is happening today, and it is something that we are going to have to deal with that is going to have an enormous cost. The longer we put off preventing and dealing with this issue, the higher that cost is going to be.

There is a second reason this is a national security issue, and that is the aggravation of conflict and the initiation of migration. The number of refugees from Syria—which has disrupted the politics of Europe and disrupted many of the European countries and, indeed, has had a reflection here in this country—is roughly 3 to 4 million people. The estimate for refugees from climate change—from extreme temperature, from drought, from famine—is in the hundreds of millions as opposed to 3 to 4 million from Syria. Imagine the disruption to all of the countries of the world that are destinations for these refugees who are fleeing places that have become uninhabitable.

This is a question we are going to have to address, and, as our military characterizes it, it is a threat multiplier because when you have people moving from one region to another, you have conflict. From time immemorial, conflict has largely been based on things like access to water and access to arable land, and we are talking about an enormous accelerator of that across the world.

Now let me talk about the effects in my home State. First the good news. Lobster landings in Maine are up. We have ridden a lobster boom over the past 30 years. Since the 1980s, the poundage of lobsters harvested in Maine has grown 500 percent. When I was Governor, a good harvest of lobsters was 50 to 60 million pounds; 2 years ago, it was 127 million pounds—more than double. That is the good news.

The bad news is that it is starting to change, and we may have seen the turning point in this boom. We don’t know that, but the last 2 years have been down substantially from the peak in 2016. We will see what happens this year. Hopefully, it is a blip and not a trend.

By the way, one of the reasons the lobster industry has survived and flourished in Maine is not only the favorable impact of gradual increases in temperature but because of the conservation ethic of the lobstermen themselves, who voluntarily throw back egg-bearing females. They cut a V-notch in their tails so they won’t be caught again. If they are too small or too large, they throw them back. An amazing ethic of conservation has been imbued in the culture of lobstering and also in our laws for many years. So the fact that we still have a lobster fishery and that it is as vigorous and as productive as it is, is due in large measure to the creativity and conservation ethic of our lobstermen.

Here is the bad news. The bad news is, when water temperature gets to about 68 degrees, it is like turning a switch. It stresses the lobster population to the point where they can’t survive. The good news is, it gets warmer, and they multiply. The bad news is, once it reaches a certain critical point, the species could collapse. Indeed, that is what has happened, as the Senator from Rhode Island has indicated, to the once-plentiful lobster population of New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island.

The problem is, over recent years—and I have talked to a lobsterman friend today, just this afternoon—the center of gravity of lobstering along the Maine coast is steadily moving north and east. He told me it has moved about 50 miles in the last 10 years.

The other problem that is occurring is that the lobsters are going further offshore to seek cooler water, which means the lobstermen have to go further. They have to have bigger boats. They have to make more of an investment in order to make a living.

Right now, we are in good shape, but the trend is not good. We are seeing other changes that have magnified both the boom, and what we are worried about is the bust. We have seen changes decline in some fish species like the cod that fed on baby lobsters. Now, as Senator WHITEHOUSE mentioned, we are seeing a growth of a fish that was never seen in Maine in the recent past, the black sea bass.

My friend tells me, today they are catching triggerfish in the Gulf of Maine, which is a North Carolina species. They have even caught seahorses in lobster traps. This is a dramatic change as the waters warm.

As I mentioned, if they get close to the 68-degree level, the lobster population is in trouble. It is not only lobsters. By the way, lobstering is a serious business in Maine—half a billion dollars just in land value, a billion and a half dollars in the overall economic impact of this species to our State.

By the way, before I leave the question of lobsters, I have to acknowledge the comments made by the Senator from Pennsylvania earlier when he was talking about the economy, and he flashed a warning light at the end of his remarks about trade and tariffs. We are already seeing the negative impact of what I consider ill-considered tariffs on China. The first place they retaliated was against lobsters. Twenty percent of the entire lobster catch in Maine is sold and exported to China. It is our fastest growing market. If the Chinese tariffs they have already announced are imposed and fully implemented, it could cut that to zero.

Canada doesn’t have those tariffs. Canada is not engaging in a trade war with China. Canada and other countries are moving into the vacuum we have created. The idea that we can impose tariffs on other countries without any ill effects here just isn’t true.

Right now, it looks like the lobster industry, soybeans in the Midwest, maple syrup in Vermont, other agricultural products across the country are going to be collateral damage in an incipient trade war that I don’t understand where it is going.

I would like to know what the strategy is. What is the end game? Where does this go? So far, I haven’t seen any indication of that. What I have seen an indication of is severely dangerous impacts on our economy industry.

Another part of our ocean ecosystem is clams. There is a massive decrease in harvest because of two reasons: One, acidification. As the Senator from Rhode Island indicated, 30 percent of all the carbon dioxide that has been emitted during the Industrial Revolution has ended up in acidification in the ocean and, two, nonnative green crabs, which are exploding because they like the warmer water. They have been around for 100 years, but that population is growing enormously. They are just devastating the clams. Green crabs can consume 40 half-inch clams a day. Those crabs have decimated blue mussels and scallops along the shore. They are going for clams, and we are concerned that maybe lobsters could be next.

Warming water and shifting predators are not the only challenges we face: more carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, absorbed into the ocean, and one-quarter of what is emitted goes into the ocean. The ocean then becomes more acidic. Any kind of shelled

animals—lobsters, clams, oysters—expend evermore energy maintaining the pH balance in their bodies, and that means they can't grow and reproduce. The world's oceans have become 30 percent more acidic since the Industrial Revolution.

Oysters have become a great new product for Maine. We are growing them in oyster farms along the Damariscotta River and other places. You can go to fancy restaurants and see Damariscotta oysters. They are wonderful.

My friend Bill Mook, who is one of the pioneers of the oyster industry in Maine, has had to move the incubation of his oysters out of the ocean, out of the natural river, onshore, and into tanks so he can buffer the water to minimize the acidification and then put them back in the water to grow out. That is a pure result of climate change and acidification of the ocean.

Freshwater runoff is another issue that increases the acidification. We have had an enormous increase in the amount of freshwater rainfall in this country, and in Maine that has increased the acidification in the oceans. What do we do? The first thing we do is admit there is a problem. You can't solve a problem if you act like there is nothing wrong. The first thing we have to do is admit there is a problem. I think more and more people are coming to that conclusion.

When this administration was nominating people, the refrain I heard in all of the hearings was climate is changing, man has an impact on it, but we don't know how much.

That is progress. At least it is an admission that something is happening. What do we do? We admit there is a problem. I think we are close to reaching that point.

The second thing we have to do is more research. We have to continue to fund the science to do the research to understand what is happening, to understand what we can do to mitigate these risks. Research and scientific data is crucial. For some of our great agencies that have the people who have been researching this for years, to be suppressing the research or not supporting it or burying it is not a service to our country. Research is crucial. We need the facts. We need the data. We need mitigation strategies. We also need to pay attention to the underlying cause of climate change, which is a combustion of fossil fuels and the enormous amount of carbon dioxide that is being added to the atmosphere.

This is a long-term challenge. It is not something we can solve in the next 1 or 2 years. Some people ask: Well, it is such a long-term challenge, why are we doing it? Because it may not be solved for 50 years.

In my office is Edmund Muskie's desk. I sit behind Edmund Muskie's desk—one of the greatest Senators of the 20th century and one of the greatest citizens Maine has ever produced. Fifty years ago—2 years from now,

1970—Edmond Muskie led the passage of the Clean Water Act and the Clean Air Act, which are two of the greatest and most important pieces of legislation passed in this body in the last 100 years; the first real recognition that we had a responsibility to the environment, that we had a responsibility to our children and our grandchildren. By the way, astoundingly, the Clean Water Act passed the U.S. Senate unanimously. Can you imagine? We can't agree on the time of day unanimously in this body. In 1970, under Ed Muskie's leadership, the Clean Water Act was passed unanimously.

The point I want to make is, the steps they took almost 50 years ago have cleaned up our rivers, have cleaned up our atmosphere, have made parts of our country blossom again.

In Maine, we are working on our rivers. The towns that turned their backs on the rivers are now turning back toward the rivers because people can fish, swim, and enjoy the rivers. When Ed Muskie started his lonely crusade in the late 1960s, the rivers were essentially open sewers.

Fifty years ago, Ed Muskie started that work. We see the benefit of it today. We should be doing the same thing. The fact that it may not come to fruition for 20, 30, 40, or 50 years is no reason to not start now. We have to start. This isn't pie in the sky. This isn't somebody trying to impose new regulations. This isn't something that is made up by environmentalists or people who just don't want to see any development. No. This is lives and livelihood. These are families, communities. It is responsible stewardship and just plain common sense.

There is a lot of science, and there is a lot of complexity to this issue. It seems to me we can take inspiration from Ed Muskie, Howard Baker, and all those a generation ago who built the edifice upon which we have a cleaner, healthier, stronger economy and stronger society.

I remember those days. The great debate was payrolls versus pickerel. You couldn't have payrolls if you preserved the pickerel. It turned out to not be true. We have developed the strongest economy in the history of the world. Yet we paid attention to the environment. We have paid attention to our responsibilities, to our children and our grandchildren, and we created the economy at the same time we were able to clean up the environment.

I remember those debates. They were bitter. You can't do it. If you do this, you are going to put everything out of business. There will be no economy. That was the argument. It hasn't happened.

Finally, you can talk about the science. You can get caught up in all the data. To me, there is a really easy rule that makes this easy to understand what our responsibilities are. I call it the "Maine rototiller rule." Many people in Maine have gardens, but it is a small garden. It is in your

backyard, so it doesn't make sense for everybody to buy a rototiller—the machine you use once or twice a year to clean your garden and till over the ground and begin to plant. We borrow them. I used to borrow one from my neighbor Peter Cox. The "Maine rototiller rule" goes like this. When you borrow your neighbor's rototiller, you return it to them in as good a shape as you got it, with a full tank of gas.

That is all you need to know about environmental stewardship. Do you know what? We have the planet on loan. We don't own it. We own a little piece of land for a generation, but we don't own it. We have it on loan from our children and our grandchildren and their children and their grandchildren. Therefore, we have a sacred responsibility to turn over the planet to them in the same or better shape than we found it. That is our responsibility. It is very simple. When you borrow something from your neighbor, you return it in as good a shape as you found it. That is what we should be doing today.

We can do this. There will be costs, but the costs of not doing it will dwarf the costs we can undertake today to protect the Gulf of Maine, the coast of the United States, the fields of Africa, the forests of North America, and the land and water and air that our children and grandchildren deserve to have passed on to them in better shape than we found it.

We can do this. We can start today. We may not live to see the results, but we will know we have done something important, something meaningful, something that will make a difference in the lives of generations we don't know. They will know what we do or what we don't do. I myself choose the side of action—recognizing the problem, analyzing it, understanding it, and acting to mitigate the harms that otherwise will befall our children.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Senator KING and I yield the floor.

First, let me thank him for joining us. Second, with Senators present here from landlocked States, let me make the requests to both of you that, when we come before this body with concerns about what is happening to our ocean economies, which I think are shared by every coastal Senator who is seeing these changes, that you view our pleas with the same courtesy and respect that we show you when wildfires burn through Utah and we come to make sure that there is adequate emergency response or when Oklahoma faces hurricanes or cyclones and tornadoes and the Federal Government and the Senate rally to the response of those who are experiencing the pain of that in your States. Our fishing communities and our coastal communities have a very different distress, but I hope you will see it as an equal distress and pay us the courtesy of your due consideration.

I yield the floor.

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

SECURING OUR ELECTIONS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, there has been a lot of conversation again, of late, about election security. It seems to be a frequent conversation in the hallways the last couple of days, and it is an ongoing issue that I think some people have lost track of, but we have not.

AMY KLOBUCHAR and I and several others have worked very hard for months on this issue of election security, quietly trying to get the language right and to work through the process of what it takes to secure our elections for 2018, 2020, and beyond, learning the lesson from 2016.

I do want to remind this body that the elections are not something that happens this November. It is already ongoing. Many States' primaries have already been conducted. Last night there was a runoff primary that happened in Alabama. Georgia holds their runoff primaries next week, and Tennessee is the week after that. Kansas, Michigan, Missouri, and Washington will be on Tuesday, August 7. It is already ongoing.

While we watch the indictments that just came down from the Mueller investigation on GRU officers from Russia who were trying to interfere in our elections in 2016, as we have seen the sanctions and the indictments that have come down on some of the oligarchs from Russia and from the Internet Research Agency for what they were doing in social media, trying to be able to interfere with our election in 2016, I think it may be important for us to do a quick lookback at what has happened and what is still going on and what we are trying to accomplish in the next few weeks.

Let me just give a quick look at what is happening in my State of Oklahoma. In Oklahoma, in the 2016 cycle, the FBI and others began to discover that there were issues with the elections and some interference from what they, at that time, called "bad actors" in June of 2016. Later that summer, in August of 2016, the FBI issued what they call a nationwide "flash alert" to every State dealing with a threat from a "bad actor."

The Oklahoma State Cyber Command director received that warning, as did everyone else, but at that time the FBI didn't share any details because no one in my State was given security clearance to be able to have that kind of classified conversation with the FBI.

It wasn't until September 22 of 2017, a year and a little bit later, that DHS actually notified my State and our State election authorities that we hadn't just been targeted by a bad actor but that we had been targeted by the Russians—a year later—because no one had clearance and there was no one engaged.

DHS told Oklahoma State Election Board secretary Paul Ziriaux, who is doing a great job, that there was evidence that the Russians conducted a

surveillance scan looking into vulnerabilities in the State computer network, but they didn't get into the election board computer network, and they didn't get into any of our equipment.

They basically came and checked to see if the door was locked, and they found out that in Oklahoma the door was locked, and the Russians could not get in. They didn't penetrate into our system, though they tried.

But it was a year after the elections before we were even notified that the Russians were trying to penetrate our system. A subtle flash warning is all that we received in the summer of 2016.

Oklahoma has a great system for elections. Our system is consistent across every single county. We have optical scanners with a paper ballot backup so that we can verify the computer count with a hand count if needed. We have had a very good system. That system was tested by the Russians when they evaluated the computer networks of our State, and they were also not able to get in, thanks to the leadership of some of the cyber and the technology folks who are in Oklahoma.

Not all States have the same practices. In some States, from county to county their election systems are different. From township to township they may have different systems with different companies and different backgrounds. They may not have the same kind of system where they get a chance to protect their cyber systems.

We saw that in 2016, when the Russians were able to penetrate some of the States and actually were able to harvest some of their voter register rolls. They weren't able to change any votes. They weren't able to affect the voting that day, but they did a tremendous amount of scanning through systems to be able to see where there were vulnerabilities, what they could learn on our election systems, and how they could engage for a future time.

I think we should learn a lesson from that and be aware that the Russians are trying to penetrate that system and learning as much as they could.

At the same time that they were hacking into different systems and testing them out to see if they could get in, a different set of folks from the Russian group the Internet Research Agency were trying to put out social media disinformation.

Some 200,000 Oklahomans saw Facebook and Twitter posts that Russians put out as false information. They weren't all on one candidate. There were multiple candidates and multiple issues. Sometimes it was on Hillary Clinton, sometimes on Donald Trump, sometimes on BERNIE SANDERS, sometimes on Jill Stein, and sometimes just on ideological issues. Over 200,000 Oklahomans saw those posts from different Russians, not knowing they were Russian posts at all. They were Russians pretending to be Americans, and they were pushing that information out.

What can we learn from this? One is the most simple of those things: You shouldn't believe everything you see on the internet. It is not always an American. It is not always who they post to be, and it is not always true. It should be the most basic information that we should learn about what is happening on the internet and what is online, including Facebook and Twitter.

The other lesson that we need to learn is a little more complicated. We have to be able to have better communication between the Federal Government and States, better cybersecurity systems, and the ability to audit that.

That is why Senator KLOBUCHAR and I have worked for months on a piece of legislation called the Secure Elections Act. That piece has worked its way through every State looking at it and their election authorities. We have worked it through multiple committee hearings. In fact, recently, just in the last month, there were two different hearings in the Rules Committee. It is now ready to be marked up and finalized to try to bring it to this body.

It is a very simple piece. It affirms that States run elections. The Federal Government should not take over elections nationwide. In fact, that would make a bad situation worse. States need to be able to run elections and be able to manage those.

But it qualifies several things. One is that it gives a security clearance to a person in every single State. If there is a threat from a hostile actor, there is not some vague warning that comes out. There is an immediate address about what is happening and a communication within the intelligence community here on the Federal level to individuals with a clearance on the State level.

Right now, the DHS, in absence of this legislation, has started implementing it anyway. Every single State has at least one person with a security clearance now, including my own. They are working to have at least three in every State to do a backup system.

We also need to be able to affirm that every State can audit their elections, that they would do what is called risk-limiting audits after the election just to check and to make sure that the results are correct, but also that they have the ability to audit it as the election is going on so that it is not just counting on a machine but that there is also some way to back it up. States have a variety of ways they can actually do that.

If elections are trusting that the electronics are going to work and not be hacked into and not be affected, we should have learned the lesson from 2016 that there are outside entities trying to attack these systems and to find vulnerabilities, and they will.

Some way to be able to back it up, to be able to audit the election while it is happening, risk-limiting audits after the fact, security clearances for individuals within States, and rapid communication State to State and State to

Federal Government all help to maintain the integrity of our elections.

That is what we do in the Secure Elections Act. I think it is so important that we try to resolve this as quickly as possible.

I encourage this body to finish the markup in the Rules Committee to be able to bring it to the floor and to have a consistent bipartisan vote to be able to support the work that we need to continue to do to protect our elections in the days ahead.

Our Republic is one that maintains its stability based on the integrity of our elections. I have zero doubt that the Russians tried to destabilize our Nation in 2016 by attacking the core of our democracy. Anyone who believes they will not do it again has missed the basic information that is out day after day in our intelligence briefings.

The Russians have done it the first time. They showed the rest of the world the lesson and what could be done. It could be the North Koreans the next time. It could be the Iranians the next time. It could be a domestic activist group the next time. We should learn that lesson, close that vulnerability, and make sure that we protect our systems in the days ahead.

There is more that can be done, but the States seem to take a lead on this. This is something that the Federal Government should do, and we are very close to getting it done. I wanted to be able to tell this body that we are close. Let us work together to get this done in the days ahead.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATO

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, thank you.

Last week at the NATO summit in Brussels, the leaders of all 29 member states, including the United States with President Trump, signed a declaration reaffirming the purpose of the alliance—collective defense and the importance of article 5, which regards being attacked against one ally as an attack against all others.

There may be a growing sense here in the United States that NATO is no longer useful to our interests and that it is a burden that is not worth the cost.

I recently traveled to Moscow, Oslo, and Helsinki with members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, many of us on the Subcommittee on Defense. We had meetings with U.S. Embassy officials, our Ambassadors, and foreign government officials—people within the ministries of foreign affairs, ministries of defense, and with legislative leaders in that region.

At my meetings in Moscow, we worked to begin a dialogue with Russian counterparts. Everything I heard in those meetings reinforces my belief that Russia remains a threat to European stability and that a united NATO is essential to countering the threat and preserving American peace and prosperity.

Two wars in Europe last century resulted in the loss of hundreds of thousands of American lives who fought the forces of tyranny. To prevent a third war against this Communist menace, Western European powers, still weakened by World War II, formed an alliance with America and Canada to deter the Soviet Union's massive conventional forces from invading beyond what became the eastern bloc.

Not only did NATO successfully deter the Soviet Union until its collapse in 1991—and in my view, NATO contributed to the Soviet Union collapse in a significant way—but in that process, America's commitment to European security allowed these allies to recover from the war economically, strengthened democratic governance, and enabled them to stop fearing one another.

We would be naive to believe that threats critical to North Atlantic security have faded along with the Soviet Union. Indeed, my recent interactions in Europe confirmed that Russia remains a revisionist power intent on continuing Russia's disruptive activities in Europe, the Middle East, and here at home in the United States.

In every meeting I attended, I made clear that the Russians must end their election-meddling here in the United States and Europe in order to open doors to rebuilding our relations. I brought up Russia's destabilizing support for separatists in Ukraine and its illegal seizure of Crimea after Ukraine democratically chose a President who sought closer ties with the West.

Supporting and admitting that they share intelligence with the Taliban undermines the democratic government in Afghanistan and undermines our Nation's military as we continue to fight the Taliban alongside the Afghan National Security Forces.

In each circumstance of those conversations, Russian officials, including Foreign Minister Lavrov, continued to obfuscate or outright deny any responsibility. However, those meetings left me unconvinced that Russia is prepared to change its behavior.

In subsequent talks in Norway, a NATO member, and Finland, a NATO partner, the concerns relayed to me by these European leaders underscore the fear our European friends have about Russian activities. During our meetings, my colleagues and I reassured them of America's commitment to our joint security, and that commitment from the entire U.S. Government must not waver.

The first Supreme Allied Commander in Europe overseeing all NATO military operations was Kansas's own Dwight D. Eisenhower. As President in

1957, he declared before our NATO allies that we must "re-dedicate ourselves to the task of dispelling the shadows that are being cast upon the free world."

In addition to ongoing Russian subterfuge, terrorist groups remain intent on striking the West, threats to data information require strong cyber security measures, and the scourge of human and drug trafficking degrades social structures. On these and other issues, NATO allies have coordinated and contributed to the security of our own country, the United States of America.

In particular, let's recall that only once has NATO invoked article 5—in the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks on our country. The only time the NATO alliance has been asked to respond, they declared a willingness to respond—that an attack on one is an attack on all—when the United States of America was attacked on 9/11.

When we went to war against al-Qaida and its Taliban hosts in Afghanistan, we were not alone. The United States has nearly 15,000 troops serving in Afghanistan, and they are serving with NATO coalition forces as part of counterterrorism efforts to support Afghanistan's fight against the Taliban and ISIS, which has seized strategic territories in recent years.

We are approaching 17 years of support from our NATO allies in Afghanistan—support that has come even at the expense of the blood of those who serve. Just last week, I am saddened to say, two U.S. Army soldiers paid the ultimate sacrifice and were killed while serving in Afghanistan, and at least two more soldiers have been wounded from insurgent attacks.

Finally, there is an economic threat that a destabilized Europe poses to our Nation's well-being. The EU—distinct from NATO but certainly a beneficiary of the security provided—is America's largest trading partner.

Questioning why we should come to the defense of the smallest NATO member damages the alliance, and it hurts our alliances elsewhere. If we won't honor a treaty in Europe, friends might wonder why we would honor a treaty in Asia. Predators can take advantage of our perceived indifference. That is, in part, what led to the Korean war.

The United States contributes 22 percent of NATO's total budget. In addition to our NATO contributions, the United States continues to increase defense spending on our military presence supporting our partners, with more than \$6 billion in fiscal year 2019 appropriated for the European Deterrence Initiative and another \$792 million invested in military construction across the continent.

President Trump is absolutely right to urge fellow allies to increase their defense spending, and I echoed that message on our trip to Norway when we visited with those allies in Oslo. To the credit of our allies, they have increased spending by more than \$40 billion in the past year.

Fighting alongside us in Afghanistan, where they continue to serve beside us today, unfortunately, more than 1,000 Europeans have died.

NATO is strong, and it is getting stronger. I believe the strength of NATO relies on remaining unified. Words matter, and what Americans say can bolster or shake confidence in the United States.

I will conclude on this personal note. I thought of the force for good our country has provided the world as I stood in our Embassy in Moscow on July 4th, our Independence Day, watching the Marine Corps Honor Guard's presentation of the colors as our national anthem was sung. It is difficult for me to sing the national anthem without choking up wherever I am, but it was especially difficult that day as I reflected upon the course of events in my life—when kids practiced getting under their desks for missile drills, to the fall of the Berlin Wall, to the aftermath of 9/11, to a father who served in World War II. I honor him and all those who served.

Over the past 70 years, it is America that has safeguarded freedom for our people and for those who live elsewhere in the world. Along the way, our vision of a freer, more prosperous world attracted allies who shared our dream.

Our foremost responsibility is to protect Americans all the time and to promote our values around the world. We can do this better. We can do this with our allies. With them, we will have a better future.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE NATO OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in April, the Democratic leader and I announced the reestablishment of the Senate NATO Observer Group. Senators TILLIS and SHAHEEN, both Members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, were named cochairs. We have asked for the following Senators

to participate: BARRASSO, RUBIO, GARDNER, ERNST, ROUNDS, MERKLEY, COONS, KING, BOOKER and VAN HOLLEN.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for July 2018. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2018, H. Con. Res. 71, and the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (BBA18). This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act (CBA).

This is the fifth scorekeeping report this year and the second since I filed new enforceable levels on May 7, pursuant to BBA18 requirements. My last filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 6, 2018. The information included in this report is current through July 16, 2018.

Republican Budget Committee staff prepared Tables 1–6.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the most recently adopted budget resolution and the fiscal year 2019 enforceable levels filing. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. For this reporting period, 10 of the 16 authorizing committees are in compliance with their allocations.

During this reporting period, Congress cleared two pieces of legislation with significant budgetary effects scored to authorizing committees. The first bill was H.R. 770, the American Innovation \$1 Coin Act. This measure requires the Secretary of the Treasury to mint, beginning in 2019, new \$1 coins “in recognition of American innovation and significant innovation and pioneering efforts of individuals or groups from each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the United States territories.” CBO estimates that H.R. 770 would increase direct spending in the near term by \$3 million but would be deficit-neutral over the entire budget window. This bill was charged to the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. The second bill was H.R. 5956, the Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018. This bill modifies U.S. immigration policy regarding the Northern Mariana Islands, thereby reducing the number of people able to claim asylum and receive means-tested benefits. CBO estimates that this bill would save \$3 million over the budget window. H.R. 5956 was charged to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Tables 2–6 remain unchanged from my last filing.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by Congress.

Because legislation can still be enacted that would have an effect on fiscal year 2018, CBO has provided a report both for fiscal year 2018 and fiscal year 2019. This information is used to enforce aggregate spending and revenue levels in the budget resolution under section 311 of the CBA. CBO's estimates show that current-law levels of spending for fiscal year 2018 exceed the amounts in H. Con. Res. 71 by \$157.4 billion in budget authority and \$106.3 billion in outlays. Revenues are \$3.2 billion above the revenue floor for fiscal year 2018 set by the budget resolution. Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed by the resolution, while Social Security revenues are \$446 million below the levels in the budget.

For fiscal year 2019, CBO estimates that current-law levels are below the fiscal year 2019 enforceable aggregates by \$1,142.2 billion in budget authority and \$646.1 billion in outlays. The allowable spending room will be reduced as appropriations bills are enacted. Revenues are \$5 million below the level assumed for fiscal year 2019. Finally, Social Security outlays and revenues are at the levels assumed in the fiscal year 2019 enforcement filing.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. After accounting for enacted legislation during this reporting period, the PAYGO scorecard shows deficit increases in fiscal year 2019 of \$25 million—\$5 million revenue loss, \$20 million outlay increase—over the fiscal year 2019–2023 period of \$332 million—\$47 million revenue loss, \$285 million outlay increase—and over the fiscal year 2019–2028 period of \$487 million—\$108 million revenue loss, \$379 million outlay increase. The Senate's PAYGO rule is enforced by section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71.

Included in this submission is a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the May 7 enforcement filing. On June 18, 2018, Senator BERNARD SANDERS raised a Senate PAYGO point of order against H.R. 5515, the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019. That point of order was waived by a vote of 81–14. H.R. 5515 has yet to be enacted and is currently in conference.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

[In millions of dollars]

	2018	2019	2019–2023	2019–2028
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry				
Budget Authority	47	0	0	0
Outlays	47	0	0	0
Armed Services				
Budget Authority	–33	0	0	0
Outlays	–24	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	21	285	382
Outlays	0	20	285	382
Commerce, Science, and Transportation				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Energy and Natural Resources				
Budget Authority	220	0	0	–3
Outlays	198	0	0	–3
Environment and Public Works				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Finance				
Budget Authority	21,971	0	0	0
Outlays	5,211	0	0	0
Foreign Relations				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Judiciary				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions				
Budget Authority	705	0	0	0
Outlays	205	0	0	0
Rules and Administration				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Intelligence				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs				
Budget Authority	7,300	0	0	–729
Outlays	1,850	4,400	4,400	3,671
Indian Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Small Business				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Total				
Budget Authority	30,210	21	285	–350
Outlays	7,487	4,420	4,685	4,050

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹

[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2018	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	629,000	579,000
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	23,259
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,400	54,200
Defense	589,320	132
Energy and Water Development	21,800	21,400
Financial Services and General Government	31	23,392
Homeland Security	2,058	45,665
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	35,252
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	177,100
Legislative Branch	0	4,700
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	10,091	81,900
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	42,000
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	300	70,000
Current Level Total	629,000	579,000
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	0	0

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹
[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	647,000	597,000
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	44	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,684

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹—Continued
[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Legislative Branch	0	1
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	67,109
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	44	96,212

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS ¹—Continued
[Budget authority, in millions of dollars]

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	–646,956	–500,788

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 4.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2018
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2018	17,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	10,228
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	6,772
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	17,000
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	0

TABLE 5.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2019
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2019	15,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0

TABLE 5.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)—Continued

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2019
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	–15,000

TABLE 6.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2018
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2018	11,224
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	10,228
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0

TABLE 6.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND—Continued

(Budget authority, millions of dollars)	
	2018
Current Level Total	10,228
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	–996

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2018.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2018 budget and is current through July 16, 2018. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of H. Con. Res. 71, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018.

Since our last letter dated June 6, 2018, the Congress has not cleared any legislation for the President's signature that affects budget authority, outlays, or revenues in fiscal year 2018.

Sincerely,

MARK P. HADLEY
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JULY 16, 2018
(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,399.8	3,557.2	157.4
Outlays	3,221.3	3,327.6	106.3
Revenues	2,497.1	2,500.3	3.2
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^a	849.6	849.6	0.0
Social Security Revenues	873.3	872.9	–0.4

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018, AS OF JULY 16, 2018
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^{a b}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,658,139
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,105,225	2,003,386	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	513,307	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–866,685	–866,685	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,238,540	1,650,008	2,658,139
Enacted Legislation			
Authorizing Legislation			
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (P.L. 115–91)	–33	–24	0
CHIP and Public Health Funding Extension Act (P.L. 115–96, Division C)	705	205	0
An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 . . . and for other purposes (P.L. 115–96, Division D)	2,100	1,050	0
An act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (P.L. 115–97)	–8,600	–8,600	–143,800
An act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (P.L. 115–120, Divisions C and D)	14,509	1,203	–1,263
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Divisions A and C–G) ^{b c d}	7,504	4,050	–12,424
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Divisions M–V (P.L. 115–141) ^e	225	203	–348
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–182)	5,200	800	0
Total, Authorizing Legislation	21,610	–1,113	–157,835
Appropriation Legislation			
Department of Defense Missile Defeat and Defense Enhancements Appropriations Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–96, Division B)	4,686	803	0
Further Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2018 (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision I)	84,436	11,185	0
Further Extension of Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018, (P.L. 115–123, Division B, Subdivision 3)	–315	–315	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018, Divisions A–L (P.L. 115–141) ^{e f g}	2,259,985	1,663,110	0
Total, Appropriation Legislation	2,348,792	1,674,783	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	2,370,402	1,673,670	–157,835
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	–51,440	4,205	0
Total Current Level ^{b h}	3,557,239	3,327,620	2,500,304
Total Senate Resolution ⁱ	3,399,841	3,221,349	2,497,139
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	157,398	106,271	3,165
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^aIncludes the budgetary effects of the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues and were cleared by the Congress during the 1st session of the 115th Congress, but before the adoption of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018: the VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–46); the Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–48); a joint resolution compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission (P.L. 115–54); the Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 and Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–56); the Emergency Aid to American Survivors of Hurricanes Irma and Jose Overseas Act (P.L. 115–57); the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–62); the Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63); the Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–64); and the Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017 (P.L. 115–72).

^bEmergency funding that was not designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2) (A) of the Deficit Control Act does not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. These amounts, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017 (P.L. 115–63)	263	263	0
Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123)	2,217	1,469	–509
Total	2,480	1,732	–509

^cThe Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–123) contains seven divisions: Division A, Subdivision 2 of Division B, and Divisions C–F contain authorizing legislation, of which the budgetary effects of Subdivision 2 of Division B were designated as being for emergency requirements. Subdivisions 1 and 3 of Division B contain appropriation legislation: Subdivision 1 provided supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for disaster relief and designated those amounts as being for emergency requirements, and section 158 of Subdivision 3 provided authority for the duration of fiscal year 2018, for the Secretary of Energy to draw down and sell crude oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Division G of P.L. 115–123 provided for the budgetary treatment of Divisions A–F.

^dPursuant to section 232(b) of H. C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve's surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$2,450 million in fiscal year 2018, \$2,180 million over the 2018–2022 period, and \$1,750 million over the 2018–2027 period.

^eSections 540–543 of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2017 (Division F of P.L. 115–31), extended several immigration programs through the end of fiscal year 2017. Several continuing resolutions continued those authorities through March 23, 2018, and sections 202–205 of title II of Division M of P.L. 115–141 further extended those programs through 2018. CBO estimates that extending those authorities for the entirety of fiscal year 2018 will increase on-budget direct spending by \$5 million in fiscal year 2018, \$27 million over the 2018–2022 period, and \$53 million over the 2018–2027 period. In addition, CBO estimates that extending those authorities will decrease off-budget direct spending by \$1 million over the 2018–2022 period and by \$7 million over the 2022–2027 period. Further, CBO estimates that continuing those authorities will increase revenues by \$2 million over the 2018–2022 period and by \$7 million over the 2018–2027 period. Consistent with the budgetary treatment of Divisions K–V of P.L. 115–141, the budgetary effects of extending the immigration programs through March 23, 2018, are charged to the Appropriations Committee; the effects of extending the programs for the remainder of fiscal year 2018 are charged to the relevant authorizing committees.

^fPursuant to sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255), certain funding provided to the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS)—in particular the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in 2017 through 2026 shall not count for the purposes of complying with provisions of the Deficit Control Act or the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974. As a result, the amounts shown do not include \$1,056 million in budget authority or \$770 million in associated outlays in fiscal year 2018, specifically, \$60 million in budget authority and \$22 million in outlays for the FDA; and \$996 million in budget authority and \$748 million in outlays for HHS, which includes \$500 million in budget authority for state responses to the opioid abuse crisis and \$496 million for NIH.

^gSection 255 of the Departments of Labor, Health, and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2018 (Division H of P.L. 115–141), delayed implementation of the recommendations of the United States Preventive Services Task Force with respect to breast cancer screening, mammography, and prevention. CBO estimates that the delay will increase direct spending (budget authority and outlays) by \$14 million in fiscal year 2019 and by \$6 million in fiscal year 2020. In addition, CBO estimates that section 225 will decrease revenues by \$23 million in fiscal year 2019 (of which \$6 million will be off-budget) and will decrease revenues by \$9 million in fiscal year 2020 (of which \$2 million will be off-budget).

^hFor purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

ⁱPeriodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in H. Con. Res. 71, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The total for the Initial Senate Resolution shown below excludes \$47,660 million in budget authority, \$22,467 million in outlays, and \$150,003 million in revenues assumed in H. Con. Res. 71 for discretionary spending not constrained by the budgetary caps established by the Budget Control Act of 2011 (P.L. 112–25) and subsequently amended, including spending that qualifies for adjustments pursuant to section 4205 of H. Con. Res. 71.

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Initial Senate Resolution	3,089,061	3,109,221	2,640,939
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 3003 of H. Con. Res. 71	–8,600	–8,600	–143,800
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	4,686	803	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	84,436	11,185	0
Pursuant to section 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and section 4108 of H. Con. Res. 71	230,553	108,997	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	–295	–257	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,399,841	3,221,349	2,497,139

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 18, 2018.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2019 budget and is current through July 16, 2018. This report is sub-

mitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018, pursuant to section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123).

Since our last letter dated June 6, 2018, the Congress has cleared the American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770), which awaits the President's signature. That act has significant effects on budget authority and outlays in fiscal year 2019.

Sincerely,

MARK P. HADLEY
(For Keith Hall, Director).

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF JULY 16, 2018

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,547.1	2,404.9	–1,142.2
Outlays	3,508.1	2,861.9	–646.1
Revenues	2,590.5	2,590.5	0.0
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^a	908.8	908.8	0.0
Social Security Revenues	899.2	899.2	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^aExcludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF JULY 16, 2018

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,590,496
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,337,789	2,232,677	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	573,950	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	–890,012	–890,015	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,447,777	1,916,612	2,590,496
Enacted Legislation			
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (P.L. 115–174) ^a	18	17	–5
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–182)	18	17	–5
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (P.L. 115–182)	0	4,400	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	18	4,417	–5
Legislation Cleared Congress and Pending Signature			
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770)	3	3	0
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	957,064	940,899	0
Total Current Level ^b	2,404,862	2,861,931	2,590,491

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF JULY 16, 2018—Continued
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Total Senate Resolution	3,547,094	3,508,052	2,590,496
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	1,142,232	646,121	5
Memorandum			
Revenues, 2019–2028			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	33,273,105
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	33,273,213
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	108

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.
^a Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve's surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.
^b For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS, AS OF JULY 16, 2018
(In millions of dollars)

	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b, c}				
A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Incident Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act".	*	*	*	*
(S.J. Res. 57, P.L. 115–172).				
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (S. 2155, P.L. 115–174) ^d	*	22	329	490
Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2017 (S. 204, P.L. 115–176)	*	*	*	*
An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes (H.R. 3562, P.L. 115–177)	*	*	*	*
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (S. 2372, P.L. 115–182) ^e	*	*	*	*
Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act (S. 1869, P.L. 115–192)	*	*	*	*
All Circuit Review Act (H.R. 2229, P.L. 115–195)	*	*	*	*
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770)	0	3	3	0
Small Business 7(a) Lending Oversight Reform Act of 2018 (H.R. 4743, P.L. 115–189)	*	*	*	*
Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018 (H.R. 5956)	0	0	0	–3
Current Balance	*	25	332	487
Changes to Revenues	*	–5	–47	–108
Changes to Outlays	*	20	285	379

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
Notes: P.L. = Public Law, * = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.
^a On May 7, 2018, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.
^b The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.
^c Excludes off-budget amounts.
^d Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve's surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.
^e The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 512 of the Act.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF POINTS OF ORDER RAISED SINCE THE FY 2019 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive	Result
127	June 18, 2018	H.R. 5515—John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.	4106(a)-Senate-Pay-As-You-Go Violation ¹	Sen. McConnell (R-KY) ²	81–14, waived

¹ Senator Sanders raised a section 4106(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress) point of order against the bill because the bill would increase the on-budget deficit.
² By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to a roll call vote to waive the point of order.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise today because, like many Americans, I am deeply troubled by the Democrats' reckless calls to abolish ICE, the Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency. That is why I am introducing a resolution to condemn calls for the abolishment of ICE and express support for all officers and personnel who carry out ICE's important mission of protecting American borders. With the ever present threat of international terrorism in the post-9/11 era, abolishing ICE is unthinkable. As our country battles threats from abroad, a historic opioid crisis, and increasing rates of violence against law enforcement officers, we must show our support for the mission of ICE. That is what this resolution does: It says that we see all of you at ICE and your commitment and that the Senate supports you.
ICE's mission is simple: to protect Americans from the cross-border crime

and illegal immigration that threaten our communities. The criminal trafficking of persons and goods across our borders is among the greatest threats to public safety in this country. When ICE agents take to the streets, they are looking to protect our most vulnerable from being exploited by cartels and international gangs like MS-13. This violent gang has taken hold in at least 42 States, including Louisiana.
Just last year, ICE agents removed a million pounds of narcotics and more than 4,800 gang members from the streets of this country. They arrested nearly 800 members of the notoriously violent MS-13 gangs, like Juan Blanco, who was arrested after assaulting someone with a machete in Baton Rouge. Those numbers are just a small fraction of the nearly 127,000 arrests made by ICE agents against people who came here and committed violent crimes against law-abiding Americans. Those criminals were responsible for

more than 50,000 assaults, 2,000 kidnappings, and 1,800 homicides.
However, in 2017, assaults on law enforcement officers also rose dramatically. This wasn't limited to police officers; assaults on ICE agents nearly tripled last year. Now, I am shocked to hear that some of my colleagues are calling for this important Federal agency to be abolished. In fact, I learned today that some Democrats in the House of Representatives plan to introduce legislation that would abolish ICE and expose its agents to the scrutiny of international courts. This open contempt for ICE is astonishing, and it belittles the courage of those who work for this Agency and engage in the legitimate defense of our borders.
The Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency performs vital functions that are necessary to any government, like securing its borders. Last year, agents worked tirelessly around the clock to rescue 1,422 victims of

human trafficking. More than 900 of those victims were children. Abolishing ICE would mean that these people, these precious lives, would still be in grave peril. If we were to heed these extremist calls to abolish ICE, thousands of pounds of heroin, cocaine, and fentanyl would be in our schools and on the streets of our neighborhoods. We cannot ignore the role that ICE agents play in combatting terrorism, sex trafficking, child pornography, gang activity, labor exploitation, and the opioid crisis.

I want to make sure that our agents understand that the American people have their back. My resolution will honor the mission of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement Agency and commend the bravery of these men and women who put their lives on the line every day to dismantle violent and dangerous gangs. I thank all my Republican colleagues who are joining with me on this crucial piece of legislation.

Although much of their work is thankless and goes sight unseen, I am grateful to the thousands of ICE agents who work around the clocks to keep our streets safe. Without them and their tireless service, I can only imagine what our headlines would look like, and I am ashamed of my colleagues on the radical left who are calling for the elimination of this vital agency. I know I speak for more than just myself when I say, simply, don't abolish ICE.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:57 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with amendments, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 488. An act to increase the threshold for disclosures required by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to compensatory benefit plans, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 717. An act to promote pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence.

The message further announced the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3030. An act to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

H.R. 3777. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land containing the Nephi Work Center in Juab County, Utah, to Juab County.

H.R. 4032. An act to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4645. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate certain segments of East Rosebud Creek in Carbon County, Montana, as components of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 4819. An act to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin of southern Africa.

H.R. 4989. An act to require the Department of State to establish a policy regarding the use of location-tracking consumer devices by employees at diplomatic and consular facilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5105. An act to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5480. An act to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 12:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 490. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam.

S. 931. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office".

S. 2692. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

S. 2734. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

At 5:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2) to provide for the reform

and continuation of agricultural and other programs of the Department of Agriculture through fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes, and asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the following Members be the managers of the conference on the part of the House:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONAWAY, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, GOODLATTE, LUCAS, ROGERS of Alabama, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CRAWFORD, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, YOHIO, ROUZER, MARSHALL, ARRINGTON, PETERSON, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, COSTA, WALZ, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. MCGOVERN, VELA, Meses. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. O'HALLERAN.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 4204, 4205, and 9131 of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. FOXX, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. ADAMS.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of subtitles A and B of title VI, sections 6202, 6203, 6401, 6406, 6407, 6409, 6603, 7301, 7605, 8106, 8507, 9119, 9121, and 11101 of the House bill, and sections 6116, 6117, 6202, 6206-09, 6301, 6303, 7412, 9102, 9104, 9106, 9111-13, 12408, 12627, and 12628 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SHIMKUS, CRAMER, and TONKO.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 12609 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HENSARLING, DUFFY, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, CHABOT, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 2802, 6408, 8104, 8107, 8109, subtitles B and C of title VIII, 8402, 8502, 8503, 8506, 8507, 8509, 8510, 9111, 11614, and 11615 of the House bill, and section 2425, subtitle D of title VIII, sections 8601, 8611, 8621-28, 8631, 8632, 12515, 12601, and 12602 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BISHOP of Utah, WESTERMAN, and GRIJALVA.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 1601, 4022, 4026, 8502, and 11609 of the House bill, and sections 3113, 7128, 8623, 8630, 8632, 12301, and 12407 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALKER, COMER, and Ms. PLASKETT.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of section 7509 of the House bill, and section 7409 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ABRAHAM, DUNN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 2404, 6223, 6224, 6503, 9117, and 9118 of the House bill, and sections 2415, 2416, 6124, 6304, and 7412 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DENHAM, GIBBS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3777. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land containing the Nephi Work Center in Juab County, Utah, to Juab County; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4032. An act to confirm undocumented Federal rights-of-way or easements on the Gila River Indian Reservation, clarify the northern boundary of the Gila River Indian Community's Reservation, to take certain land located in Maricopa County and Pinal County, Arizona, into trust for the benefit of the Gila River Indian Community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 4819. An act to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin of southern Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 4989. An act to require the Department of State to establish a policy regarding the use of location-tracking consumer devices by employees at diplomatic and consular facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 5480. An act to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3030. An act to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

H.R. 5105. An act to establish the United States International Development Finance Corporation, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5966. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Mid-Session Review of the Budget of the U.S. Government for Fiscal Year 2019"; to the Committees on Appropriations; and the Budget.

EC-5967. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of General Darren W. McDrew, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5968. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5969. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9980-68-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5970. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Priorities List: Partial Deletion of the Beloit Corporation Superfund Site" (FRL No. 9980-64-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5971. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List: Partial Deletion of the Naval Industrial Reserve Ordnance Plant Superfund Site" (FRL No. 9980-71-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5972. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Emissions Statement Requirement for the 2008 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9980-70-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5973. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Revisions to Part 9 Miscellaneous Rules" (FRL No. 9980-94-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5974. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Flint Hills Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Revision" (FRL No. 9980-96-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5975. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Ohio NSR PM_{2.5} Precursors" (FRL No. 9980-92-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5976. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Approval Plan; Tennessee; Revisions to Stage I and II Vapor Recovery Requirements" (FRL No. 9980-81-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5977. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Kentucky; 2008 Ozone NAAQS Interstate Transport SIP Requirements" (FRL No. 9980-57-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5978. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Setting Medicare Payment Rates for Clinical Diagnostic Laboratory Tests"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5979. A communication from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The MEDIC Produced Some Positive Results but More Could be Done to Enhance its Effectiveness"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5980. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-396, "Helicopter Landing Pad Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5981. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-398, "Student Fair Access to School Amendment Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5982. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Management Response for the period from October 1, 2017 through March 31, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5983. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and Federal Employees Dental and Vision Insurance Program: Expiration of Coverage of Children of Same-Sex Domestic Partners; Federal Flexible Benefits Plan: Pre-Tax Payment of Health Benefits Premiums: Conforming Amendments" (RIN3206-AN34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5984. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Debt Collection Recovery Activities of the Department of Justice for Civil Debts Referred for Collection Annual Report"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5985. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedules of Controlled Substances: Temporary Placement of NM2201, 5F-AB-PINACA, 4-CN-CUMYL-BUTINACA, MMB-CHMICA and 5F-CUMYL-P7AICA Into Schedule I" ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA-479)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5986. A communication from the Assistant Administrator of the Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

"Controlled Substances Quotas" ((RIN1117-AB48) (Docket No. DEA-480)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 16, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-5987. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 13, 2018; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-5988. A communication from the Director of the Contract and Grant Policy Division, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Revised Voucher and Invoice Submission and Payment Process" (RIN2700-AD83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 11, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3229. A bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 3230. A bill to impose a limitation on increases in duties on imports of steel and aluminum from Canada, Mexico, and the European Union, to improve congressional oversight of tariffs imposed to protect national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. KING, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. JONES, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 3231. A bill to establish the Task Force on the Impact of the Affordable Housing Crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 3232. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to provide greater access to in-State television broadcast programming for cable and satellite subscribers in certain counties; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. NELSON, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3233. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons responsible for violence and human rights abuses in Nicaragua, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 3234. A bill to provide at-risk and disconnected youth with subsidized summer and year-round employment and to assist local community partnerships in improving high school graduation and youth employment rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 3235. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish a presumption of

service-connection for certain veterans with tinnitus or hearing loss, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3236. A bill to enhance the ability of Federal agencies to deliver relocation management services to the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON):

S. 3237. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 12th Street Lobby in Columbus, Georgia, as the "Richard W. Williams Chapter of the Triple Nickles (555th P.I.A.) Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 3238. A bill to improve oversight by the Federal Communications Commission of the wireless and broadcast emergency alert systems; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 3239. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 75th anniversary of the integration of baseball; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3240. A bill to promote botanical research and botanical sciences capacity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 576. A resolution designating September 4, 2018, as "National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day", and raising awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 577. A resolution strongly recommending that the United States renegotiate the return of the Iraqi Jewish Archive to Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. Res. 578. A resolution honoring the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration on the 45th anniversary of the agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REED, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 579. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Nelson Mandela on the centenary of his birth; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 580. A resolution recognizing and supporting public awareness of the importance of trademarks and the goals and ideals of the National Trademark Exposition of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 339

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 539

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 539, a bill to designate the area between the intersections of 16th Street, Northwest and Fuller Street, Northwest and 16th Street, Northwest and Euclid Street, Northwest in Washington, District of Columbia, as "Oswaldo Paya Way".

S. 885

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 885, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include foster care transition youth as members of targeted groups for purposes of the work opportunity credit.

S. 1503

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1503, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the 60th anniversary of the Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1917, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2127

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) 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. 2128

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2128, a bill to improve the coordination and use of geospatial data.

S. 2174

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2174, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a study on the Veterans Crisis Line.

S. 2265

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2265, a bill to promote democracy and the rule of law in Nicaragua, and for other purposes.

S. 2276

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2276, a bill to require agencies to submit reports on outstanding recommendations in the annual budget justification submitted to Congress.

S. 2313

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 2313, a bill to deter foreign interference in United States elections, and for other purposes.

S. 2577

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2577, a bill to reauthorize programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

S. 2600

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2600, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on indoor tanning services.

S. 2620

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2620, a bill to establish a Federal cyber joint duty program for cyber employees of Federal agencies.

S. 2667

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

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2863

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2863, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in commemoration of the opening of the National Law Enforcement Museum in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 3029

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3029, a bill to revise and extend the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (PREEMIE Act).

S. 3058

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3058, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the requirement that the taxpayer's basis in a building be reduced by the amount of the rehabilitation credit determined with respect to such building.

S. 3166

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3166, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II.

S. 3172

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3172, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service

Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 3198

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3198, a bill to require annual reports on allied contributions to the common defense, and for other purposes.

S. 3207

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3207, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow for the deferment of certain student loans during a period in which a borrower is receiving treatment for cancer.

S. 3225

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3225, a bill to ensure the humane treatment of pregnant women by reinstating the presumption of release and prohibiting shackling, restraining, and other inhumane treatment of pregnant detainees.

S. 3227

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3227, a bill to reunite families separated at or near ports of entry.

S. RES. 572

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 572, a resolution supporting the officers and personnel who carry out the important mission of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. DAINES):

S. 3229. A bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, last week, President Trump was in Europe meeting with other NATO leaders. One of the major issues he raised was the need to bolster energy security throughout NATO. He specifically talked about a natural gas pipeline that the Russians are building between Russia and Germany. It is called the Nord Stream II Pipeline. I have been talking about this pipeline for years.

President Trump was absolutely right to bring up this important subject. Here is how the Boston Herald put it in an editorial over the weekend: "Trump's testy, tough talk to NATO on point." They say the President's tough talk was absolutely on point.

The President pointed out that Germany relies on natural gas for a substantial amount of its energy needs.

More than half of Germany's natural gas imports come from Russia. With this new pipeline, Germany will actually increase its dependence on Russian gas. Russia will have more of an influence on Germany.

Germany and other countries are members of NATO, and the reason they are members of NATO is to protect themselves against Russian aggression. So if you are Germany, why would you want to become more dependent on Russia when you joined NATO and have been a member of NATO for years to protect against Russian aggression? It seems that Germany has turned around now and given Russia influence over its energy security.

President Trump pointed out how strange it seems. I think it seems strange to other members of NATO, and it seems strange to people all across the country. No one who understands the facts can say that President Trump is wrong. President Trump is right. His tough talk to NATO was on point. Even the Obama administration knew it. The rest of NATO knows it. Even Germany knows it. When one country allows another aggressive, opportunistic country like Russia to have that kind of influence over its energy security, I believe it is asking for trouble. Germany seems to be betting that increasing its economic ties to the Kremlin will have no effect on the political manipulations that Russia wants to play on Europe. I think it is a sucker's bet.

Energy security is national security. Energy security is called the master resource for a reason. It powers our country. It powers our economy. It is an instrument of power. It is a force multiplier. It is important for the United States and our allies around the world to have that correct understanding of energy and the impact that it has globally as a geopolitical weapon. We have seen Russia in the past use its natural gas as a geopolitical weapon. Russia threatens other countries. It extorts money from them. It bullies them. Russians then can tell their customers: Do what we say, or we turn off the tap and we shut off your gas. They have done it in the past.

It also means a lot of money going from our NATO allies straight into the Kremlin's pocket. That is money they could be using instead to fund aggression in Europe and other parts of the world. That is what Russia wants to do with the money, if they get that money from Germany, from the energy. They use the money against us and against our NATO allies.

This new pipeline, I believe, was all the desire of the Russian people—and specifically of Vladimir Putin—to put our NATO allies much more under Russia's control. With the new pipeline, Russia is seeking to make Germany and the rest of Europe even more dependent and even more susceptible to this kind of Russian coercion.

The Wall Street Journal had an editorial on the subject last week. They

wrote that “the embarrassment for Berlin and NATO is that Germany is so happy to help Vladimir Putin execute this plan.” That is the embarrassment for Berlin and the embarrassment for NATO. They said: “Usually hostages need to be taken, instead of volunteering.” But that is what Germany is doing right now—volunteering to be Russia's hostage. That is exactly right.

Europe needs new energy, new energy security, and a new energy source. They need diversity. That is what the European Union needs. They need diversity in both the types of energy—that is what our NATO allies need—diversity in the types of energy that they use and where they get their energy from. That is how countries ensure that their own long-term economic health and independence is sound.

Russia has a right to compete in the world market for energy. The trouble starts when Russia gets so much of the market in some of these European countries that they become a monopoly in terms of the way they act. Russia is the largest supplier of natural gas to Europe. Across Europe, nearly 40 percent of the natural gas imports come from Russia. So Russia has incredible control. In some countries, it is virtually 100 percent.

Countries like Germany should be reducing the amount of natural gas they buy from Russia, not increasing it, but that is what this Nord Stream II Pipeline between Russia and Germany does. It increases the amount of natural gas Germany will be buying from Russia.

Germany should absolutely reject the Nord Stream II Pipeline as part of their reduction of dependence on Russia. That would help shrink the influence and the threat Russia continually poses to our NATO allies. It would also help our other allies in the region because, right now, a lot of Russian gas travels through pipelines that cross Ukraine and other countries into Central Europe. These countries make money from the gas crossing their territory, and they get a lot of their energy through these pipelines as well. But remember, Russia has invaded parts of eastern Ukraine. Russia has taken over Crimea. If Russia has their other new pipeline to help export its natural gas, it can shut off the revenue for countries, such as Ukraine, and shut off their energy completely.

Remember, one of the things President Trump has done, which I think has been helpful and which I had been calling for for years during the Obama administration, is actually provide lethal weapons to Ukraine to deal with the incursions coming from Russia to eastern Ukraine. Vladimir Putin actually cut off natural gas supplies to Ukraine in 2006, 2009, and 2014. He invaded Ukraine and annexed Crimea in part to cut off access to the natural gas and oil resources.

This is a pattern Vladimir Putin has of using energy as a weapon, and the best defense against this weapon is for these countries in Europe to have the

kind of energy diversity and energy security that I have recommended.

In March, I wrote a letter to the Treasury and State Departments encouraging the Trump administration to look at ways to stop the construction of the Nord Stream II Pipeline. That is what we need to do—stop the construction of the pipeline. It was a bipartisan effort, and 39 Senators from both parties signed on to the letter to express our concerns to President Trump about what was happening between Russia and Germany.

Today, I take the next concrete step and introduce legislation to do four very important things.

First, the legislation directs our representatives in NATO to work to achieve energy security for our partners throughout Europe and Eurasia.

Second, it calls for a comprehensive strategy that involves increasing American energy exports to these countries being held hostage by Russia.

Third, it requires the Energy Secretary to speed up approvals of American natural gas exports to our NATO allies and other countries.

Finally, it authorizes mandatory U.S. sanctions on the development of Russian energy pipelines like Nord Stream II.

It is in the national security interests of our country to help our allies reduce their dependence on Russian energy. Where those countries don't see it for themselves, we need to show them how important it is for their own security. Our NATO alliance is strong. A robust energy security strategy will make it even stronger.

When Vladimir Putin looks at natural gas, he doesn't think natural gas; he thinks politics, he thinks money, and he thinks power, because that is how he equates the energy he supplies to these countries, on which they have become so dependent—money, power, politics.

Germany and other countries in Europe and NATO should be doing all they can to diversify their sources of energy so they can help reduce the threat Russia poses to them. The United States should do all we can by exporting our abundant natural gas to our allies as quickly as possible. We have more than enough natural gas to meet our own needs and to export to our friends around the world. We can boost the security of our NATO allies and our friends around the world, and we should be doing it. We can do it through a peaceful process and a peaceful means without spending tax dollars, while at the same time growing our American economy with the production of American energy.

When President Trump came to office, he said: It is no longer about energy security or energy independence; it is about energy dominance. Given what we have been blessed with in this country and the amount of energy and resources we have, we have an opportunity and, I believe, an obligation to use that energy wisely and productively.

Vladimir Putin thinks about energy as money, as power, and as politics, and I think that what we need to do with the resources we have, as I am introducing in this legislation today, is a very commonsense approach.

By Mr. KAINÉ:

S. 3234. A bill to provide at-risk and disconnected youth with subsidized summer and year-round employment and to assist local community partnerships in improving high school graduation and youth employment rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINÉ. Mr. President, nearly 5 million young people ages 16 to 24, or 1 in 9 youth, are disconnected from both school and work. These disconnected youth often face significant barriers; they are three times more likely than other youth to have a disability, twice as likely to live below the federal poverty threshold, and significantly more likely to live in racially segregated neighborhoods. Disconnection can leave young people without the entry-level work experience and post-secondary credentials they need to succeed in the workforce and with significantly less lifetime earnings than the typical worker.

Disconnection also imposes significant costs on affected young people, their communities, and the overall economy. According to Measure of America, in 2013, youth disconnection resulted in \$26.8 billion in public expenditures, including spending on health care, public assistance, and incarceration.

Dedicated Federal funding to support summer and year-long employment for youth can help to mitigate and prevent disconnection, as well as help young people, their communities, and the economy to flourish and develop our future workforce. Twenty years ago, dedicated Federal funding supported an estimated 500,000 summer jobs for youth. However, when the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA) eliminated Federal stand-alone funding, participation in summer youth employment programs dropped by 50 to 90 percent in most local areas. Through targeted resources and supports, including funding for summer and year-long employment and comprehensive supports for youth, we can move closer as a country toward reconnecting the millions of young people who have slipped through the cracks and prevent disconnection from occurring in the first place.

This is why I am pleased to introduce today The Opening Doors for Youth Act. The Opening Doors for Youth Act aims to assist the 5 million at-risk young people who are disconnected from both school and work find summer or year-long jobs that help them to succeed in future careers. The bill provides, Federal funding so local communities can create partnerships with businesses, mentoring, financial lit-

eracy planning, and other supportive services. Through the partnerships, workforce boards can use funds to cover up to 75 percent of wages for each eligible young person participating in the program.

Young people play a critical role in our economy and communities and we must ensure that they have the resources and skills to find and maintain jobs that set them up for future success. With the right resources, city governments, local workforce boards, school districts, and employers can work together to help us close the employment gap we're seeing for at-risk young people. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle consider The Opening Doors for Youth Act commonsense legislation that moves the needle forward on promoting access for all youth to meaningful employment.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 576—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 4, 2018, AS “NATIONAL POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE AWARENESS DAY”, AND RAISING AWARENESS AND UNDERSTANDING OF POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE

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

S. RES. 576

Whereas designating September 4, 2018, as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day” will raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease, one of the most prevalent, life-threatening genetic kidney diseases;

Whereas National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day will help to foster an understanding of the impact polycystic kidney disease has on patients and their families;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease is a progressive, genetic disorder of the kidneys that causes damage to the kidneys and the cardiovascular, endocrine, hepatic, and gastrointestinal organ systems;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease has a devastating impact on the health and finances of people of all ages, and equally affects people of all races, genders, nationalities, geographic locations, and income levels;

Whereas, of the people diagnosed with polycystic kidney disease, approximately 10 percent have no family history of the disease, with the disease developing as a spontaneous (or new) mutation;

Whereas there are very few treatments and still no cure for polycystic kidney disease, which is one of the 4 leading causes of kidney failure in the United States;

Whereas 50 percent of patients with polycystic kidney disease suffer kidney failure at an average age of 53, causing a severe strain on dialysis and kidney transplantation resources and on the delivery of health care in the United States;

Whereas polycystic kidney disease instills in patients fear of an unknown future with a life-threatening genetic disease and apprehension over possible discrimination, including the risk of losing their health and life insurance, their jobs, and their chances for promotion;

Whereas countless friends, loved ones, spouses, and caregivers of patients with polycystic kidney disease must shoulder the physical, emotional, and financial burdens that polycystic kidney disease causes;

Whereas the severity of the symptoms of polycystic kidney disease and the limited public awareness of the disease cause many patients to live in denial and forego regular visits to their physicians or avoid following good health management, which would help avoid more severe complications when kidney failure occurs;

Whereas people who have chronic, life-threatening diseases like polycystic kidney disease have a predisposition to depression because of their anxiety over pain, suffering, and premature death;

Whereas the PKD Foundation and its more than 50 volunteer chapters around the United States are dedicated to—

(1) conducting research to find treatments and a cure for polycystic kidney disease;

(2) fostering public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) educating patients and their families about the disease to improve their treatment and care; and

(4) providing support, including by sponsoring the annual “Walk for PKD” to raise funds for polycystic kidney disease research, education, advocacy, and awareness; and

Whereas the PKD Foundation is partnering on September 4, 2018, with sister organizations in Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, and other countries to increase international awareness of polycystic kidney disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 4, 2018, as “National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day”;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day to raise public awareness and understanding of polycystic kidney disease;

(3) recognizes the need for additional research to find a cure for polycystic kidney disease; and

(4) encourages all people in the United States and interested groups to support National Polycystic Kidney Disease Awareness Day through appropriate ceremonies and activities to promote public awareness of polycystic kidney disease, and to foster an understanding of the impact of the disease on patients and their families.

SENATE RESOLUTION 577—STRONGLY RECOMMENDING THAT THE UNITED STATES RENEGOTIATE THE RETURN OF THE IRAQI JEWISH ARCHIVE TO IRAQ

Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 577

Whereas, before the mid-20th century, Baghdad had been a center of Jewish life, culture, and scholarship, dating back to 721 B.C.;

Whereas, as recently as 1940, Jews made up 25 percent of Baghdad's population;

Whereas, in the 1930s and 1940s, under the leadership of Rasheed Ali, anti-Jewish discrimination increased drastically, including the June 1–2, 1941, Farhud pogrom, in which nearly 180 Jews were killed;

Whereas, in 1948, Zionism was added to the Iraqi criminal code as punishable by death;

Whereas, throughout 1950–1953, Jews were allowed to leave Iraq under the condition that they renounce their citizenship;

Whereas, as result of past persecution, few Jews remain in Iraq today, and many left their possessions and treasured artifacts behind;

Whereas the Ba'ath regime confiscated these artifacts, later dubbed the Iraqi Jewish Archive, from synagogues and communal organizations;

Whereas, on May 6, 2003, members of the United States Armed Forces discovered the Iraqi Jewish Archive, which included 2,700 books and tens of thousands of documents, in the heavily damaged and flooded basement of the Mukhabarat (secret police) headquarters;

Whereas, under great urgency and before adequate time could be dedicated to researching the history of the Iraqi Jewish Archive, an agreement was signed between the National Archives and Records Administration and the Coalition Provisional Authority on August 20, 2003, stating that the Iraqi Jewish Archive would be sent to the United States for restoration and then would be sent back to Iraq after completion;

Whereas the Iraqi Jewish community is the constituency of the Archive and is now represented by the diaspora outside Iraq;

Whereas the current Government of Iraq has publicly acknowledged the importance of the Archive and demonstrated a shared respect for the wishes of the Iraqi Jewish diaspora by attending the December 2013 burial of several Torah fragments from the Archive in New York;

Whereas United States taxpayers invested \$3,000,000 to restore the Iraqi Jewish Archive, and the National Archives and Records Administration has worked diligently to preserve the artifacts;

Whereas the National Archives and Records Administration has, from 2013 to 2018, displayed the Iraqi Jewish Archive in—

- (1) Washington, DC;
- (2) New York, New York;
- (3) Kansas City, Missouri;
- (4) Yorba Linda, California;
- (5) Miami Beach, Florida;
- (6) Dallas, Texas;
- (7) Atlanta, Georgia; and
- (8) Baltimore, Maryland;

Whereas the exhibition of the Iraqi Jewish Archive across the United States and its cataloguing online has enabled people throughout the world and especially the Iraqi Jewish community diaspora to discover, learn about, and reflect upon the rich history of the Jewish community in Iraq;

Whereas, in February 2014, the United States Senate unanimously passed a resolution calling on the Administration to extend the agreement to keep temporarily the Iraqi Jewish Archives in the United States;

Whereas the Administration reached an agreement with the Government of Iraq to keep the Archive in the United States until September 2018; and

Whereas the Iraqi Embassy to the United States has said that the Iraqi Jewish community, like other communities in Iraq, played a key role in building the country, shared in its prosperity, and also suffered exile and forced departure because of tyranny: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) strongly urges the Department of State to renegotiate with the Government of Iraq the provisions of the current agreement that establish the date by which the artifacts of Iraqi Jewish Archive are meant to return to Iraq in order to ensure that they are kept in a place where long-term preservation and care can be guaranteed;

(2) recognizes that the Iraqi Jewish Archive should be housed in a location that is accessible to scholars and to Iraqi Jews and their descendants who have a personal interest in it;

(3) recognizes that the initial agreement between the National Archives and Records Administration and the Coalition Provisional Authority was signed before knowing the complete history of the Iraqi Jewish Archive;

(4) reaffirms the United States' commitment to cultural property under international law; and

(5) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to ensuring justice for victims of ethnic and religious persecution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 578—HONORING THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION ON THE 45TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AGENCY

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

S. RES. 578

Whereas the Drug Enforcement Administration (referred to in this preamble as the "DEA") was—

(1) established by an Executive order on July 1, 1973; and

(2) given the responsibility to coordinate all activities of the Federal Government directly related to the enforcement of the drug laws of the United States;

Whereas the more than 8,900 men and women of the DEA, including special agents, intelligence analysts, diversion investigators, program analysts, forensic chemists, attorneys, and administrative support staff, as well as more than 2,700 task force officers and hundreds of vetted foreign drug law enforcement officers—

(1) serve the United States with courage; and

(2) help protect the people of the United States from drug trafficking, drug abuse, and related violence;

Whereas, during the 45 years since the establishment of the DEA, the agency has targeted and brought to justice numerous criminals from around the world;

Whereas, throughout the 45-year history of the DEA, the agency has continually adapted to evolving trends of drug trafficking organizations by targeting individuals involved in the manufacturing, distribution, and sale of drugs, including cocaine, heroin, methamphetamine, marijuana, ecstasy, controlled prescription drugs, and new psychoactive substances;

Whereas, during the past decade, DEA special agents—

(1) seized—

- (A) more than 65,000 kilograms of heroin;
- (B) 1,240,000 kilograms of cocaine;
- (C) 3,240,000 kilograms of marijuana;
- (D) more than 191,000 kilograms of methamphetamine; and

(E) more than 23,000,000 dosage units of controlled prescription drugs; and

(2) identified more than 600 new psychoactive substances, including controlled substance analogues;

Whereas the DEA has deployed enforcement and regulatory tools and strategies to address the threat posed by new psychoactive substances, including controlled substance analogues, which—

(1) mimic the effects of known licit and illicit controlled substances, including fentanyl; and

(2) are largely responsible for driving the opioid epidemic that claimed the lives of more than 42,000 individuals in the United States in 2016;

Whereas, with 91 foreign offices located in 70 countries, the DEA has the largest inter-

national presence of any Federal law enforcement agency, facilitating—

(1) close collaboration with international partners around the world, including in the Republic of Colombia, the United Mexican States, the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and the People's Republic of China, through information-sharing, training, and technology; and

(2) the provision of resources that have resulted in the disruption or dismantling of 300 priority target drug trafficking organizations in the Republic of Colombia, 226 in the United Mexican States, 53 in the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan, and 45 in the People's Republic of China;

Whereas, throughout the history of the DEA, employees and members of the agency's task forces have sacrificed their lives in the line of duty, including Emir Benitez, Gerald Sawyer, Leslie S. Grosso, Nickolas Fragos, Mary M. Keehan, Charles H. Mann, Anna Y. Mounger, Anna J. Pope, Martha D. Skeels, Mary P. Sullivan, Larry D. Wallace, Ralph N. Shaw, James T. Lunn, Octavio Gonzalez, Francis J. Miller, Robert C. Lightfoot, Thomas J. Devine, Larry N. Carwell, Marcellus Ward, Enrique S. Camarena, James A. Avant, Charles M. Bassing, Kevin L. Brosch, Susan M. Hoefler, William Ramos, Raymond J. Stastny, Arthur L. Cash, Terry W. McNett, George M. Montoya, Paul S. Seema, Everett E. Hatcher, Rickie C. Finley, Joseph T. Aversa, Wallie Howard, Jr., Eugene T. McCarthy, Alan H. Winn, George D. Althouse, Becky L. Dwojeski, Stephen J. Strehl, Richard E. Fass, Frank Fernandez, Jr., Jay W. Seale, Meredith Thompson, Juan C. Vars, Frank S. Wallace, Jr., Shelly D. Bland, Rona L. Chafey, Carrol June Fields, Carrie A. Lenz, Kenneth G. McCullough, Shaun E. Curl, Larry Steilen, Royce D. Tramel, Alice Faye Hall-Walton, Elton Lee Armstead, Terry Loftus, Donald C. Ware, Jay Balchunas, Thomas J. Byrne, Jr., Samuel Hicks, Forrest N. Leamon, Chad L. Michael, Michael E. Weston, James Terry Watson, and Brent L. Hanger; and

Whereas many other DEA employees and task force officers have been wounded or injured in the line of duty, including 14 who have received the DEA Purple Heart Award: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Drug Enforcement Administration on the occasion of its 45th anniversary;

(2) honors the heroic sacrifice of the employees of the agency who have sacrificed their lives or who have been wounded or injured in the service of the United States; and

(3) gives heartfelt thanks to all the men and women of the Drug Enforcement Administration for their past and continued efforts to protect the people of the United States from the dangers of drug abuse.

SENATE RESOLUTION 579—HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF NELSON MANDELA ON THE CENTENARY OF HIS BIRTH

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. REED, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 579

Whereas Nelson Mandela was born on July 18, 1918, as Rolihlahla Mandela in the village of Mvezo in the Eastern Cape of South Africa;

Whereas Nelson Mandela became a political activist as a young man and engaged in diverse acts of civil disobedience and resistance during the struggle against apartheid, the state-enforced system of racial segregation and systematic oppression maintained by the former white minority government of South Africa;

Whereas Nelson Mandela was arrested twice in 1952 for his participation in the Defiance Campaign, which involved the organized contravention of apartheid laws through acts of civil disobedience, and received a suspended sentence of imprisonment with hard labor;

Whereas, on August 5, 1962, as a leader of the African National Congress and the African National Congress Youth League, Nelson Mandela was arrested for his activism to end the discriminatory policies of apartheid;

Whereas, on June 12, 1964, Nelson Mandela was found guilty of all charges against him and sentenced to life imprisonment;

Whereas the global movement to release Nelson Mandela and end the South African system of apartheid—

(1) employed international economic sanctions, such as the sanctions under the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-440; 100 Stat. 1086); and

(2) included the condemnation of apartheid by countless citizens, artists, intellectuals, and activists of the United States;

Whereas, on February 11, 1990, under increasing international pressure and domestic campaign efforts, Nelson Mandela was released from prison after 27 years, 6 months, and 1 week of continuous incarceration;

Whereas, on his release, Nelson Mandela earned international recognition for leading efforts to foster reconciliation, peace, and democracy and for bringing about a negotiated transition ending the apartheid system and establishing universal suffrage and equal rights for all South Africans;

Whereas, on July 4, 1993, former President Bill Clinton awarded Nelson Mandela and Frederik Willem de Klerk the Philadelphia Liberty Medal;

Whereas, on October 1, 1993, the Nobel Peace Prize was jointly awarded to Nelson Mandela and Frederik Willem de Klerk “for their work for the peaceful termination of the apartheid regime, and for laying the foundations of a new democratic South Africa”;

Whereas, between April 16 and April 29, 1994, the citizens of South Africa voted in the first fully representative, multiracial national elections in the history of South Africa;

Whereas, on May 9, 1994, the National Assembly elected Nelson Mandela as President of the Republic of South Africa under a government of national unity;

Whereas, during his term as President of South Africa from 1994 to 1999, Nelson Mandela—

(1) led the peaceful transition from apartheid minority rule to multicultural, multiracial, and multiparty democracy; and

(2) played a critical role in the ongoing efforts of South Africa to foster national reconciliation;

Whereas, on July 29, 1998, Congress awarded Nelson Mandela the Congressional Gold Medal;

Whereas the decision of Nelson Mandela to step down after 1 term as the elected President of South Africa was a commendable act exemplifying his commitment to democratic principles and serves as a model for elected leaders around the globe;

Whereas, on July 9, 2002, former President George W. Bush honored Nelson Mandela with the Presidential Medal of Freedom;

Whereas on November 10, 2009, the United Nations General Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution to designate July 18 as Nelson Mandela International Day;

Whereas the United States was a proud sponsor of the resolution;

Whereas, on December 5, 2013, Nelson Mandela died at the age of 95;

Whereas former President George W. Bush called Nelson Mandela “one of the great forces for freedom and equality of our time”;

Whereas former President Barack Obama called Nelson Mandela “the last great liberator of the 20th century” and observed that “Mandela taught us the power of action, but he also taught us the power of ideas; the importance of reason and arguments; [and] the need to study not only those who you agree with, but also those who you don’t agree with”;

Whereas, on July 28, 2014, former President Barack Obama renamed the Young African Leaders Initiative fellowship the “Mandela Washington Fellowship for Young African Leaders” in honor of Nelson Mandela;

Whereas July 18, 2018 marks the centenary of the birth of Nelson Mandela, which provides an opportunity for people around the world to reflect on his life and promote his legacy;

Whereas, through the leadership of Nelson Mandela, the notion and spirit of “Ubuntu”, a South African term referring to the interconnectedness and harmony of humanity, has spread throughout the world; and

Whereas Nelson Mandela leaves a legacy that transcends his time and place in history and will guide and inspire future generations: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Nelson Mandela;

(2) celebrates the leadership and commitment of Nelson Mandela to fighting discrimination, poverty, and inequality and to promoting human rights and justice for all;

(3) recognizes the shared history between South Africa and the United States, the embedded legacies of racial discrimination and division in both countries, and the shared and continuing efforts to overcome those challenges in the manner exemplified by Nelson Mandela;

(4) encourages the Administration of President Donald Trump to foster the enduring relationship between the people and governments of South Africa and the United States; and

(5) encourages people around the world to reflect on the importance of tolerance, forgiveness, and peace in honor of the centenary of the birth of Nelson Mandela.

SENATE RESOLUTION 580—RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF TRADEMARKS AND THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE NATIONAL TRADEMARK EXPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

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

S. RES. 580

Whereas intellectual property is instrumental to the economy of the United States by fueling innovation and creating jobs;

Whereas Congress and the Congressional Trademark Caucus understand the impor-

tance of trademarks and wish to support the United States Patent and Trademark Office in operating to drive economic growth and enhance the competitiveness of the United States;

Whereas the first National Trademark Exposition took place more than 30 years ago in Washington, D.C.;

Whereas, in an increasingly competitive global marketplace, counterfeit goods pose an escalating threat to businesses and jobs in the United States;

Whereas counterfeit goods cost the United States billions of dollars and countless jobs annually;

Whereas it is important for Congress and consumers to understand the impact of counterfeit goods on the economy of, and the health and safety of consumers in, the United States;

Whereas low quality counterfeit goods can—

(1) be dangerous to consumers and harmful to entrepreneurs; and

(2) erode consumer confidence in brands; Whereas trademark registration and Federal trademark law assist the public in—

(1) discerning between authentic and counterfeit merchandise; and

(2) stopping the flow of counterfeit goods; Whereas consumers in the United States encounter an average of 1,500 trademarks each day;

Whereas it is important for the United States to strive to have the best intellectual property system possible that is understood by the public of the United States;

Whereas the Congressional Trademark Caucus focuses on supporting initiatives that increase awareness of, and foster a productive public dialogue about, the importance of trademarks and the risks associated with counterfeit goods;

Whereas the National Trademark Exposition supports the work of the Congressional Trademark Caucus by facilitating the education of thousands of consumers; and

Whereas educating the public about the value of brand names and trademarks in an increasingly competitive global marketplace serves the public interest of helping to safeguard consumers against deception and confusion in the marketplace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) there should be greater public awareness of the importance of trademarks for the society and economy of the United States;

(B) the 2018 National Trademark Exposition of the United States Patent and Trademark Office provides a unique opportunity to—

(i) educate the people of the United States about trademarks; and

(ii) encourage—

(I) a greater understanding of the role that trademarks play in the economy of the United States; and

(II) corporations, small businesses, governmental agencies, and nonprofit organizations to share information with the public about trademarks; and

(C) the United States Patent and Trademark Office and the Smithsonian Institution should be recognized for orchestrating a free, family-friendly event that educates tens of thousands of people about the importance of trademarks; and

(2) the Senate supports efforts to increase public awareness of the importance of trademarks, including the goals and ideals of the 2018 National Trademark Exposition of the United States Patent and Trademark Office held on July 27 and 28, 2018.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3397. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. RISCH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 526, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

SA 3398. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2850, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3397. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. RISCH) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 526, to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike section 4.

SA 3398. Mr. ROUNDS (for Mr. FLAKE) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2850, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. ____ . USE OF FUNDS IN WMAT SETTLEMENT FUND FOR WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION OF WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.**—Section 307(a) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-291; 124 Stat. 3080) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, (b)(2),” after “subsections (a)”.

(b) **FUNDING.**—Section 312(b)(2)(C)(i)(III) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-291; 124 Stat. 3093) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, including the planning, design, and construction of the WMAT rural water system, in accordance with section 307(a).”.

SEC. ____ . EXPANSION OF PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA LAND ELIGIBLE FOR 99-YEAR LEASE.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”) (25 U.S.C. 415(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking “Indians,” and inserting “Indians,”;

(2) by inserting “Ohkay Owingeh pueblo,” after “Cochiti,”;

(3) by inserting “the pueblo of Santa Clara,” after “Pojoaque,”;

(4) by striking “the the lands” and inserting “the land”;

(5) by striking “lands held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara,”; and

(6) by striking “lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have 7 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 au-

thorized 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, July 18, 2018, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Sharks”.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nominations of Brian J. Bulatao, of Texas, to be an Under Secretary (Management), and Denise Natali, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary (Conflict and Stabilization Operations), both of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, CUSTOMS, AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

The Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, July 18, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Molly Patrick, Lane Davis, Victoria Barczyk, James Payne, and Gabe Dabin, interns from Senator KENNEDY’s office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

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

NOTICE: REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for the 2018 second quarter Mass Mailing report is Wednesday, July 25, 2018.

An electronic option is available on Webster that will allow forms to be submitted via a fillable pdf document. If your office did no mass mailings dur-

ing this period, please submit a form that states “none.”

Mass mailing registrations or negative reports can be submitted electronically or delivered to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510-7116.

The Senate Office of Public Records is open from 9 a.m. to 6 p.m. For further information, please contact the Senate Office of Public Records at (202) 224-0322.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Calendar No. 942; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nomination considered and confirmed is as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Coast Guard Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203(a):

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (1h) Andrew S. McKinley

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MICROLOAN MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 346, S. 526.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 526) to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Microloan Modernization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “intermediary” has the meaning given the term in section 7(m)(11) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(11)); and

(2) the term “microloan program” means the program established under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)).

SEC. 3. MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY LENDING LIMIT INCREASED.

Section 7(m)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(3)(C)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$6,000,000”.

SEC. 4. MICROLOAN TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Section 7(m)(4)(E) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(4)(E)) is amended by striking “25 percent” each place that term appears and inserting “50 percent”.

SEC. 5. SBA STUDY OF MICROENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall conduct a study and submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the operations (including services provided, structure, size, and area of operation) of a representative sample of—

(A) intermediaries that are eligible to participate in the microloan program and that do participate; and

(B) intermediaries (including those operated for profit, operated not for profit, and those affiliated with a United States institution of higher learning) that are eligible to participate in the microloan program and that do not participate;

(2) the reasons why intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B) choose not to participate in the microloan program;

(3) recommendations on how to encourage increased participation in the microloan program by intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B); and

(4) recommendations on how to decrease the costs associated with participation in the microloan program for eligible intermediaries.

SEC. 6. GAO STUDY ON MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY PRACTICES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report evaluating—

(1) oversight of the microloan program by the Small Business Administration, including oversight of intermediaries participating in the microloan program; and

(2) the specific processes used by the Small Business Administration to ensure—

(A) compliance by intermediaries participating in the microloan program; and

(B) the overall performance of the microloan program.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that the Risch amendment at the desk be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment (No. 3397) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To strike section 4)

Strike section 4.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. ROUNDS. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 526), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 526

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Microloan Modernization Act of 2018”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “intermediary” has the meaning given the term in section 7(m)(11) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(11)); and

(2) the term “microloan program” means the program established under section 7(m) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)).

SEC. 3. MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY LENDING LIMIT INCREASED.

Section 7(m)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(m)(3)(C)) is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” and inserting “\$6,000,000”.

SEC. 4. SBA STUDY OF MICROENTERPRISE PARTICIPATION.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall conduct a study and submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the operations (including services provided, structure, size, and area of operation) of a representative sample of—

(A) intermediaries that are eligible to participate in the microloan program and that do participate; and

(B) intermediaries (including those operated for profit, operated not for profit, and those affiliated with a United States institution of higher learning) that are eligible to participate in the microloan program and that do not participate;

(2) the reasons why intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B) choose not to participate in the microloan program;

(3) recommendations on how to encourage increased participation in the microloan program by intermediaries described in paragraph (1)(B); and

(4) recommendations on how to decrease the costs associated with participation in the microloan program for eligible intermediaries.

SEC. 5. GAO STUDY ON MICROLOAN INTERMEDIARY PRACTICES.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives a report evaluating—

(1) oversight of the microloan program by the Small Business Administration, including oversight of intermediaries participating in the microloan program; and

(2) the specific processes used by the Small Business Administration to ensure—

(A) compliance by intermediaries participating in the microloan program; and

(B) the overall performance of the microloan program.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION PROTECTION ACT OF 2017

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 347, S. 791.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 791) to amend the Small Business Act to expand intellectual property education and training for small businesses, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. ROUNDS. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 791) was passed, as follows:

S. 791

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Small Business Innovation Protection Act of 2017”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) the term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the SBA;

(2) the term “Director” means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the USPTO;

(3) the term “SBA” means the Small Business Administration;

(4) the term “small business concern” has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632(a));

(5) the term “small business development center” means a center described in section 21 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648); and

(6) the term “USPTO” means the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the USPTO and the SBA are positioned to—

(A) build upon several successful intellectual property and training programs aimed at small business concerns; and

(B) increase the availability of and the participation in the programs described in subparagraph (A) across the United States; and

(2) any education and training program administered by the USPTO and the SBA should be scalable so that the program is able to reach more small business concerns.

SEC. 4. SBA AND USPTO PARTNERSHIPS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Director, shall develop partnership agreements that—

(1) provide for the—

(A) development of high-quality training, including in-person or modular training sessions, for small business concerns relating to domestic and international protection of intellectual property;

(B) leveraging of training materials already developed for the education of inventors and small business concerns; and

(C) participation of a nongovernmental organization; and

(2) provide training—

(A) through electronic resources, including Internet-based webinars; and

(B) at physical locations, including—

(i) a small business development center; and

(ii) the headquarters or a regional office of the USPTO.

SEC. 5. SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS.

Section 21(c)(3) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(c)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (S), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (T), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(U) in conjunction with the United States Patent and Trademark Office, providing training—

“(i) to small business concerns relating to—

“(I) domestic and international intellectual property protections; and

“(II) how the protections described in subclause (I) should be considered in the business plans and growth strategies of the small business concerns; and

“(ii) that may be delivered—

“(I) in person; or

“(II) through a website.”.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 416, S. 2850.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2850) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the Flake amendment at the desk be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The amendment (No. 3398) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SEC. _____. USE OF FUNDS IN WMAT SETTLEMENT FUND FOR WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF WMAT RURAL WATER SYSTEM.—Section 307(a) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat.

3080) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by inserting “, (b)(2),” after “subsections (a)”.

(b) FUNDING.—Section 312(b)(2)(C)(i)(III) of the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–291; 124 Stat. 3093) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: “, including the planning, design, and construction of the WMAT rural water system, in accordance with section 307(a).”.

SEC. _____. EXPANSION OF PUEBLO OF SANTA CLARA LAND ELIGIBLE FOR 99-YEAR LEASE.

Subsection (a) of the first section of the Act of August 9, 1955 (commonly known as the “Long-Term Leasing Act”) (25 U.S.C. 415(a)), is amended—

(1) by striking “Indians,” and inserting “Indians,”;

(2) by inserting “Ohkay Owingeh pueblo,” after “Cochiti,”;

(3) by inserting “the pueblo of Santa Clara,” after “Pojoaque,”;

(4) by striking “the the lands” and inserting “the land”;

(5) by striking “lands held in trust for the Pueblo of Santa Clara,” and

(6) by striking “lands held in trust for Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo”.

The bill (S. 2850), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2018

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, July 19; 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. I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bounds nomination; further, that all time in recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count against postcloture time.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROUNDS. 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, following the remarks of the Senator from Delaware.

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

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

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

HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF NELSON MANDELA

Mr. COONS. Mr. President on this date a century ago, an extraordinary life began that would change the lives of millions of others. One hundred years ago today, Nelson Mandela was born in the village of Mvezo in a countryside of grass-covered rolling hills in the Eastern Cape of South Africa. That day began a 95-year journey of one man who led the South African people to liberation and whose legacy continues to reverberate through time.

Over the course of his life, Nelson Mandela, known by his nickname “Madiba,” became venerated as a global advocate for justice and equality by millions—arguably, more than any other political figure of our time. Through political activism and resistance, Madiba led a revolution by shepherding his people from racial division, hate, and subjugation to freedom, tolerance, and democracy.

One of the most striking aspects of Nelson Mandela’s leadership as the first President of a truly free, non-racial, nonsexist South Africa was his enormous capacity for forgiveness and his ability to open his heart to those who were once his brutal oppressors.

Twenty years after he was released from a lifetime in prison, Nelson Mandela invited to dinner at his own home one of his former jailers, a man with whom he had become close friends, saying that their friendship reinforced his belief in the essential humanity of even those who had kept him for so long behind bars. How long? Twenty-six years, 6 months, and 1 week.

Despite all of those years, months, and days of continuous imprisonment, Nelson Mandela never himself became a prisoner to hate. Madiba set the example of healing, forgiveness, and reconciliation that ultimately allowed South Africa’s rainbow nation to emerge from the ashes of brutal racial oppression.

His example is particularly timely and powerful in light of the polarization, distrust, and division in our world and even in our own Nation today. History reminds us, though, that this reconciliation, this openness, is not a new phenomenon.

Fifty-two years ago this summer, in June of 1966, then-U.S. Senator Robert F. Kennedy delivered a memorable speech at the University of Cape Town in South Africa. Speaking to a nation then deep in the throes of the cruel injustices of apartheid, Senator Bobby Kennedy began his speech by describing “a land in which the native inhabitants were at first subdued, but relations with whom remain a problem to this day; a land which defined itself on a hostile frontier; a land which was once the importer of slaves, and must now struggle to wipe out the last traces of that former bondage.” Kennedy then paused before famously concluding: “I refer, of course, to the United States of America.”

Then, as now, the differences between the United States and South Africa are significant. Yet Americans and South Africans share more than we might recognize or want to acknowledge. On the positive side, we share remarkable constitutions and inspiring foundational documents in South Africa's Freedom Charter and our own Declaration of Independence, whose fundamental principles are profound and inspiring but whose lived experiences have so far fallen short. We also share a deep commitment to democracy, societies grounded in the rule of law, a vibrant and free press, and capable and independent judiciaries. We are also multilingual, multifaith democracies, Federal republics that have incredible human histories and deep and rich natural resources. Both South Africa and the United States have demonstrated how important civic institutions are to sustaining democracy and preserving the progress of humanity.

Today, on what would have been Nelson Mandela's 100th birthday, the United States is itself facing serious challenges to the very institutions that underpin and preserve our hard-won democracy. As we weather these challenges together as a nation, let us find inspiration in Mandela's life and legacy. Let us remember that on his long walk to freedom, Nelson Mandela taught the need to study not only those with whom we agree but also those with whom we disagree and to be willing to compromise and find common ground.

In Madiba's words:

It is easy to break down and destroy. The real heroes are those who make peace and build.

In the years to come, it is my hope that the United States and South Africa will look to each other as both nations continue to struggle against the legacy of racial injustice, reverse our growing economic inequality, and protect our evolving experiments in democracy.

Nelson Mandela ventured to shape the world as it should be. He showed us that values such as forgiveness, respect, and tolerance are not just words but concrete actions we can all take.

I am inspired by Madiba's example to keep fighting for a better, more just world here in the U.S. Senate, as I was first inspired in the fall of 1986 when I traveled to South Africa to volunteer for the South African Council of Churches during the anti-apartheid struggle.

Just 2 years ago, I had a chance as a new Senator to revisit Johannesburg and Cape Town with a delegation that included Senator Kennedy's daughter, Kerry Kennedy, and a whole host of the Kennedy clan. Our own Congressman JOHN LEWIS, a leader in America's civil rights struggle; my friend and colleague Congressman STENY HOYER; and two survivors of the racially motivated shooting in a church in downtown Charleston, Polly Sheppard and Felicia Sanders, were there to serve as a living

example of the challenges and the difficulties of reconciliation, of forgiveness, and of grace.

We had remarkable experiences. We met with Desmond Tutu, my former supervisor at the Council of Churches decades ago, a winner of the Nobel Peace Prize and someone who helped lead the peace and reconciliation process in South Africa. We also heard from today's chancellor of the University of Cape Town, Nelson Mandela's widow, Graca Machel.

Our reflections were interrupted by student protesters demanding a more just dispensation in today's South Africa—a jarring reminder that even the greatness of the remembrance of Bobby Kennedy and Nelson Mandela is not enough to still the relentless yearning for more—more justice and more equality—by the youngest among us.

I still today believe in Nelson Mandela's vision for the world—a world governed by justice and equality and peace and cooperation for the common good. But it is important to remember just how much we have to do together as a global community to hear each other, forgive each other, and get there.

Nelson Mandela once famously said: "I am not a saint, unless you think of a saint as a sinner who just keeps trying." So today let us remember Nelson Mandela's relentless trying, his historic contribution to South Africa and the world, and the example of his struggle to promote human rights and justice for all. Madiba's service is an enduring reminder of what it means to place the good of a nation's people above one's own narrow self-interests—a lesson from which we can all benefit.

I am pleased to celebrate the 100th anniversary of the birth of a giant of history and to honor Nelson Mandela's lifetime of extraordinary service with a bipartisan resolution submitted today. Today, let us rededicate ourselves to his vision for our world and together work tirelessly to make it a reality.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:24 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SCOTT HUTCHINS, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS, VICE CATHERINE E. WOTEKI.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

LANE GENATOWSKI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE ADVANCED RESEARCH PROJECTS AGENCY-ENERGY, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE ELLEN DUDLEY WILLIAMS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID HALE, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MIN-

ISTER, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (POLITICAL AFFAIRS), VICE THOMAS A. SHANNON, JR., RESIGNED.

KIP TOM, OF INDIANA, FOR THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS AGENCIES FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE.

DONALD Y. YAMAMOTO, OF WASHINGTON, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF SOMALIA.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

CHARLES WICKSER BANTA, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022, VICE MARIA ROSARIO JACKSON, TERM EXPIRED.

MICHELLE ITCZAK, OF INDIANA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2020, VICE IRVIN M. MAYFIELD, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

BARBARA COLEEN LONG, OF MISSOURI, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022, VICE DEEPA GUPTA, TERM EXPIRED.

CARLETON VARNEY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022, VICE PAUL W. HODES, TERM EXPIRED.

COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RICHARD S. TISCHNER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE NANCY MARIA WARE, TERM EXPIRED.

ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION

DONALD L. PALMER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE ELECTION ASSISTANCE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 12, 2021, VICE MATTHEW VINCENT MASTERTSON, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. MARYANNE MILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MICHAEL T. PLEHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

ILDA Y. ISAZA
MATTHEW J. KING

To be major

YOBANKA E. PAEZ-MUNOZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

SAMANTHA S. RIEGER-PINSON

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

KENNETH F. KLOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BRANDON C. KLING

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BURTON C. GLOVER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MANUEL REYES, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

EMMANUEL D. EISENSTEIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MARSHALL L. BARTEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

DONALD C. CARMICHAEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ETHAN P. CARTER
GREGORY L. CLARK
LASHONDA D. COLESWIGGINS
JOHN C. DAVIS
BRYAN J. GREEN
GEORGE F. HENRY, JR.
ROBERT E. H. JOHNSON
THOMAS R. KIRBY
PETER P. MACK
TEALLA H. MARTIN
AARON B. NEAL
WILLIAM S. ROBBINS
NEIL T. ROEDER
MICHAEL A. SEISE
NEIL E. THOWE
GREGORY J. VENVERTLOH
DAVID L. WASHINGTON
SAMUEL R. WETHERILL IV

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

PATRICIA J. RASMUSSEN
AMY L. SANDERS
TRACY H. SCHMITT
RONALD M. SOUTHERLAND
DICKIE J. VEST, JR.
KENT J. VINCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JEREMY W. BERNDT
MONICA MARTINEZ
AMY M. RAMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

SCOTT M. EVERHART
VERNON G. LANCE
MARK A. MILLER
ALBERT SOHNEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

WILLIAM PEREZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBYN D. BOLGLA
JAMES J. BOR
KATHLEEN D. KAPPEL
NICOLE T. KEENEY
KEVIN M. LOVE
RHONDA D. WYNDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL C. AMPELAS
JAMES F. BRINKMAN
MELISSA A. BUSOVSKYMCNEAL
JULIO A. CHALELA
JANE E. GROSS
CHARLES T. HUDDLESTON
KERMIT D. HUEBNER
GREGORY M. JOHNSTON
JUSTIN L. KNOWLES
TIMOTHY O. PFEIFFER
JORDAN E. PINSKER
STEPHEN R. TRAVIS
TIMOTHY G. VEDDER
WILLIAM A. WALTERS III
DANIEL R. WILLIAMS
KAREN C. WRIGHT
KURT G. ZIMMER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

MICHAEL S. ALLAIN

BRYON W. FETTY
PAUL W. GROTELUSCHEN
MICHAEL L. LAZO
GEOFFREY B. LINCOLN
ERIC J. MARTINSON
ANTHONY P. MCGINTHY
RANDALL J. MYSZKA
PAUL R. PETERSON
LAURA J. STEPHENS
MONTY K. TORRES
CARMEN M. TUCKER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DONNA M. KENTLEY
AARON C. KYER
GARY W. LOUDEN
STEPHEN P. MCKENZIE
HEIDI R. MUNRO
ROY C. OUANO
MICHAEL S. ROSCOE
DAVID J. SKELLEY, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KIMBERLY D. DEJESUS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROYAL M. MINOR III
CRAIG E. PARSONS
BENITO E. RODRIGUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

EDWARD L. BARRON, JR.
BENJAMIN A. BLACKBURN III
SEAN P. CONNOLLY
FRANKLIN R. FLORENCE
GABRIEL A. ISIOYE
ALVARO MAYA
MICHAEL B. MOREHEAD
MICHELE M. RICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LORI J. ALLERT
RICHARD T. ALSDORF, JR.
CATHY BALZANO
DANA F. BARRETT CAMPBELL
SMITH V. L. BASE
EILEEN C. BROWN
JAMES M. COMPLIMENT
DARRIN B. DAILEY
JOAN R. DAVIS
TIMOTHY B. DAVIS
CATHERINE F. DEVITO
PAUL E. ESACHINA
ALECIA A. HARRISON
CHRISTOPHER W. HONEA
FAITH L. JUNGHANN
DEBRA L. KRISAK
MICHELLE D. LAFLEUR
TONI A. LOFTUS
DENNIS C. LOURA
ARLENE LUCKY
KAREN L. MCGUIRE
JAY H. MOTOKAWA
MAEVELYN A. ODONNELL
CLAUDIA A. PETERSON
JOHN M. PROVENZANO
ROBERT R. RAMONAS
DAVID C. REED
RODNEY L. SANDERS
SONIA A. M. TENADU
LARA K. TERAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CARL W. ADAMS
SANDEEP K. AGGARWAL
MICHAEL O. BARRON, JR.
IAN H. BLACK
TIEN D. BUI
BRUCE T. BURKS
WILLIAM T. BURNETT
MICHAEL B. COOK
PAUL J. CORCORAN
DOUGLAS J. CREEDON
MARC P. DIFAZIO
BRENDAN T. DOHERTY
CHARLES H. DUKES
TIMUR S. DURRANI
PARHAM K. GHAVAMI
ELLINA HALL
HANY E. HANNA
JOSHUA P. HERZOG
LYNN C. HUFFMAN
MALENE INGRAM
DIANE K. JONES
JONATHAN KITCHIN

PAUL J. KUBIAK
GREGORY LACY
RALPH E. LAYMAN III
JACK C. LEONG
TRACY S. LOPER
STEVEN A. LORBER
WILLIAM E. NORTHRINGTON
PHILIP R. PALMER
KRISHNA PATEL
JOHN C. PAUMIER
DIANA RIERA
MICHAEL J. ROACH
BRENDA ROSARIO PADRON
LOREN P. SIMPSON
WILLIAM R. SMITH
ADA D. STEWART
CHARLES A. STILLMAN
GARY STOLOVITZ
STEVEN G. SUGDEN
KENNETH L. WILSON
KEVIN M. WOODS
JOHN H. WU

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

KORY A. ANGLESEY
CHRISTOPHER S. CASNE
JOSEPH W. CHARLES
MARK J. CHRISTENSEN
BRAD G. COLEMAN
LUKE A. COWLEY
ARCE D. DOBLE, JR.
JOSEPH A. DUNAWAY
MARCEL T. DUPLANTIER
NATHANIEL L. HERRON
ANDREW B. HUNT
STERLING P. INGRAM IV
MICAH J. KILETICO
ERIC L. MARTENS
JEROD D. MCCULLY
TATE L. METLEN
GARETH A. MONTGOMERY
ROBERT L. OLSON
JOSHUA M. PERRY
ROBERT S. RAMSEY
BRENT D. RICHARDSON
DAWN C. ROE
BRIAN B. SCHONEFELD
KENNETH D. SOWELL
JAMES T. STEWART
FRANCIS J. TAY, JR.
BRENT J. UYEHARA
BENJAMIN C. WAITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

DAVID W. ALEXANDER
JOHN D. AULT
GREGORY A. CATES
VICTORIA A. CHAPPELL
JOHN D. CONNOLLY
SAMUEL CONTRERAS
CRISTIANO S. DESOUSA
PETER W. DIETZ
GARY W. FOSHEE
DOUGLAS A. GRACE
ERIC P. HAMMEN
SONG S. HWANG
DAVID J. JELTEMA
CHARLES W. JOHNSON
RONALD J. KENNEDY
DAVID D. J. KIM
RICHARD S. LEE
RUSSELL D. MARTIN
AARON T. MILLER
SUNNY MITCHELL
ROBERT S. NELSON
THOMAS P. OFLANAGAN
ROBERT W. PETERS
RANDAL K. POTTER
CARL P. RHOADS
AARON D. ROBERTSON
RICHARD C. SMOTHERS
COREY T. THORNTON
JOHN C. VANDYKE
BRUCE A. VAUGHAN
RICHARD H. WIESE
HAROLD B. WOODRUFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JONATHAN D. ALBANO
VINCENT M. J. AMBROSINO
KARLIE M. BLAKE
CLINTON S. BRYANT
JASON D. CALANDRUCCIO
WILLIAM I. COFFERN IV
BRIAN D. COLBURN
SUQUON D. COMBS
ERIC J. COOMES
DIANA I. DALPHONSE
AUTUMN L. DANIEL
EUGENE DAWSON, JR.
ERIK A. DECKER
DUNCAN R. ELLIS
KRISTEN J. ELLIS
KIRK A. ENGLER

KENNETH E. FINDLEY
 MONICA M. FREY
 MAXINE J. J. GARDNER
 JASON P. HARPER
 WILLIAM B. HUNT
 SCOTT T. HUTTLESTON
 JASON V. ILETO
 IAN G. ILIFF
 BRENNAN J. KEMPER
 MICHAEL A. KIDD
 GENE M. LATTUS, JR.
 SCOTT A. LONG
 BENJAMIN I. MAY
 DONALD M. MCINTYRE
 JAMIE L. MITCHELL
 MICHAEL J. MULLERHEIM
 BENJAMIN S. NICHOLS
 CHRISTOPHER F. OCONNOR
 THURMAN B. PHILLIPS
 DOUGLAS M. QUINN
 CHRISTOPHER C. RADKE
 MICHELLE A. SIMMONS
 JARROD H. SMITH
 DONNA L. SMOAK
 ALBERT T. SONON IV
 JARED J. SWEETSER
 JOHN TAMEZ
 ROBIN L. TAYLOR
 ANDREW J. TEW
 BLAKE A. WHITTLE
 RAYMOND C. YAU
 JAMES P. ZAKAR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JANE J. ABANES
 EDUARDO F. BARNET
 JAMES R. BIRKLA
 COLLEEN C. BLOSSER
 CONNIE J. BRAYBROOK
 BRIAN K. BURDICK
 PATRICIA D. BUTLER
 RHONDA H. CANTU
 MARCELO A. CENTAURE
 MOLLY A. COOK
 MICHAEL J. CORNELL
 ROBERT F. CUENTO
 TERESA C. DENT
 RONALD G. DEWEES
 ELIZABETH M. DRAKE
 CAROLYN H. ELLISON
 JAMES L. ESTOESTA
 EBONY J. FERGUSON
 SUZANNE N. FIERROS
 KAREN A. FLANAGAN
 CANDACE R. POURA
 ABDON F. GALERA
 DANILO A. GARCIA DUENAS
 SARAH E. GENTRY
 JASON A. GOFF
 JASON M. GUZMAN
 PENELOPE J. HEIGES
 ANDREA M. HERNANDEZ
 ELISABETH B. HOLMES
 JOHN A. HOYOS
 DAVY J. JENKINS
 JOANNA T. JOHNSON
 MARIA KENNEDY
 ROBERT J. KIMBERLING
 HEATHER L. KIRK
 TRACY R. KRAUSS
 DUANE J. LAMPERT
 LYL A. E. LAW
 DERRICK LEBEAU
 JONATHAN D. LEVENSON
 JACQUELINE LOPEZ
 KATHLEEN M. MACAPAGAL
 SCOTT M. MACDONALD
 JENNIFER J. MAGUIRE
 SCOTT A. MCGILL
 MATTHEW P. MCMAHON
 JOSE A. MERCADO
 REGINALD MIDDLEBROOKS
 JEFFREY A. MILES
 CHAD B. MOORE
 THERESA D. MORRIS
 SARA L. NACZAS
 PETER I. NYILAS
 TED U. PAGULAYAN
 STEPHANIE M. PAONE
 KENDRA L. PENNINGTON
 TRAVIS J. PETERSON
 MARGARET M. REYNOLDS
 MATTHEW V. REZA
 SHANNAN C. ROTRUCK
 AMANDA E. SCHAFFELD
 REBECCA A. SCHROEDER
 KATIE E. SCHULZ
 MARC A. SILFIES
 JAMIE M. SORENSON
 ANDREAS STILLER
 DAMIAN M. STORZ
 RANDY L. TOLBERT
 KELLY A. TROUT
 MICHELLE L. WESTCOTT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

MATTHEW S. BAILEY
 JOHN J. BATTISTI
 DENIZ M. BAYKAN

MICHAEL W. BLOOMROSE
 DAVID A. CHRISTENSON
 SARAH J. COTTRILL
 JUSTIN C. HENDERSON
 WILLIAM A. HOLT
 MICHAEL J. HUSSEY
 JOCELYN E. LOFTUSWILLIAMS
 JOSHUA R. LORENZ
 JOHN A. V. LOVASTIK
 DAVID A. MELSON
 MICHAEL G. MONTAGUE
 CAMERON R. NELSON
 PETER R. OSTROM
 JENNIFER L. POLLIO
 JESSICA L. PYLE
 TRACY L. REYNOLDS
 KATHERINE E. SHOVLIN
 RACHEL E. TREST
 ALLISON E. WARD
 MEREDITH S. WERNER
 LENA E. WHITEHEAD
 ADAM B. YOST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LYNDA S. AMELL
 CHRISTOPHER E. BARNES
 ALLISON L. BENNETT
 WILLIAM O. BENNETT
 EDWARD BRINSTON
 HYRUM T. BROSSARD
 ALAN D. CHRONISTER
 KATHLEEN A. COLTER
 RODERICK DAVIS, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER S. DEANGELIS
 KYLE D. DOHM
 KORRINA R. DONALD
 NICOLE J. DUTTON
 ASHLEE C. ESPERITU
 JOSEPH J. FORD, JR.
 REINA GOMEZ
 DANIEL L. IMMEKER
 ELMER L. JIMENEZ
 JAMES M. KEENER
 KIMBERLY L. LITTEL
 NICHOLAS J. MARTIN
 FELECIA E. MCCLELLAN
 KINAU Y. MCCOY
 WILFREDO MORALES
 MARKEECE L. MURRIEL
 JAMES M. NOGLE
 KIMBERLY A. OELSCHLAGER
 AYODELE O. OLABISI
 EMILY A. OWENS
 CINDI L. PALACIOS
 MICHAEL G. PROUTY
 MATHEW B. RARIDEN
 JENIFER M. SCANCELLA
 MARK P. SIMONS
 DAVID J. SOHL
 LISSETH C. THOMAS
 JESUS S. THOMPSON
 AYESSA B. TOLER
 TYLER J. TOWERS
 JEREMY H. WESTCOTT
 BRANDON J. WILLIAMS
 CHADWICK Y. YASUDA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LALEH ABDOLAZADEH
 WILLIAM P. BOGGESE
 MARTIN J. BRAUD
 JASON N. BURKES
 KATHERINE L. CHENG
 LORA L. CHOW
 JEFFREY L. CULBREATH
 CORINNE C. DEVIN
 DAVID M. DOW II
 DANIKI J. DOWNEY
 COLIN A. ELIOT
 BENJAMIN D. FITZHARRIS
 REBECCA A. FRAZER
 JARED A. GELER
 EDUARDO GOMEZ
 JESUS M. GONZALEZ
 MICHAEL J. GRAU, JR.
 FRED J. HARPER III
 SCOTT A. HOCKER
 JACQUELINE A. M. HOGAN
 DANIEL J. HONL
 JAIME L. JAMES
 BROCK J. JOHNSON
 BENJAMIN J. LAGO
 DARIEN G. LAZARO
 ANDREA D. LISELL
 BRADLEY D. MARTINSEN
 GEOFFREY T. MCMURRAY
 PATRICK T. MORRELL
 HOAN B. NGHIEM
 MARK A. NOCERA
 JAMES M. OBRIEN
 ANDREW C. PARK
 CHRISTOPHER D. PARKS
 MICHAEL L. PAYNE
 LEONEL PEREZ, JR.
 DAVID M. RASMUSSEN
 BENJAMIN L. RICKS
 GREGORY E. RINGLER
 JUSTIN L. ROGERS
 JAMES M. ROSS

FREDERICK J. RUMFORD IV
 ANGELA C. SESSA
 ANDREW D. SILVESTRI
 DEREK D. SODEN
 SARA A. STIRES
 CLARENCE S. TANG
 STEPHEN M. WADE
 LESLIE H. WALLACE
 MARY N. WILLIAMSTREESH
 DONAVON A. YAPSHING
 CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LISA L. ABELS
 KEITH A. ALFIERI
 LEE R. ALLEN
 ALEX T. ALLWEIN
 GEORGE C. BALAZS
 RUSSELL P. BALMER
 TAYLOR A. BANKS
 JEREMY P. BARAN
 NADINE S. BARKSDALE
 ANTHONY M. BIELAWSKI
 VERONICA E. BIGORNIA
 KESHA N. BLAIR
 BENJAMIN R. BLEVINS
 ERIN M. BLEVINS
 DENISE BOGGSWILKERSON
 TAMARA BRAINARD
 JACK R. BRANDAU
 ANDREW M. BRANHAM
 ERIK D. BRINK
 STEPHEN M. BRONAUGH
 HELEN L. CANN
 SHANNON M. CAPP
 BRETT M. CHAMBERLIN
 DARRIN CHERRY
 GREGORY T. CHESNUT
 ROBERT D. CHIARUTTINI
 EVA CHOU
 JAMES C. CLIFFORD
 MARY J. CLINGAN
 WILLIAM K. CONLEY II
 JONATHAN COOKE
 JAMES S. CORTES
 MARK P. COSIO
 TIFFANY C. COX
 HAMPTON A. CRIMM
 RAYMOND J. CUDNIK III
 MICHAEL E. CUNNINGHAM
 FRANCIS P. CUOZZO
 NATHAN S. CUTLER
 BENNETT L. DAVIS
 AMBER N. DECHAMBEAU
 ANGELA M. DICARLOMEACHAM
 TIMOTHY J. DONAHUE
 MICHAEL L. DOXEY
 ERYN J. H. DUTTA
 CHARLES S. EISENBERG
 JEREMY S. ENNIS
 WILLIAM L. FALLS
 JAMIE L. FITCH
 DEREK L. FOERSCHLER
 BRIAN C. FOLEY
 CHRISTOPHER W. FOSTER
 JANELLE A. FOX
 AMY J. FRANKSTON
 KYLE D. GADBOIS
 MICAH J. GASPARY
 ANTHONY A. GIBERMAN
 DAVID M. GLANSMAN
 SARAH L. GRANGER
 ROLF E. GRANING
 MICHAEL S. GREEN, JR.
 JUSTIN A. HARDER
 TRAVIS E. HARRELL
 GREGORY S. HENDERSON
 ANTONIA J. HENRY
 MATTHEW F. HOEFELER
 MATTHEW A. HUMPHREYS
 ANDREW P. HURVITZ
 DINCHEN A. JARDINE
 SHANE D. JENSEN
 PAUL D. JOHNSON
 KEVIN D. JOHNSON
 LUCAS A. JOHNSON
 MARK S. JOHNSON
 REBECCA L. JOHNSON
 JAIME H. KAPUR
 MATTHEW W. KELLER
 JEAN D. KEMP
 BENJAY J. KEMPNER
 SHELLIE M. KENDALL
 BRIAN M. KEUSKI
 TIM I. KIM
 JOANNA R. KRAUSE
 ANDREW C. KUNG
 LAURA M. LAUER
 MICHAEL R. LEADER
 SCOTT LIU
 JOHN M. LYDON
 MICHELLE M. LYNCH
 JOHN S. MADDOX
 FRANKLIN C. MARGARON
 APRIL S. MATIASKE
 PAUL D. METZGER
 MATTHEW M. MICHALOWICZ
 JESSICA M. MILLER
 JONATHAN P. MILLER
 RUSSELL J. MILLER
 JOSHUA W. MINYARD
 DAVID A. MOORE
 ERIN K. MOORE

LUCAS A. MUELLER
MEREDITH R. NEAL
NIELS H. OLSON
MONICA D. ORMENO
YAN T. ORTIZPOMALES
ANDREW M. PARSONS
MICHAEL B. PAUL
AARON J. PHARISS
KEVIN A. PINKOS
BRYAN J. PLATT
KRISTINA M. POLK
AARON T. POOLE
AARON D. REED
JASON P. RICE
SHANNON L. RIGLER
VICTOR A. RIVERA
DARIN M. ROLFE
CRYSTAL A. RUSSELL
LEAH S. SAG
JULIA A. SAVITZ
CAROLINE M. SCHLOCKER
MICHAEL S. SCULLY
PETER G. SEGUIN
HEATHER L. SHIBLEY
ADAM C. SISCHY
CHRISTOPHER S. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER A. STETLER
ALAN A. STRAWN

JIMMY SUVATNE
ERIC R. TERPSTRA
ANDREW J. TOMPKINS
ADELAINE D. TRASK
SCOTT A. TRASK
EDWARD R. UTZ
JAIME VEGA
ANGELA G. VIERS
DAVID M. VOLK
WILLIAM R. VOLK
ROBERT B. WALTON
ALICIA L. WARNOCK
LAUREN A. WEBER
NICHOLAS J. WELLS
DENNIS A. WHITE
COLIN R. YOUNG
JERRY YUAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

JAVIER LOPEZMARTINEZ

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE
SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
STATE FOR THE PERSONAL RANK OF CAREER AMBAS-

SADOR IN RECOGNITION OF ESPECIALLY DISTINGUISHED
SERVICE OVER A SUSTAINED PERIOD:
PHILIP S. GOLDBERG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DAVID M. HALE, OF NEW JERSEY
MICHELE JEANNE SISON, OF MARYLAND
DANIEL BENNETT SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by
the Senate July 18, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

ANDREW S. OLDHAM, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES
CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE
GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION
12203(A):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW S. MCKINLEY