United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2018 *No. 43*

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 12 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2018

The Senate met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JONI ERNST, a Senator from the State of Iowa.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our source of hope, we praise You for Your daily mercies. Bless our lawmakers with Your goodness, empowering them to labor for justice and truth.

Lord, guide them as they grapple with difficult issues so that they will choose right over political expediency. Give them wisdom to forget yesterday's disappointments and tomorrow's fears. Teach them to focus on accomplishing their present duties for Your Name's glory, trusting You to take care of all their tomorrows. May they build their hopes in You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 12, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable JONI ERNST, a Senator from the State of Iowa, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. ERNST thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

CONGRATULATING KENTUCKY NCAA BASKETBALL TEAMS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I want to start with what I know is on everybody's mind, and that is Kentucky basketball.

The University of Kentucky Wildcats men's team won their 31st SEC title—their fourth straight, by the way. Hall of Fame coach John Calipari is leading Big Blue Nation back to the NCAA tournament and, we hope, to the school's ninth national championship.

At Western Kentucky University, the Lady Toppers just brought home a second straight Conference USA title. They are hoping the hardware keeps on coming as they head to their school's 20th showing in the NCAA tournament.

I proudly join many Kentuckians in congratulating both UK and WKU. We will be rooting for them in the Big Dance.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, later this afternoon the Senate will vote to advance the financial reform bill that is before us.

Senator CRAPO's legislation starts from a simple premise: Small community lenders on Main Street are not the same as the multi-trillion-dollar banks on Wall Street. But since the Dodd-Frank Act passed in 2010, too many regulations have treated all of them the same and imposed a crushing burden on community banks that are not able to bear it.

A small number of our colleagues in the Senate seem dead set against any commonsense reforms to help these smaller institutions. They are dusting off old arguments and predicting apocalyptic consequences from even this modest set of reforms. That is a shame because when small lenders shut their doors, communities throughout America pay the price. Even in this online era, research tells us that the closure of physical banks makes it harder for farmers, ranchers, small business owners, and low-income families to access capital. This story has played out thousands of times across the country.

The legislation before us would restore a community lenders' ability to

provide credit without having to navigate a maze of regulation that was designed for far bigger organizations.

This commonsense bill has earned the support of a wide bipartisan coalition. I would urge all Members to join us in moving it forward this afternoon.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, now on one final matter, for more than 20 years, Hope House in Spokane, WA, has offered vulnerable women refuge from the streets and a safe place to sleep. Unfortunately, the need is great. Even after stacking bunk beds in every available inch, the shelter reaches capacity every single night. Last year, more than 2,000 women had to be turned away.

But there is good news this morning. Premera Blue Cross, a major health insurer in the Pacific Northwest, announced that it will make a $1 million contribution to the organization that operates Hope House. The gift will jump-start the nonprofit's plan to build a brand-new shelter with 120 beds—triple the current capacity.

Across the State, in Everett, WA, another organization called Cocoon House serves at-risk and homeless youth. They are also receiving a donation of $1.6 million to finish funding a brand-new youth center.

What has made all of this possible? Well, that would be tax reform. Premera's president and CEO explained that America's new 21st century Tax Code is allowing his company to devote major new resources to help investment and philanthropy.

The women of Hope House and the children of Cocoon House are not alone. There are stories like this all over our country. Just how many Americans' lives will be changed for the better by tax reform when all is said and done?

There are the big donations to countless nonprofits such as these serving homeless women and children, higher take-home pay for American families to help them make ends meet, more investment and more job opportunities over the long term now that our Tax Code gives our job creators a fairer fight with overseas competitors, and, of course, special bonuses, raises, and new benefits for 4 million American workers and counting.

We can add Premera workers to that list, by the way. They are getting $15,000 bonuses as well. Every single Democrat voted to block these good things—every single one of these guys over here. They did all they could to stop tax reform from happening. Now that the law they opposed is unleashing so much good news, they are in a tricky spot.

My colleagues across the aisle are falling back on the same old rhetoric. They are trying to divide Americans, pitting different groups against one another. Now they are even proposing to claw back tax reform. Well, with a Republican Congress, that is not going to happen. Democrats may want to repeal tax reform; that is, repeal the bonuses, the raises, the family tax cuts, and the huge donations to life-changing organizations. They may want to repeal all of that, but Republicans set out to take money out of Washington's pocket and put it back in the pockets of the American people, who know best how to use it. We will make sure that is exactly where it stays.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Democratic leader is recognized.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Madam President, after the deadly shooting at Stoneman Douglas High School, the American people are wondering if Congress can do something meaningful to curb the epidemic of gun violence—an epidemic that has gone on far too long and taken the lives of far too many.

For years, Democrats have proposed commonsense gun safety policies to ensure that dangerous people can't get their hands on dangerous weapons. Recently, Democrats have reiterated our support for several specific measures, including universal background checks, protection orders, and a debate on banning assault weapons.

Americans of all political stripes support a debate on these policies, and yet the majority leader, who has given gun safety no time on the floor of the Senate, has also given us no indication we might consider the issue anytime soon. He is sweeping it under the rug. The NRA is powerful around here.

At the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, President Trump failed to show the conviction and steady leadership required to make progress on this issue. After indicating support for a host of reasonable gun safety measures a few weeks ago and in front of the TV cameras he invited in, yesterday President Trump released a list of administration policies which represent a 180-degree reversal. What President Trump said at the public meeting and what he proposed yesterday are opposites.

After signaling, for instance, he would be for raising the age of purchase of assault weapons from 18 to 21—a modest measure—President Trump backed off saying he would leave it to the States and the courts to decide. That is a copout, and we know that. After indicating support for universal background checks, President Trump makes no mention of closing the dangerous gun show loophole or internet sales loophole. There is no mention of anti-domestic violence legislation, no mention of assault weapons or support for significant changes to protection orders. The President's plan consists only of small-bore, NRA-approved policies, including the absurd proposal to send more guns into classrooms by arming teachers.

In the wake of so many American tragedies, the Trump proposal on gun safety is utterly insufficient as a response. Even if you discarded the idea of arming teachers and took the Fix NICS proposal and the changes to mental health in President Trump's proposal, that wouldn't be close to enough to address the issue of gun violence. The Nation is clamoring for significant, meaningful progress on gun safety, but President Trump's proposal is just a baby step, when America needs to take a giant leap.

The administration's proposal makes it perfectly clear that President Trump has an obeisance to the NRA. Even when President Trump momentarily departs the NRA script, he quickly gets reeled back in. If President Trump, his staff, and some of our Republican friends are wondering why his ratings are so low, it is because he does this all the time. At the meeting, he publicly challenged conservative Republican Senator TOOMEY. He said: Oh, I guess you are afraid of the NRA.

Well, Toomey is not afraid of the NRA. He has taken them on. It is President Trump who is afraid of the NRA. He is afraid to do anything that doesn't meet their approval. We all know what this Fix NICS bill is about. It is tiny, but it is OK with the NRA, so my good friend from Texas is happy to come to the floor and talk about it. When is he going to come to the floor and say something we really need that the NRA doesn't support? We are all waiting, not just for him but for our Republican colleagues. We all know the game going on here—make it seem like you want to do something but don't offend the NRA, which is way to the extreme when you look at where Americans are at on this issue.

After watching the same sequence of events take place on guns, on immigration, no one should be surprised when President Trump initially talks about bipartisanship but ends up caving to hard-right special interests. No one should be surprised that the Republican leadership in the Senate, when it comes to guns, does the same exact thing. In this case, the gun lobby is the hard-right special interest.

President Trump's behavior on the most sensitive political issues is turning into a predictable Kabuki theater, where he invites the cameras in, talks the good talk but then refuses to walk the walk. It shows great weakness in this President, and if he doesn't have the guts to move forward, he shouldn't invite the cameras in and act like he

does. Now, that may give him a temporary little high, but it is not what the American people want. It is not leadership and, in my judgment at least, that is why the President is down so much in the polls no matter what he does. That is why even a race in the southwestern corner of Pennsylvania, in a district he won by 20 points, is a nail-biter.

I hope the President will change, I hope he will become a leader, and I hope he will stop just focusing on the show but actually get things done. So far, the American people, not just us, are disappointed.

Now, Democrats in the Senate are going to keep fighting to go much further than the President's proposal. We are going to fight to pass universal background checks, to actually get Federal legislation on protection orders, and to start debating banning assault weapons. This is the conversation the country needs to have. We will keep pushing our Senate colleagues and President Trump to do something real, not just something they think they can talk about that the NRA rubberstamps approval of.

RUSSIAN ELECTION INTERFERENCE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, on a different subject—Russia. Despite heaps of evidence Russia interfered in our election, President Trump has hardly lifted a finger to punish Russia or safeguard future elections. This is a dereliction of duty.

Over the last few weeks, the Senate has heard testimony from the DNI—the Director of National Intelligence—and the head of the U.S. Cyber Command. Neither had been directed by the administration to counter Russia's continued efforts to undermine our democracy. A report in the New York Times last week documented how President Trump's State Department ''has yet to spend any of the $120 million it has allocated since late 2016 to counter foreign efforts to meddle in elections or sow distrust in democracy.'' Still, the Trump administration has not fully implemented the sanctions Congress passed to punish Putin.

Meanwhile, Russia-linked bots continue to sow division and inflame political tensions on social media. Multiple officials from the intelligence community have warned that Russia will try to interfere in our elections again. We have done nothing to harden our election security in anticipation of the midterms.

Our democracy is under attack, and the President of the United States seems unwilling to punch back or even harden our defenses. It is as if an enemy naval flotilla were headed to our shores, and we didn't put up any defense. That is exactly what is happening. It is a new world. It is not a flotilla of a navy or planes buzzing along our coasts, but it is these cyber attacks and social media attacks on our election system, but they are every much as vital to America as our physical defense. Yet we hear nothing, nothing, nothing out of the White House.

You only have to look to our ally, the United Kingdom, for an example of how a nation should respond to the threat from Russia. Just today, Prime Minister Theresa May went to the House of Commons to expose a likely Russian attack against two people in her country using a nerve agent. She demanded a response from President Putin and promised appropriate countermeasures if he refuses or the answer is insufficient.

Prime Minister May's quick and decisive action is exactly what is missing from President Trump when it comes to cyber security in our elections.

President Trump still has an opportunity. Over the weekend, President Putin rather ridiculously blamed Ukrainians, Jews, or other minorities for the attack on our election in 2016—another attempt, of course, at misdirection and distraction. In reality, Special Counsel Mueller's investigation has charged 13 Russian nationals with subverting the 2016 elections—not Ukrainians, not Tatars, not Jews but 13 Russian nationals.

Today Leader PELOSI and I, alongside Senator FEINSTEIN and Congressman NADLER, sent President Trump a letter urging him to use all available resources to extradite the 13 Russian nationals named in the special counsel's investigation to stand trial here in the United States. Ensuring these Russian nationals stand trial in the United States would be a clear signal to those who seek to meddle with our elections that their actions are not without consequences. This is imperative to deter Russia and any other nation in the future from attacking our democracy. This is another test of President Trump's leadership and another test he is failing miserably.

If President Trump really cared about our country, he would expand every resource in his possession to bring justice to these foreign actors who meddled with our country's most sacred democratic process—the one enshrined by the Founding Fathers, embraced and even worshiped by Americans over the centuries with good reason.

Now there is meddling in this sacred process and President Trump does nothing? Why are we not hearing anything from those on the other side of the aisle about that? You can be sure that if it were another President—particularly a Democratic one—we would hear howls, but this is not about Democrats or Republicans. This is about our democracy, and Americans inevitably ask the question, Why is President Trump so afraid to do anything about Putin?

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ECONOMIC GROWTH, REGULATORY RELIEF, AND CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2155, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2155) to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Crapo) modified amendment No. 2151, in the nature of a substitute.

Crapo amendment No. 2152 (to amendment No. 2151), of a perfecting nature.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this week, we will complete work on an important bipartisan bill. Thanks to the leadership of the Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, who is chairman of the Banking Committee, they passed it out of the Banking Committee, and now it is time for us to do our job and pass it out of the Senate. Last week, we voted to proceed, and we will vote to pass it out of the Senate in the next few days.

Senator CRAPO explained why this work is so important. Since the passage of the Dodd-Frank legislation in 2010—as we all recall, after the great recession of 2008, when Wall Street melted down together with our financial institutions, there were reform efforts undertaken known as Dodd-Frank—Senator Dodd and Congressman Frank—which imposed regulatory requirements on banks large and small. The problem is, the small community banks—the ones that are disproportionately harmed by this overregulation—weren't the cause of the great recession, the financial meltdown of 2010 and 2009, but they are the collateral damage. What has happened is, there has been a lot of consolidation. Many small community banks and credit unions have simply had to close or been consolidated with other larger banks and institutions. It has taken a toll on our economy, and it has taken a toll on our communities across the country. What happens is, these community banks have less money to loan because they have had to use the money they would loan to hire more people to help them comply with all the unnecessary redtape because of the Dodd-Frank overregulation. Some have had to basically defer that sort of investment in their communities and

others have had to shutter completely because of the financial burden.

The second-order effect is, some people don't have access to capital; that is, to loans they need. They can't get credit they need in order to start a small business, grow an existing business, or even get a mortgage to buy their first home.

Let's be clear, though, about which financial institutions this bill is tailored toward helping. It is small community banks, midsized regional ones, as well as credit unions. The bill we are considering somehow does not exempt large banks from those regulations, and saying it does, which some have said, doesn't make it so. It is a claim too eagerly peddled by those who want to maintain the status quo, to the detriment of our smaller communities and small businesses. Large banks are still subject to measures designed to protect the stability of the overall economy, like rigorous stress testing.

After all, this bill is called the Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protection Act. What it actually does is rightsize those regulations. It does this by providing targeted exemptions from risk-weighted capital requirements, for example, and the Volcker rule. It also provides a qualified mortgage safe harbor for small banks and raises the SIFI threshold so community banks are not lumped into the same overall category as giant financial institutions operating on Wall Street.

The majority leader recently said: ''In an era of online banking and multinational corporations, smaller institutions remain uniquely able to build community connections,'' and that is important to our civic fabric as well as the economies in rural and smalltown America.

Based on research, community banks provide more than half of all small business loans. That could translate into small banks getting to know their customers on a personal level and then extending credit to entrepreneurs and families who might not have access otherwise.

That is certainly the situation in parts of my State, the State of Texas. I have heard from banks and communities there that are more than ready to finally be freed of the shackles of Dodd-Frank.

As the chief executive officer of the Independent Bankers Association of Texas put it, ''Congress holds the key to unchain community banks from the burden pushing them toward consolidation''—in other words, mergers, forcing them to become big banks, which seems to me to be an odd way to deal with this problem, to be sure, or putting them out of business altogether.

In the IBAT's view—Independent Bankers Association of Texas—rules meant to curb the abuses of banks deemed too big to fail have instead trickled down to harm their much smaller counterparts. Because of this effect, in essence, community banks have become too small to survive as mergers and acquisitions have occurred all over the map.

Independent bankers have reported that since 2009, Texas has lost nearly one-third of its banks—one-third of its banks. They have said that based on Federal data on rural counties, approximately one-third don't have a local credit union or bank at all. This bill addresses that situation. It enjoys wide bipartisan support, and I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting passage before the end of the week.

FIX NICS BILL

Madam President, on another matter, I want to emphasize another point and talk about a new milestone reached and announce some good news.

We have now reached 64 total cosponsors for a bill I have introduced with the junior Senator from Connecticut, Mr. MURPHY, called the Fix NICS, which is the background check reform bill we cosponsored together.

In an institution like this, during polarized times, it is pretty remarkable that you have 64 Senators—32 Democrats and 32 Republicans—coming together and saying: Yes, we have a problem, and, yes, we want to work together to fix it.

This is the kind of legislation the Nation has been waiting for, as people continue to be frustrated, frightened, and depressed by random acts of violence that have broken out in and around some of our churches, our cities, and our schools. I am talking about shootings like those that occurred at Sutherland Springs, TX, outside of San Antonio, in Las Vegas, and, of course, Parkland, FL. With Fix NICS, we are saying the status quo is not acceptable.

I am happy to hear my friend the Democratic leader, Senator SCHUMER, say there are other things he and his colleagues on the other side of the aisle would like to do. I would just quote to him some ancient wisdom; that ''the journey of a thousand miles begins with a single step.'' We ought to take that first step and do what we can do today and do what is achievable in order to make our communities safer.

I have talked about it before, but if the background check system had been working the way Congress intended, the shooter who murdered 26 people as they worshiped on Sunday morning in Sutherland Springs, outside of San Antonio, and injured 20 more would not have been able to legally purchase firearms because the background check system would have reflected the fact that he was a convicted felon, he had been convicted of domestic violence, and he had been in a mental institution. All three of those things are disqualifiers from being able to legally purchase firearms under current law, but if the background system isn't uploaded with the appropriate information for the FBI to maintain, then those convictions will never be discovered, and someone can merely lie their way into purchasing firearms and committing atrocities like we saw in Sutherland Springs.

Fix NICS is designed to make sure convicted felons can't get access to firearms because, under current law, they are disallowed from doing so. It is designed to make sure people who commit domestic violence can't buy a firearm because they are currently prohibited by law from doing so. It is designed to make sure people who are dishonorably discharged from the military can't legally get a firearm because the current law prohibits them from doing so.

Sometimes criminals with domestic abuse convictions, records of mental illness, and violent erratic behavior slip through the cracks and get their hands on guns, despite what the law already prohibits. That is why it is so important for us to pass this legislation now—again, with 64 cosponsors of the legislation, evenly divided between Republicans and Democrats.

The effectiveness of doing this sort of background check system has been confirmed by academic research. A recent study by RAND Corporation found evidence that dealer background checks may decrease firearm homicides by as much as 20 percent or more. In other words, it saves lives. One specific part of that study further suggested that enforcing background checks for felony records may have a similar diminishing effect. In other words, enforcement matters, and enforcement is what we are trying to ensure.

We have learned from Sutherland Springs that the NICS system is not operating as Congress intended and that the military, in this instance, was not uploading certain records, but they are not alone. Recent news reports out of places like Ohio have shown it is often the case at the State level as well. We know, a few years back, the shooter at Virginia Tech, near Washington, DC, had been adjudicated mentally ill by the State of Virginia, but the State had never uploaded that information on the background check system, so he was able to purchase a firearm.

This bill will save lives. I know my friend the Democratic leader, the minority leader, has said: Well, it is not enough, but if it saves lives, isn't it a good start? I am grateful to him for cosponsoring the legislation. You couldn't tell he cosponsored the legislation by his comments here, acting like this is somehow not a very important step, but it is because it will save lives.

This bill has the backing of the President as well, whom I have spoken to personally, and the minority and majority leaders in the Senate and is supported by gun groups across the spectrum from—yes, the National Rifle Association but also Everytown for Gun Safety. They are at the opposite ends of the ideological spectrum when it comes to the Second Amendment. It is not just them. It is others like the National Coalition Against Domestic Violence, Sandy Hook Promise, the National Shooting Sports Foundation, the

National Domestic Violence Hotline, and the National Sheriffs' Association.

It really is remarkable when you have groups with such widely divergent views, when it comes to the Second Amendment, come together and say: Well, this is where we can find common ground. This is where we can actually do something. That is reflected in the 64 bipartisan cosponsors we have for the bill.

The bill would do this: First, it would require Federal agencies and States to produce NICS implementation plans, in other words, to fix what is broken, including measures to verify the accuracy of the records.

It would hold Federal agencies accountable if they fail to upload the relevant information.

I think it is accurate information, but I have heard that after the shooting in Sutherland Springs, the military has now gone back and uploaded 4,000 additional records into the NICS background check system that weren't previously loaded. Those are 4,000 people now in the system who, if they attempted to buy a firearm legally through a gun store or Federal licensed firearm dealer, would not be able to do so because there would be a hit on the FBI background check system.

I think if we provided similar incentives to the States, we would see a similar increase in compliance and public safety continue to be enhanced.

This bill would reward States that comply with their NICS implementation plan through Federal grants incentives. It would reauthorize and improve law enforcement programs to help State governments share relevant criminal record information. Let's not forget, this is not just a Federal problem.

Finally, the bill would provide important technical assistance to Federal agencies and States that are working to comply with NICS record-sharing requirements.

We have all the support we need. What we need is a vote. I know that despite the minority leader's comments here today, he does not oppose this bill. He says it is merely not enough, but why can't we pass this bill that we all agree on and then build from there? I am not afraid of having any debate or any vote on any matter related to the Second Amendment. That is why our constituents sent us here, to debate and to vote and to be held accountable for those votes.

I know there is pressure from those who want more controversial measures to be added, but frankly they are ones that can't pass the Senate, much less the House, or be signed into the law. I would hope we focus—focus our attention on what is achievable, what is bipartisan, what brings people together at the opposite ends of the ideological spectrum and pass the Fix NICS bill. Again, NICS is the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. It will improve our background check system and in the process save lives.

If we did nothing else—and I am not advocating that for a moment, but if we did nothing else in this space other than pass this background check reform system, we would save lives. I don't know why that is not compelling enough to everyone to actually get it done. I hope it is, and I hope we do so without further delay.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Thank you, Madam President.

Ten years ago today, at breakfast tables all around the country, Americans read a shocking headline: ''Fed assumes the role of lender of last resort.'' The biggest investment banks on Wall Street were getting their first taxpayer bailout, but some of the banks were so addicted to poisonous scam mortgages that even that bailout wasn't enough. Within a week, Bear Stearns—an 85-year-old fixture on Wall Street—would fall, and the financial crisis would begin.

Within a year, American workers' retirement accounts had lost $2.7 trillion, almost one-third of their value. No one bailed them out. Within 2 years, 8.8 million Americans had lost their jobs. No one bailed them out. Within 3 years, more than 4 million homes had been lost to foreclosures, and millions more were in danger. No one bailed the homeowners out. Now, to mark the 10th anniversary of that devastating crisis, the Senate is on the verge of rolling back the rules on the big banks again.

Last week I talked about how this bill guts important consumer protections, how it weakens the oversight of banks with up to a quarter of a trillion dollars in assets, and how it could set the stage for another financial crisis, just like past bipartisan bills to roll back the financial rules. But the bill will also roll back the rules on the very biggest banks in the country, the true Wall Street banks, including JPMorgan Chase, Citigroup, and the rest—banks that taxpayers spent $180 billion bailing out in 2008. And no matter what the supporters of this bill say, there are three glaring parts of this bill that without question help the very biggest Wall Street banks.

First, this bill opens the door to easing up on big banks' stress tests. Right now, about 40 of the biggest banks go through stress tests every year, simulating a financial crisis and making sure that if it happened, they could survive. This bill says that 25 of them can just skip the hard test from now on, and the remaining 15 or so—well, they don't necessarily have to do those tests every single year. For the banks that are still going to be doing stress tests, they can now be done, under this bill, ''periodically.'' Who decides what ''periodically'' means—the former investment bankers Donald Trump has nominated to lead the Fed and to head up the Fed's supervisory work? Does that make you feel safe?

Second, the bill gives the biggest banks a new legal tool to fight for weaker rules. Right now, the law says that the Fed ''may'' tailor capital and other rules for the biggest banks. This bill says the Fed ''shall'' tailor the rules for the banks with more than $250 billion in assets—the very biggest banks in this country. That one word—the switch from ''may'' to ''shall''—may not seem like much, but it means everything to the high-priced lawyers who represent these banks.

Here is what Jeffrey Gordon, a professor at Columbia Law School, had to say about that one-word change:

> This apparently minor change is likely to produce significant degradation of financial stability, especially over the long run. The change would expose the Fed to litigation challenges to its enhanced standards, in particular whether they are already adequately tailored. . . . The statute thus empowers the largest firms which pose the biggest risks to bargain with the Fed for laxer standards with the threat of a well-resourced litigation challenge in the background. Over time this bargaining for laxity will produce a race-to-the-bottom dynamic that will dramatically increase the chance of another financial crisis.

Professor Gordon of Columbia Law School says that will dramatically increase the chance of another financial crisis.

If you think the one-word change from ''may'' to ''shall'' won't change much, consider this: Opponents to the bill have been pointing out this problem loudly and publicly, but the bill's sponsors won't change it. They won't change that one word. Why? Because the giant banks want the change.

The third bank giveaway in this bill undercuts capital requirements for the biggest banks. The best way to stop another taxpayer bailout of the big banks is to make sure they have enough capital on hand to withstand a crisis. That is why Congress and the regulators established tougher capital requirements for the big banks after the last financial crisis. This bill reverses direction, opening the door to big banks like JPMorgan and Citigroup facing much lower capital requirements than they do now. In fact, the independent Congressional Budget Office says there is a 50-percent chance that JPMorgan and Citigroup can take advantage of a provision in the bill to reduce their capital requirements.

The Wall Street Journal editorial board—no fan of tough regulation—wrote that the change proposed in the banking bill is dangerous and ''will make the financial system more vulnerable in a panic.'' The Bloomberg editorial board says the bill ''chip[s] away at the bedrock of financial resilience—the equity capital that allows

banks to absorb losses and keep on lending in bad times.'' And the consequences could be huge. According to the FDIC, this provision could lower capital requirements for JPMorgan by $21.4 billion and for Citigroup by $8.6 billion.

At the end of last week, the supporters of the bill introduced a new amendment that they claimed would address the problems in this bill, but that amendment did nothing to address these three glaring big-bank giveaways: The stress test provision is unchanged, the litigation provision is unchanged, and the capital requirements provision is unchanged. Victories for the big banks have been preserved 100 percent.

But it is not just the big-bank giveaways that remain unaddressed in this new amendment. Over the last week, we have heard a lot of criticism about this bill from experts and from civil rights groups and from consumer advocates and from former regulators, and, most importantly, from our constituents back home. They don't like it. This banking bill undermines civil rights laws. It weakens consumers protections on mortgages and mobile home purchases. It rolls back rules on 25 of the 40 largest banks in the country. It does almost nothing to protect consumers. Let me be perfectly clear about this. The new amendment does not address a single one of these legitimate criticisms. It is a bunch of fig leaves designed to let supporters of the bill pretend that they have addressed those criticisms without actually addressing them. In some cases, these little fig leaves actually make things worse.

Let's start with the fake fixes—first, mortgage discrimination. Mortgage discrimination is real in America. Some banks charge African Americans more for loans than they charge Whites with similar credit. Some deny loans to Latinos or to single women. How do we know that? Because banks have to disclose information about the loans they provide under something called the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act, or HMDA. Using HMDA data, a new report shows that in 61 different cities around the country, minority borrowers were more likely to be denied a mortgage than White borrowers with the same income. But this bill—the bill that is pending on the floor of the Senate—now exempts 85 percent of banks from reporting any HMDA data, making it much harder to discover and stamp out discrimination.

Senator CORTEZ MASTO had a great idea for fixing this: Take the HMDA provision out of the pending bill. Leave HMDA alone. If the authors of this bill really wanted to fix this problem, they would support her amendment and insist that without that amendment, they would withdraw their support for the bill. But now the bill's supporters have a fig leaf. They say that of the 85 percent of banks that no longer will have to report information about discrimination, if one of those banks flunks two consecutive examinations under the Community Reinvestment Act, those banks will have to start reporting discrimination data. If that looks like a tiny little fig leaf, consider this: Banks get tested at most every 3 years, which means it would take 6 years of discrimination to flunk twice. This fig leaf is so small, it is basically invisible.

Now, for some of these so-called consumer protection fig leaves—the problems are real; it is just the solutions that are fake. For example, there is a provision to deal with private student loans from banks. It says that if a student loan borrower dies, then the bank can't go after the cosigner of the loan for the full balance. That sounds really good—at least until you read the fine print. It turns out that spouses don't count. So the bank will still be free to hound widows and widowers for the balances of their deceased spouses. And the loan isn't actually forgiven. That means the bank can still go after the dead borrower's estate for the loan, maybe take half of the house or take whatever is in the checking account or savings account. It is a nightmare for a grieving family—and it is also perfectly OK under this fig leaf amendment.

In some places, it isn't even a fig leaf that pretends to address problems with the bill; it is just new provisions to create new problems—like a section that blows a hole in regulators' ability to require banks to hold capital for commercial real estate. Does anyone remember that risky commercial real estate investments were a factor in Bear Stearns' failure 10 years ago this week? Does anyone remember that 6 months later, commercial real estate losses would help blow up Lehman Brothers? I guess not—at least not right here in Congress, because 10 years later—right now, this week—Congress wants to let banks take one more commercial real estate fix with less oversight.

Banks of all sizes are making record profits. Only in Washington would people think it is time to scrap the protections that have kept us safe for a decade, all so that these same profitable banks can make even more money. It is the same mindset that set the stage for the savings and loan crisis in the late 1980s and the financial crisis of 2008.

America's working families will pay the price if we make the same mistakes again. It isn't too late. We should stop this bill from becoming law.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Florida.

GUN VIOLENCE

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, so many are still grieving from the atrocious killing of 17 people at the high school in Florida. Indeed, our entire State is grieving. Broward County is grieving. Parkland is grieving. I think we are going to find on March 24, in the rallies and the marches that will occur in 500 cities around this country and will have a focus of the main one in Washington, that a lot of people are grieving, because a lot of people all across this country have been touched by these massacres that continue to occur, starting almost three decades ago at Columbine in Colorado. We have certainly had our fill of it in Florida just in the last 2 years: 49 people gunned down with an assault rifle, a Sig Sauer MCX, at the Pulse nightclub; another assault pistol used to gun down 5 people in the Fort Lauderdale Airport; and now an AR–15 used to gun down 17. He would have gotten a lot more had he been able to open the third-story window overlooking the courtyard from a perch as the students fled across the courtyard to get out of the schoolyard. He couldn't get the window open. He tried to shoot it open, but it was hurricane-proof glass, and it only shattered; it didn't break.

It has been almost 1 month since the tragic shooting. Those 17 families—14 students and 3 adults—are certainly grieving, and we have seen in the last few weeks many of the parents, students, families, and community leaders stand up to say that enough is enough. They are asking us, the U.S. Congress, to enact meaningful legislation to reduce gun violence.

The action starts in Tallahassee, and the students are going there while the State legislature is still in session, talking about commonsense solutions, such as enacting universal background checks in the purchase of a gun; not allowing a gun show loophole or a private transaction loophole; not allowing a loophole for orders on the internet; universal background checks that would include mental problems; if you have been on the terrorist watch list, that would include, of course, criminal records but also mentally adjudicated records; universal background checks in the acquisition of a gun, particularly an assault rifle. But we can't get that passed here because some folks aren't listening.

Take, for example, what was said at the White House just last night. Giving in to the will of the NRA, the White House announced that it would provide Federal funding for firearms training for teachers and other school personnel. This Senator thinks that arming teachers is a terrible idea. It is not what the students are asking for. It is not what the teachers are asking for. It is not what the American people want us to do.

Just last week, the Florida legislature passed and the Governor signed into law a bill—a watered-down version, but it is still arming school personnel, and it falls short on what is really needed to reduce gun violence and especially the massacres that are occurring. While what Florida has done is a step in the right direction, particularly with regard to mandating 3-day waiting periods in the purchase of an assault rifle, we are far from where we need to be in addressing gun violence if

we are talking about putting more guns in our schools, and if—as the President suggested last night—we arm teachers. The teachers don't want it, and I can tell you who else doesn't want it. The SWAT teams that have to storm the building looking for the shooter don't want to encounter a teacher with a gun and mistakenly think that teacher is the shooter. It is common sense.

What studies do supporters of this idea cite, suggesting that arming teachers will reduce gun violence at schools? Why even propose this solution before seeing what policies are proposed by a new Federal commission on school safety, which has now been developed? Why don't we at least see what they are proposing? No, this is to sell more guns by arming teachers.

I have spoken to many teachers, students, and families. I haven't found one person who wants teachers to be armed, including the teachers themselves. There is near universal agreement that arming teachers is a terrible idea. Yet such an idea continues to direct Congress's attention away from obvious and commonsense solutions supported by most Americans, which are universal background checks and getting the assault rifles and banana clips that have 30 rounds off the streets.

I have supported several bipartisan bills—some with my colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO—that address background check issues and seek to make sure our schools have the resources to keep our students safe.

Senator RUBIO and I announced last week that if there are red flags, they need to be brought to the attention of law enforcement. We are offering in our bill a Federal incentive program to the States to get those red flags about a problem person to the authorities before it is too late. But ideas like arming teachers and putting more guns in our schools are just plain dangerous.

Mr. President, I know you have backed off of certain things because the NRA wanted you to, and I know you are now proposing arming teachers. Let's get down to some real commonsense solutions. Let's work on how to prevent assault weapons from getting into the wrong hands and to stop the massacres that continue to plague this country. The people of America want no less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be able to complete my remarks and for the Senator from Arizona to follow me.

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

NATIONAL NUTRITION MONTH

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise to recognize the role of nutrition in the health and wellness of our Nation and the development of our children. Arkansas' agricultural producers play a vital role in providing affordable, nutritious food, not only for our State and country but for the entire world.

March is recognized as National Nutrition Month. This is a time to focus attention on the importance of a balanced diet and healthy eating choices. As a cochair of the Senate Hunger Caucus, I am committed to supporting and raising awareness of efforts that provide nutritious, healthy meals; creating policies that fight hunger; and supporting programs that have proven successful.

The Department of Agriculture's Child and Adult Care Food Program is a unique effort that uses public-private partnerships to meet the nutritional needs of vulnerable children and adults. This has become a critical tool in the fight against hunger.

Senator KLOBUCHAR and I recently introduced a resolution designating this week as National Child and Adult Care Food Program Week to honor and raise awareness of the important role the Child and Adult Care Food Program plays in the health of those in Arkansas, Minnesota, and throughout the country. Through this program, more than 4 million children and 130,000 adults in childcare centers, adult daycare homes, and afterschool programs receive nutritious meals and snacks daily.

Studies show that access to the Child and Adult Care Food Program can measurably and positively impact the cognitive, social, emotional, and physical health and development of children, leading to more favorable outcomes, such as decreased likelihood of being hospitalized, an increased likelihood of healthy weight gain, and an increased likelihood of a more varied diet.

As a member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I will be working to ensure that individuals who need food assistance are able to access affordable, nutritious meals. I will also continue to press for flexibility in the Department of Agriculture's Summer Food Service Program so children who rely on school meals when class is in session can access healthy, nutritious meals during the summer in order to have a seamless transition from the school year to the summer programs.

In Arkansas, more than 50,000 children receive nutritious meals through this program. For many rural areas of the country, like the Natural State, this one-size-fits-all approach fails to meet the needs of communities and the children who are most in need.

More than 60 percent of Arkansas' children rely on free or reduced meals during the school year, so we need to modernize the program so that summer meal sites are available to children no matter where they live. Arkansas is blessed to have the support of schools, churches, Boys & Girls Clubs, libraries, and other organizations that serve as host sites for summer meal programs, and we need to allow them the flexibility that is necessary to reach the students in their communities. It is time that Federal policy responds to this need.

I have seen how community involvement in Arkansas is fighting food insecurity. Efforts like the Cooking Matters at the Store Initiative, launched by the Arkansas Hunger Relief Alliance, teaches families who are on budgets to compare prices, read food labels, and buy fruits and vegetables.

This month is recognized as School Breakfast Month in Arkansas. State educators have seen how essential breakfast is to students' progress, so they have instituted programs to promote breakfast and are helping to grow gardens where the food produced is used in school lunches. Grocery stores are allowing SNAP beneficiaries to purchase locally grown produce at a discount. Proper nutrition is crucial to our well-being.

Creating opportunities to access healthy, nutritious food is also important to our State's and the Nation's economic development. In order to break the cycle of food insecurity, we must work together. Hunger knows no boundaries, but it is preventable, and we have the tools to help fight it. We have made significant gains in Arkansas, across the country, and throughout the world to improve nutrition for the most vulnerable in our society, and I will continue to be a champion of efforts to improve access to healthy nutritious, foods.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 2538 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor.

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 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 Senate amendment No. 2151, as modified, to Calendar No. 287, S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Bob Corker, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Mike Crapo, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Rounds, Jeff Flake, John Kennedy, Johnny Isakson, James Lankford, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn.

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 amendment No. 2151, as modified, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 30, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Leg.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Flake	Murkowski
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Peters
Boozman	Hassan	Portman
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Capito	Heitkamp	Roberts
Carper	Heller	Rounds
Cassidy	Hoeven	Rubio
Cochran	Inhofe	Sasse
Collins	Isakson	Scott
Coons	Johnson	Shaheen
Corker	Jones	Shelby
Cornyn	Kaine	Stabenow
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Crapo	King	Tester
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Enzi	McCaskill	Warner
Ernst	McConnell	Wicker
Fischer	Moran	Young

NAYS—30

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Blumenthal	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Smith
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Casey	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Duckworth	McCain
Heinrich	Paul

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 30.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, when you went to a local bank in Mansfield, OH, to buy a house 30, 40, or 50 years ago, you knew the lender, and the lender knew you. You saw him or her at the grocery store. Maybe they went to your church or synagogue. Your kids probably went to the same school. You knew that your deposits at the bank helped fund your neighbor's house or the hardware store down the street. A lot of banks and credit unions don't work this way.

The 2008 crisis taught us that finance has changed. Now a mortgage in Zanesville, OH, is diced and sliced and sold to an investor in Zurich, Switzerland. Banks in Frankfurt place bets on loans in Fostoria.

When the system went bust a decade ago and predatory loans began to fail, Ohio taxpayers picked up the tab, including for foreign banks headquartered an ocean away. The Federal Reserve opened up a spigot of cheap money to keep the global economy from tanking. Banks in Spain, France, Japan, Canada, and Korea all came to the United States for help to weather the financial storm.

Think about this. An analysis of the Fed's lending from February 2008 to 2009 showed that the vast majority of loans went to foreign banks. After the crisis, records released to the public showed that foreign banks took more than 70 percent of the Fed's loans during the crisis and 65 percent of loans from other emergency programs.

Under one bailout scheme, British Barclays alone borrowed $232 billion from the Fed at a sweetheart interest rate—the kind of rate a hardware store in Hillsboro, OH, could never get on a loan to keep them afloat back in 2008. Think about that. British Barclays got a sweetheart deal, a better deal than a hardware store in Ohio could get from a bank.

After the crisis, Congress responded with a law, the Wall Street reform act, to ensure that taxpayers would never again have to send bailout money to British and Swiss megabanks. We ordered the Fed to keep a closer eye on the big banks—to use their power to make sure the largest global banks did not again crash the economy.

Congress instructed that the Fed apply the strictest protections to the biggest banks—those with more than $50 billion in assets. We know that.

When the Fed implemented these rules, they applied some standards to banks that have more than $50 billion across the globe, but for global banks that have more than $50 billion in the United States, the Fed applied the strongest standards. For foreign banks with not only trillions worldwide but systemic operations in the United States, the Fed wrote rules that are as strict as those for our domestic megabanks, standards that former Fed Governor Dan Tarullo called ''special prudential measures.'' They are standards that ensure that we only import Swiss chocolate, not Swiss bank failures. These special measures are important.

Last year, the Office of Financial Research released a report showing that foreign banks in the United States are riskier than similarly sized U.S. regional banks. Hear that again. Foreign banks in the United States are riskier than similarly sized U.S. regional banks. Think of that in terms of what this bill that we just voted cloture on actually does.

This legislation threatens to undo important rules protecting us from risk. The legislation puts taxpayers on the hook for bailouts. That is what the Congressional Budget Office said.

Under this bill, foreign banks that took billions in bailouts would be able to take more risk under a less watchful eye. Who are some of them? Deutsche Bank, Santander, and UBS would all be treated more like they were an Ohio regional bank. Deutsche Bank, the Trump family's personal business bank; Santander, the bank in Spain that repossessed the cars of hundreds of service men and women cars while those service men and women were serving our country overseas; UBS, the Swiss bank that illegally financed Iranian activities—they would all be treated more like they were Huntington in Columbus, or Fifth Third in Cincinnati, or KeyBank in Cleveland. What is right about that? What is fair about that? What is smart about that?

Don't take my word for it. Secretary Mnuchin sat right in front of the Banking Committee; Senator CRAPO, the chairman, and I, as the ranking member, looked straight at him just a few weeks ago. He confirmed that this bill would treat foreign banks with up to $250 billion in assets the same as U.S. regional banks. So they are up to $250 billion, just like Huntington, just like KeyCorp, just like Fifth Third in Ohio. Secretary Mnuchin said: We are going to treat those foreign banks the same if they are up to $250 billion in assets. That may be the first direct answer I have ever heard from Secretary Mnuchin. I sit on the Finance Committee and the Banking Committee, and he has trouble giving direct answers. He did at least that time.

It makes sense because he was just confirming his intention. From what he and the Treasury Department wrote in a report last year, that is precisely what this administration wants to do. That is what they said in this report that we should do—deregulate these foreign banks that have assets under $250 billion in the United States. They wrote it into their banking deregulation blueprint back in June.

I give credit to Secretary Mnuchin, and I give credit to the Trump administration. While I don't give them credit for the White House looking like a retreat for Wall Street executives, I do give them credit for at least finally owning up in that report, in the legislation, and in his answer to my question in the Banking Committee hearing that, yes, they are going to deregulate these foreign, huge megabanks—Deutsche, Santander, UBS, and Barclays—as long as they have under $250 billion of assets in the United States, and they do.

Paul Volcker, former Chairman of the Fed, is worried, as I am, that this bill deregulates the U.S. operations of foreign banks. Sarah Bloom Raskin, former Fed Governor and Deputy Treasury Secretary, said this bill ''removes necessary guardrails that were installed to reduce the chances of foreign megabanks drawing on U.S. bailout funds.''

I have watched the Presiding Officer—the junior Senator from Oklahoma—serve with integrity and honesty. I don't think you, any of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, or anybody else wants to face the voters 5 years from now, 10 years from now if what we voted on today and will vote on this week results in our bailing out foreign banks. Americans were angry that we bailed out the big U.S. megabanks. Imagine the anger if the story is focused more precisely on the fact that we bailed out foreign banks—which we actually did—but the story was more about Wall Street. Imagine if that were the story.

Former Treasury officials Michael Barr and Antonio Weiss are worried that this bill is rolling back rules that protect the U.S. economy from foreign bank risk. The former CFTC Chairman, Gary Gensler, thinks we need to amend this bill to make sure that foreign banks don't get a windfall. These are across-the-board regulators, present, past, Republicans, Democrats. That is quite a list of watchdogs, but what is most interesting: Do you know who else is under the impression this bill helps foreign banks? Foreign bank lobbyists.

I offered an amendment during the committee markup to close the loophole. I am offering it again on the Senate floor if Republican leadership allows amendments on the Senate floor. My amendment would have ensured that foreign megabanks in the United States are watched over just as closely as Wall Street banks. They are roughly the same size; some are bigger, but because their assets are smaller in the United States, we are going to treat them like Huntington and Key and Fifth Third rather than treating them like JPMorgan Chase and Bank of America and Wells Fargo.

Foreign bank lobbyists—they are American citizens. They are lobbyists for foreign banks; they are not foreign lobbyists, a difference. These lobbyists for foreign banks, representing Deutsche and UBS—most of them—wrote a letter opposing my amendment, saying it was unfair for me to try to keep these rules in place. They said their banks should be treated like U.S. regional banks, not like the global giants they are. That amendment was defeated in the committee; we will leave it at that.

Now, why is that such a problem? Let's look at the rap sheet on some of these foreign banks. Santander, a Spanish bank, failed a stress test 3 years in a row. It would have its rules rolled back under this bill. Stress tests are exercises, as my colleagues know, to ensure that a bank can survive an economic downturn without a bailout. So this Spanish bank, Santander, failed not once, not twice but three times. What that failure means—most people, if they fail three times, they flunk out. If they fail three times, they get in this bill, and they get a potential bailout. What is smart about that? What is honorable about that? What is good economic policy about that? What is fair about that? What is just about that?

In addition to failing its stress test, it is a bank that illegally repossessed cars from 1,100 American service men and women while they were serving our country. I spend a lot of time at the Wright Patterson Air Force Base, the largest employer in Ohio. I see all kinds of financial institutions that prey on those young airmen and their families. Airmen and women, young Americans serving in the Air Force—particularly when they are 18, 19, 20, 21 years old—are more financially vulnerable. They are a little less sophisticated than somebody 10 years older. They don't make much money. Their families are always anxious when their husband or wife or mother or father serve overseas. This Spanish bank repossessed the cars of 1,100 American service men and women while they were serving our country. We are going to give them a break?

This is a bank that overcharged racial and ethnic minorities for car loans. It is a bank that violated a Federal order to keep more capital and instead improperly paid out money to its shareholders, and we are going to give them a break? I don't pretend to understand the thinking of that.

This bill helps Deutsche Bank, which the IMF called ''the most important net contributor to systemic risks'' of all worldwide banks. Deutsche Bank, a German bank, one of the biggest banks in the world, the International Monetary Fund called it ''the most important net contributor to systemic risks'' of all worldwide banks.

Deutsche Bank is the only bank that would lend to the Trump family economic empire. Even after all of its failed business deals, they kept lending, for whatever reason, to businessman Trump and the family. This is a bank that every week is met with a new request for information on shady financial arrangements with people in the White House.

I don't think my colleagues and I were sent here to serve Deutsche Bank. I am thinking none of us goes back in our campaigns—I am on the ballot this year. I am not going to go back and say: Please reelect me so I can help Deutsche Bank, so I can bail them out, so I can pass a bill that will actually give them something they don't deserve.

This bill would also help banks like Barclays and UBS and BNP Paribas—banks that have rigged interest rates, helped people avoid paying taxes, violated U.S. sanctions against Iran and Sudan, and manipulated energy markets. These aren't banks down the street lending to homeowners in Sandusky or businesses in Findlay or small companies in my hometown of Mansfield; these are some of the most complex global banks. They hold $1.4 trillion in assets. That is $1,400 billion—$1.4 trillion—in assets in the United States and more than $14 trillion in assets abroad.

Listen to Paul Volker, listen to Sarah Bloom Raskin, listen to Gary Gensler, listen to Michael Barr and Antonio Weiss. Believe Secretary Mnuchin when he tells you what he wants to do. Believe the lobbyists for these foreign banks when they say that is what they want. That is why they oppose this amendment. This bill gives them exactly what they want.

Let me talk about one change made to the substitute amendment. Because I have come to this floor and some others have joined me in objecting to this foreign bank provision, the leadership—Senator MCCONNELL and his office, I assume, down the way—I assume they huddled and thought: We have to answer this somehow; we have to at least look like we care about prohibiting a bailout of foreign banks. So they made a change in the substitute. The new version of the bill came out last week. There is a new provision that provides some window dressing. It is a figleaf protection to try to convince the public that this bill doesn't do what it actually does. It doesn't actually help Santander; it doesn't actually help UBS; it doesn't actually help Barclays; it doesn't actually help the President's bank, Deutsche Bank—but it actually does. The provision provides some vague, ambiguous language and puts the question to the Fed: You can regulate the foreign banks or not; it is your choice. It doesn't require the Fed to deregulate. It doesn't stop the foreign banks from suing if the Fed doesn't obey their requests.

Why not just prohibit? Why not just say: No, we are not going to do it. But they don't want to do that. They want to keep that door open because they know the regulators on FSOC, whether it is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Jay Clayton, whether it is Mr. Otting of the SEC, whether it is Secretary Mnuchin, or whomever they put at any of these, we know what they are going to do. They have already said what they are growing to do.

Even a writer at the Wall Street Journal agrees, saying it will be up to the Fed to decide whether Deutsche Bank ''deserves a tighter leash.''

So we are expected—we, in a pretty much party-line vote, because most Democrats think you don't want Wall Street people in these positions regulating the banks, in a party-line vote, Randal Quarles was confirmed. His job is to be the Director of Supervision at the Federal Reserve. So we are expected to trust Randal Quarles not to weaken the rules in the foreign banks—to trust Quarles, even though he himself missed the last crisis. He predicted as late as, I believe, 2007, as a member of the Bush administration, that the economy was great, the banks weren't under duress, any of that. It might have been 2006, but I think 2007. He missed the last crisis and, I might add, he personally profited from Wall Street malfeasance. I am not saying he did it on purpose, but he personally profited because of Wall Street malfeasance.

We are supposed to trust Quarles, even though just last week he spoke at an international bankers conference, where a lot of those foreign bank representatives and lobbyists were in attendance, including CEOs and other executives, and he promised those bankers regulatory relief.

So we have the head of supervision at the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States—one of the most powerful people in this country—speaking to an international bankers group saying: Yes, we are going to give you regulatory relief. Aren't you lucky you came to this conference because I am in charge of these issues at the Federal Reserve, and I am going to help you get regulatory relief as a foreign bank. Congratulations.

Finally, this last point is technical, but it is important. The bills make sure that a globally systemic U.S. bank will not benefit from any deregulation, even if it has fewer than $250 billion in assets, but the bill doesn't even do the same for foreign banks.

Let me repeat. State Street has fewer than $250 billion in assets. State Street is called a custodial bank, located in Boston, as the Presiding Officer knows. It has fewer than $250 billion in assets. The bill says, because that bank is systemically significant, it doesn't get a free pass. This legislation says that about State Street, but it doesn't say the same for similarly—or, I would argue, way more—risky foreign banks in the United States.

My amendment would close that loophole. It treats systemically risky foreign banks like systemically risky U.S. banks. Why? Because why treat Barclays and Santander and UBS and Deutsche Bank better than we treat Huntington or Fifth Third or Key or Regents in Alabama or any of these regional banks—many of which we want to help. If we want to help community banks and credit unions and our regional banks to do the right thing, let's help them. Foreign megabanks shouldn't get another chance of a handout from American taxpayers—never.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

PUBLIC SCHOOLS WEEK

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, across America, nearly 100,000 public schools open the door of opportunity to more than 50 million students from kindergarten through high school. In honor of this remarkable national accomplishment, I rise today to join Senator TESTER in recognizing March 12 through 16 as Public Schools Week.

I have visited more than 200 schools throughout my home State of Maine, and I have seen firsthand an inspiring commitment to excellence. It is a commitment that is shared by dedicated educators and staff, involved parents and community members, and enthusiastic students.

Public education has had a profound impact on our Nation's history and continues to shape our future. Nine out of 10 students in the United States attend public schools. Last year, our public high schools achieved an alltime high graduation rate of 83 percent, and nearly 70 percent of our high school graduates went on to higher education. Public schools both inspire students and give them tools to achieve their dreams.

Not only do our public schools create lifelong learners, but they also help to foster active citizenship. In addition to academics, athletics, and the arts, schools throughout Maine offer programs to encourage environmental responsibility, civic engagement, and community service. I am so proud that every Veterans Day and Memorial Day, schools throughout my State hold assemblies to honor the men and women of their communities who served our Nation and defended our freedom.

Our schools have become so much more than places where children are taught. From nutritious meals to health and emotional support services, public schools play a vital role in the lives of our young people.

Education has been described as ''not the filling of a pail, but the lighting of a flame.'' We are fortunate to have many keepers of the precious flame of learning throughout our Nation, and I urge my colleagues to join Senator TESTER and me in recognizing them during Public Schools Week.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INTERNATIONAL BACCALAUREATE

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 50th anniversary of the founding of the International Baccalaureate, which has made significant contributions to educating students around the world.

In 2018, the IB celebrates 50 years of a curriculum that prioritizes critical thinking skills with a focus on international mindfulness. This organization pioneered a movement of international education in 1968 that now offers four high-quality, diverse and challenging educational program for students aged 3 to 19 years old. Through a unique curriculum of high academic standards, the IB program emphasizes critical thinking and flexibility of learning by intertwining disciplines across cultural and national boundaries. The IB currently works with more than 1.4 million students in over 4,775 schools in 153 countries.

The IB's founders sought to create a program with a multinational approach to scholarship that would help young people develop the skills, values, and knowledge necessary to build a more peaceful future. The program inspires young people to become lifelong learners, using their energy, conviction, and positivity to engage with increasingly complex and interconnected global issues. Its program is highly respected, as the best universities in the world actively seek out IB students because of their experience with IB's crossdisciplinary and crosscultural approach. IB alumni are equipped with the skills and mindset needed to succeed and to approach challenges in innovative and effective ways.

The International Baccalaureate is one of the world's leading educational initiatives. I am honored that the IB Global Centre is located in Maryland and am delighted to recognize IB's achievements and the profound contributions it has made to education throughout the world.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING CARMEN RODRIGUEZ

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today, with a heavy heart, I wish to pay tribute to Carmen Rodriguez, a wonderful leader, role model, and family woman. Sadly, Mrs. Rodriguez passed away on January 22, 2018—her 83rd birthday. She will be remembered for her outstanding public service, particularly her advocacy of Hartford's Puerto Rican community.

Mrs. Rodriguez was born in Aguirre, PR, where she lived until she moved to Buffalo, NY, with her husband, Faustino, and their seven children. She became an active member of the Puerto Rican community there, serving as a member of the Puerto Rican Center, as well as the director of bilingual education at Public School 76, now known as the Herman Badillo Bilingual Academy. During her time in Buffalo, Carmen worked tirelessly on her own education, obtaining her GED, a bachelor's degree from Rosary Hill College, a master's in education from the State University of New York at Buffalo, and began her PhD.

She took her passion for learning and educating to Hartford, CT, in 1979, where she managed the Work Places program at the Hartford Board of Education, which helped students learn specific trades. Soon after, she began working for the deputy mayor to measure the efficiency of the program. Subsequently, she supervised Hartford Housing Authority's tenant education program for a decade. For 3 years, Carmen served as the executive director of La Casa de Puerto Rico, until retiring in 1994.

Her legacy of extraordinary service and dedication to her community shines clearly through the many people she affected, as well as through her children's unfailing efforts to uphold their mother's progress. I have seen this firsthand as two of Carmen's children, Maria and Raul, served in the Office of the Connecticut Attorney General during my tenure as attorney general.

Carmen is known by many of us throughout Connecticut as an invaluable supporter of Hartford's best interests and a fearless leader of the Puerto Rican community. Her passion to use politics to initiate change has left her town—as well as the entire State—with great hope for the future.

My wife, Cynthia, and I extend our deepest sympathies to Carmen's family during this difficult time, particularly to her 7 children, 15 grandchildren, and 8 great-grandchildren. May their many wonderful memories of Carmen provide them solace and comfort in the days ahead.●

REMEMBERING CHARLES PENCE SLICHTER

● Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to the remarkable life of Charles Pence Slichter, a University of Illinois professor emeritus of physics and of chemistry, who died on Monday, February 19, 2018, in Boulder, CO, at the age of 94.

Slichter was a pioneer in the development and application of nuclear magnetic resonance, NMR, spectroscopy to elucidate the structure and behavior of matter at the atomic scale and a renowned expert on superconductivity. Slichter's seminal contributions to the fields of condensed matter physics and chemistry have been recognized with numerous awards, including the 2007 National Medal of Science.

Slichter is revered at the University of Illinois, where he served on the faculty for 57 years, for his fostering of the ''Urbana style,'' a way of tackling longstanding scientific problems by a combination of theory and experiment that emphasizes close interdisciplinary collaboration and mutual respect. Known by everyone for his brilliant smiles, infectious enthusiasm, and trademark bowties, Slichter exemplified science at its finest: creative, rigorous, curious, and scrupulously honest. His inspired teaching trained generations of American physicists and chemists and, through them, enabled a host of modern technologies.

NMR studies atomic nuclei by probing them with radio waves and measuring their response. The nuclei respond only when the radio waves are tuned to specific resonance frequencies, which depend on both the properties of the nuclei and their local magnetic field. The measured spectrum of resonance frequencies, as well as the time dynamics of the resonance response, gives information about the local environment of the nuclei. Magnetic resonance imaging, MRI, widely used in medicine, is an extension of NMR that enables 2D and 3D images to be reconstructed from NMR spectra.

Slichter pioneered many fundamental techniques in NMR. He was a codiscoverer, with H.S. Gutowsky and D.W. McCall, of indirect spin-spin coupling, known as J-coupling, in molecules. This phenomenon enables structural information about molecules to be deduced from their NMR spectrum and is a key analytical tool in modern chemistry. With T.R. Carver, Slichter performed the first dynamic polarization of nuclei using electron spins. Dynamic nuclear polarization can be used to increase the sensitivity of NMR dramatically, enabling the study of more complex molecules and smaller samples. Extensions of the technique are used to determine aspects of molecular structure or to provide a method of operation for the three-level maser, a microwave-frequency precursor to the laser.

Slichter and his student L.C. Hebel performed the first NMR studies on superconductors, materials in which electric current can flow without resistance. This was a major feat in itself because superconductors exclude the magnetic fields and radiowaves used to perform NMR spectroscopy. The results of their experiments are recognized as the first proof of the electron-pairing concept central to the Bardeen-Cooper-Schrieffer, BCS, theory of superconductivity, which was developed concurrently, also at the University of Illinois, and was honored with the 1972 Nobel Prize in Physics. Slichter conceived of the experiment while listening to a presentation from Bardeen, and the analysis was carried out with substantial collaboration from the BCS authors, even while they raced to prepare their own theoretical work. This strong collaborative interaction between theory and experiment typified the ''Urbana style'' of research, and Slichter played an important role in setting this tone for colleagues. Another research ''first'' of Slichter's, the measurement of the Pauli spin susceptibility, came after a chance hallway meeting with colleague David Pines, who had just derived a more precise theoretical model for the effect, but lamented to Slichter that ''no one can measure it.'' Slichter, who had worked on some related problems as a graduate student, replied, ''David, I know how to measure it,'' and the experimental results were published shortly thereafter.

Other notable research achievements include discoveries on the behavior of high-temperature superconductors, fundamental studies of metal surfaces for catalysis, the introduction of phase sensitive detection to pulsed NMR, the theory of chemical exchange and its effects on NMR spectra, studies of charge density waves and the Kondo effect, and the theory of chemical shifts in fluorine.

At the University of Illinois, Slichter directed the research of 63 doctoral students and more than 15 postdoctoral researchers, including Nobel laureate Sir Peter Mansfield, coinventor with Paul Lauterbur of MRI. Slichter's textbook, Principles of Magnetic Resonance, now in its third edition, has trained students around the world for nearly 60 years. Slichter said in 2004, ''I really love doing physics; the personal connection is the way I love to do it. If I were not in a university setting, I would have to find students to work with.''

Slichter's contributions to science were not limited to the laboratory and the classroom. He served the Nation with distinction as a member of the President's Science Advisory Committee from 1965 to 1969; the President's Committee on the National Medal of Science from 1969 to 1974; the President's Committee on Science and Technology Policy in 1976; and the National Science Board from 1975 to 1984. In 1975, Slichter chaired a delegation of U.S. solid-state physicists selected by the National Academy of Sciences in an initiative to open scientific exchanges with the People's Republic of China. On this trip, he met his future wife, Anne FitzGerald, who worked for the National Academy of Sciences and acted as translator for the U.S. delegation.

In academia, Slichter served for 25 years from 1970 to 1995 as a fellow of the seven-member Harvard Corporation, Harvard University's highest governing body, including 10 years as senior fellow. He chaired the selection committee that chose Neil Rudenstine as the president of Harvard in 1991. Slichter was the president of the International Society of Magnetic Resonance from 1986 to 1989. His service to U.S. industry included membership on the board of directors of Polaroid from 1975 to 1995, and on science advisory committees to IBM from 1978 to 1993, and United Technologies from 1972 to 1982.

Among his many honors and awards are the National Medal of Science in 2007; the Comstock Prize, shared with E.L. Hahn, of the National Academy of Sciences in 1993; the Irving Langmuir Prize in Chemical Physics in 1969 and the Oliver E. Buckley Prize in Condensed Matter Physics in 1996 from the American Physical Society; the Citation for Chemical Breakthrough Award, shared with H.S. Gutowsky and D.W. McCall, from the American Chemical Society in 2016; and the Triennial Prize of the International Society of Magnetic Resonance in 1986. He received honorary doctor of science degrees from the University of Waterloo in 1993 and the University of Leipzig in 2010 and an honorary doctor of laws degree from Harvard University in 1996. He was elected a member of the National Academy of Sciences in 1967, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1969, and the American Philosophical Society in 1971.

Sir Anthony J. Leggett, Nobel laureate and the John D. and Catherine T.

MacArthur Professor and Center for Advanced Study Professor of Physics at the University of Illinois, described Slichter as ''a towering figure in condensed matter physics, on both the national and international stage. He was a warm and supportive figure in the Urbana physics department right up to his last years.''

University of Illinois emeritus professor Gordon Baym said, ''Charlie was a remarkable colleague, one of the last of the great physicists of the postwar generation. He was always intellectually curious and remarkably wise. At the same time he was a great human being, amazingly encouraging and supportive of his colleagues, students, and friends, whether young or old. Just seeing his warm smile would brighten everyone's day.''

Head of the University of Illinois Department of Physics and professor Dale Van Harlingen said, ''Charlie Slichter was a legend, a role model, and a friend to everyone who ever had the opportunity to meet him. His passion for good science, his contagious kindness, and his remarkable energy has inspired me throughout my career, and I think everyone else at the University of Illinois and beyond. In many ways, Charlie has best defined the Urbana style that characterizes the culture and spirit of the Department of Physics at Illinois through his stellar contributions in NMR that have significantly impacted our understanding of condensed matter physics, especially superconductivity, and the chemistry of materials, his excellence in teaching and mentoring of students, and his unparalleled warmth and friendliness. He is truly one the great scholars and gentlemen of our generation. Charlie has made a lasting impression on all of us—he will be missed but never forgotten.''

Slichter was born on January 21, 1924, in Ithaca, NY, to Sumner Huber Slichter, a labor economist who became the first Lamont University Professor at Harvard University, and Ada—nee Pence—Slichter. Slichter was named after his paternal grandfather, Charles Sumner Slichter, a noted professor of applied mathematics and dean of the graduate school at the University of Wisconsin. His maternal grandfather, William David Pence, was a professor of railway engineering at the University of Wisconsin. From a young age, Slichter was interested in science and mathematics. It was his senior-year physics course at the Browne & Nichols School in Cambridge, MA, that made it clear, without a doubt, that he wanted to be a physicist.

Slichter studied physics at Harvard University, receiving his A.B. in 1946; M.A. in 1947; and Ph.D. in 1949 degrees there. During World War II, while an undergraduate at Harvard, he worked as a research assistant at the Underwater Explosives Research Laboratory at Woods Hole, MA, where he constructed oscilloscopes, an experience that prepared him for his doctoral research with Edward Purcell, who led the group at Harvard that codiscovered nuclear magnetic resonance. Slichter was his third graduate student, beginning research with Purcell shortly after that discovery.

Slichter came to the University of Illinois in 1949 as an instructor, recruited by then-department head F. Wheeler Loomis as an integral part of an effort to build a world-class faculty in the emerging field of solid-state physics. Slichter was appointed assistant professor 2 years later and quickly rose through the ranks to full professor in 1955. At Illinois, he held additional professorial appointments at the Center for Advanced Study from 1968 to 1997 and the Department of Chemistry from 1986 to 1997. After his retirement in 1996, Slichter maintained an active research program at Illinois, holding an appointment as research professor of physics and continuing to advise graduate students from 1997 to 2006.

Slichter is survived by his wife, Anne FitzGerald Slichter, of Champaign, IL; by his children William Almy Slichter of Minneapolis, MN; Jacob Huber Slichter of Brooklyn, NY; Ann Thayer Slichter of Los Angeles, CA; Daniel Huber Slichter of Boulder, CO; and David Pence Slichter of Binghamton, NY; and by his grandchildren, Sarah Thayer Slichter of Kingston, NY; Thayer Ellery Slichter and Lila Mackinnon Slichter of Minneapolis, MN; and Trevor Hagar Slichter and Isabela Hagar Slichter of Boulder, CO. He was preceded in death by his son Sumner Pence Slichter, policy director for U.S. Senator Russ Feingold. He is also survived by his first wife, Gertrude Thayer Almy of Mitchellville, MD, who is the mother of Sumner, William, Jacob, and Ann.●

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

As 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.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2017, the Secretary of the Senate, on March 9, 2018, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) had signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 294. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2700 Cullen Boulevard in Pearland, Texas, as the ''Endy Nddiobong Ekpanya Post Office Building''.

H.R. 452. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 324 West Saint Louis Street in Pacific, Missouri, as the ''Specialist Jeffrey L. White, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 1208. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 9155 Schaefer Road, Converse, Texas, as the ''Converse Veterans Post Office Building''.

H.R. 1858. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4514 Williamson Trail in Liberty, Pennsylvania, as the ''Staff Sergeant Ryan Scott Ostrom Post Office''.

H.R. 1988. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1730 18th Street in Bakersfield, California, as the ''Merle Haggard Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2254. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2635 Napa Street in Vallejo, California, as the ''Janet Capello Post Office Building''.

H.R. 2302. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 259 Nassau Street, Suite 2 in Princeton, New Jersey, as the ''Dr. John F. Nash, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 2464. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 25 New Chardon Street Lobby in Boston, Massachusetts, as the ''John Fitzgerald Kennedy Post Office''.

H.R. 2672. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 520 Carter Street in Fairview, Illinois, as the ''Sgt. Douglas J. Riney Post Office''.

H.R. 2815. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 30 East Somerset Street in Raritan, New Jersey, as the ''Gunnery Sergeant John Basilone Post Office''.

H.R. 2873. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 207 Glenside Avenue in Wyncote, Pennsylvania, as the ''Staff Sergeant Peter Taub Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3109. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1114 North 2nd Street in Chillicothe, Illinois, as the ''Sr. Chief Ryan Owens Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3369. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 225 North Main Street in Spring Lake, North Carolina, as the ''Howard B. Pate, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 3638. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1100 Kings Road in Jacksonville, Florida, as the ''Rutledge Pearson Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3655. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1300 Main Street in Belmar, New Jersey, as the ''Dr. Walter S. McAfee Post Office Building''.

H.R. 3821. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 430 Main Street in Clermont, Georgia, as the ''Zack T. Addington Post Office''.

H.R. 3893. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 100 Mathe Avenue in Interlachen, Florida, as the ''Robert H. Jenkins, Jr. Post Office''.

H.R. 4042. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1415 West Oak Street, in Kissimmee, Florida, as the ''Borinqueneers Post Office Building''.

H.R. 4285. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 Bridgeton Pike in Mullica Hill, New

Jersey, as the ''James C. ''Billy'' Johnson Post Office Building''.

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–4545. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Agriculture, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4546. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Lipochitooligosaccharide (LCO) SP104; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 9973–39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4547. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Kasugamycin; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9972–96) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fluopicolide; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 9973–44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4549. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Defense Production Act Annual Fund Report for Fiscal Year 2017''; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–4550. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Monetary Penalty Inflation Adjustments'' ((RIN1029–AC75) (Docket ID OSM–2017–0012)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–4551. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Washington: Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions'' (FRL No. 9974–35–Region 10) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works .

EC–4552. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Revision to References for Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Sector to Incorporate Latest Edition of Certain Industry, Consensus-based Standards; Withdrawal'' (FRL No. 9975–19–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4553. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Quality Plans; Pennsylvania; Lebanon County 2012 Fine Particulate Matter Standard Determination of Attainment'' (FRL No. 9975–00–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4554. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources; Amendments'' (FRL No. 9975–10–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4555. 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; Virginia; Removal of Clean Air Interstate Rule (CAIR) Trading Programs'' (FRL No. 9975–32–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4556. 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; Virginia; Revisions to the Regulatory Definition of Volatile Organic Compound'' (FRL No. 9975–37–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4557. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Implementation of the 2015 National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone; Nonattainment Area Classifications Approach'' (FRL No. 9975–23–OAR) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4558. 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; Virginia; Amendment to Ambient Air Quality Standard for Ozone'' (FRL No. 9975–13–Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4559. 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; Redesignation of the Delta, Ohio Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard'' (FRL No. 9975–46–Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4560. 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; Massachusetts; Logan Airport Parking Freeze'' (FRL No. 9974–96–Region 1) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–4561. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report consistent with the Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002 (P.L. 107–243) and the Authorization for the Use of Force Against Iraq Resolution of 1991 (P.L. 102–1) for the November 9, 2017 - January 8, 2018 reporting period; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 292. A bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1091. A bill to establish a Federal Task Force to Support Grandparents Raising Grandchildren.

By Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment:

S. 2278. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide grants to improve health care in rural areas.

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. TESTER:

S. 2532. A bill to make demonstration grants to eligible local educational agencies or consortia of eligible local educational agencies for the purpose of increasing the numbers of school nurses in public elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2533. A bill to amend title III of the Public Health Service Act to allow National Health Service Corps members to provide obligated service as behavioral and mental health professionals at schools, other community-based settings, or patient homes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2534. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit individuals who are eligible for assistance under a Department of Defense educational assistance program or authority to use such tuition assistance for licensing and certification programs offered by entities other than an institution of higher education; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2535. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to strengthen Drug Enforcement Administration discretion in setting opioid quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2536. A bill to make daylight savings time permanent for the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2537. A bill to make daylight savings time permanent, and for other purposes; to

the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 2538. A bill to prohibit an increase in duties on imports of steel and aluminum; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 430. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 9, 2018, as a national day of remembrance in honor of the life, legacy, and many accomplishments of Billy Frank, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 431. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of ''International Parental Child Abduction Month'' and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. Res. 432. A resolution congratulating the Baltic states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 283

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the treatment of veterans who participated in the cleanup of Enewetak Atoll as radiation exposed veterans for purposes of the presumption of service-connection of certain disabilities by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 382

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 382, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop a voluntary registry to collect data on cancer incidence among firefighters.

S. 422

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 422, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 482

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 482, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the Secretary of Defense to use only human-based methods for training members of the Armed Forces in the treatment of severe combat injuries, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the benefits and services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs to women veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, 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. 781

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 781, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to limit the liability of health care professionals who volunteer to provide health care services in response to a disaster.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 811

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 811, a bill to ensure that organizations with religious or moral convictions are allowed to continue to provide services for children.

S. 974

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 974, a bill to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the timely entry of lower-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products.

S. 1072

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1072, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of services for homeless veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1112

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to support States in their work to save and sustain the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period, to eliminate disparities in maternal health outcomes for pregnancy-related and pregnancy-associated deaths, to identify solutions to improve health care quality and health outcomes for mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 1292

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1292, a bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to monitor and combat anti-Semitism globally, and for other purposes.

S. 1419

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1419, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1942

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1942, a bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1945, a bill to regulate large capacity ammunition feeding devices.

S. 1995

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1995, a bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to improve the number of small business investment companies in underlicensed States, and for other purposes.

S. 2006

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2006, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2135

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 2135, a bill to enforce current law regarding the National Instant Criminal Background Check System.

S. 2178

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2178, a bill to require the Council of Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency to make open recommendations of Inspectors General publicly available, and for other purposes.

S. 2208

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2208, a bill to provide for the issuance of an Alzheimer's Disease Research Semipostal Stamp.

S. 2244

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2244, a bill to create opportunities for women in the aviation industry.

S. 2268

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2268, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to modify certain provisions relating to the capital financing of historically Black colleges and universities.

S. 2272

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2272, a bill to amend the Revised Statutes to grant State attorneys general the ability to issue subpoenas to investigate suspected violations of State laws that are applicable to national banks.

S. 2324

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2324, a bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes.

S. 2416

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2416, a bill to amend titles 5, 10, and 37, United States Code, to ensure that an order to serve on active duty under section 12304b of title 10, United States Code, is treated the same as other orders to serve on active duty for determining the eligibility of members of the uniformed services for certain benefits.

S. 2421

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2421, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide an exemption from certain notice requirements and penalties for releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

S. 2455

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2455, a bill to encourage United States-Ukraine cybersecurity cooperation and require a report regarding such cooperation, and for other purposes.

S. 2461

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2461, a bill to allow for judicial review of certain final rules relating to national emission standards for hazardous air pollutants for brick and structural clay products or for clay ceramics manufacturing before requiring compliance with the rules by existing sources.

S. 2488

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2488, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to exclude the receipt of basic allowance for housing for members of the Armed Forces in determining eligibility for certain Federal benefits, and for other purposes.

S. 2494

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2494, a bill to provide standards for short-term limited duration health insurance policies.

S. 2495

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2495, a bill to reauthorize the grant program for school security in the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2507

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2507, a bill to require short-term limited duration insurance issuers to renew or continue in force such coverage at the option of the enrollees.

S. 2513

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to improve school safety and mental health services.

S. RES. 376

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 376, a resolution urging the Governments of Burma and Bangladesh to ensure the safe, dignified, voluntary, and sustainable return of the Rohingya refugees who have been displaced by the campaign of ethnic cleansing conducted by the Burmese military.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 377, a resolution recognizing the importance of paying tribute to those individuals who have faithfully served and retired from the Armed Forces of the United States, designating April 18, 2018, as ''Military Retiree Appreciation Day'', and encouraging the people of the United States to honor the past and continued service of military retirees to their local communities and the United States.

S. RES. 407

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 407, a resolution recognizing the critical work of human rights defenders in promoting human

rights, the rule of law, democracy, and good governance.

S. RES. 426

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 426, a resolution supporting the goals of International Women's Day.

AMENDMENT NO. 2047

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2047 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2133

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2133 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2139

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2139 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2179

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2179 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2180

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2180 intended to be proposed to S. 2155, a bill to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 2535. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to strengthen Drug Enforcement Administration discretion in setting opioid quotas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

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

S. 2535

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 ''Opioid Quota Reform Act''.

SEC. 2. STRENGTHENING CONSIDERATIONS FOR DEA OPIOID QUOTAS.

Section 306 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 826) is amended—

(1) in the last sentence of subsection (a), by striking '' and not in terms of individual pharmaceutical dosage forms prepared from or containing such a controlled substance''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(i)(1) In fixing and adjusting production and manufacturing quotas under this section for fentanyl, oxycodone, hydrocodone, oxymorphone, and hydromorphone, the Attorney General shall consider the impact of the production and manufacturing quotas on overall public health and rates of diversion, abuse, and overdose deaths related to these controlled substances in the United States. Any of the considerations in this subsection or in subsection (a) may be used to determine changes to levels of such production and manufacturing quotas in a given year.

''(2)(A) For any year in which the approved production quota for fentanyl, oxycodone, hydrocodone, oxymorphone, or hydromorphone is higher than the approved production quota for the substance in the previous year, the Attorney General shall include in its final order an explanation of why the public health benefits of increasing such quota outweigh the consequences of having an increased volume of such substance available for sale, and potential diversion, in the United States.

''(B) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection and every year thereafter, the Attorney General shall provide to the Caucus on International Narcotics Control, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, and Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on Energy and Commerce, and Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the following information with regard to each of the substances described in subparagraph (A):

''(i) An anonymized count of the total number of manufacturers issued individual manufacturing quotas that year for that substance.

''(ii) A count of how many such manufacturers were issued an approved manufacturing quota that was higher than the quota issued to that manufacturer for that substance in the previous year.

''(3) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit to Congress a report on how the Attorney General will ensure that the annual process of fixing and adjusting production and manufacturing quotas under this section takes into consideration—

''(A) efforts to reduce the costs, injuries, and deaths associated with the diversion and abuse of prescription opioids and heroin, including changes in the accepted medical use of certain controlled substances; and

''(B) data collection and evaluation of the volume of controlled substances that are diverted and collected from approved drug collection receptacles, mail-back programs, and take-back events.''.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 2538. A bill to prohibit an increase in duties on imports of steel and aluminum; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, when these ill-conceived tariffs were announced last week, I said I would introduce legislation that would immediately nullify this very unfortunate exercise in protectionism before it could wreak havoc on our economy.

If implemented, these tariffs will do just what tariffs have always done. They will lead to job losses and will stymie economic growth. What is worse, the President's attempt at flexibility in the form of poorly defined exceptions only serves to harm the economy further by creating uncertainty. Tariffs are bad enough on their own; tariffs married with uncertainty are even worse.

Can you imagine the President saying one day, ''Well, I think that Australia is moving in ways that we think are good in this area or that, so I am going to lessen the tariffs that we impose on steel and aluminum for Australia''? The next day it is Brazil. ''If it does this or that that is unrelated to these tariffs, I might lift tariffs or lessen the burden of tariffs on that country.'' Yet, a week later, if Brazil makes another move, the President might seek to reimpose or to make the burden heavier. That simply doesn't work if you are trying to achieve economic growth and if you are trying to convince countries to enter into trade partnerships with you. Particularly when you are dealing with our allies, that is no way to treat your allies.

I understand free trade is sometimes a challenge. I understand that it is a challenge on the campaign trail, certainly. It is often easier to point to a shuttered factory and blame trade or immigration or some other convenient scapegoat other than what is usually the case—modernization or mechanization or something that has meant that we have increased productivity or simply the best allocation capital in order to facilitate trade.

We have to aggressively negotiate both bilateral and multilateral trade deals if we are to catch up. If we fail to do this and continue to withdraw from the global marketplace, we are going to be left far behind. We saw this with regard to the Trans-Pacific Partnership. We pulled out of those negotiations, and the other 11 countries involved simply went on their own and left us behind. That has meant, in particular, countries in Southeast Asia, which would like to be a part of our trade orbit, have had no choice but to be more reliant on China. That doesn't serve our interests at all.

We have to remember we represent just 20 percent of the world's economic output. We represent just 5 percent of the world's population or just less than that. If we don't trade, we don't grow. You can be pro-growth or you can be pro-tariff, but you can't be both.

Those who have reservations about these tariffs ought to support this legislation that I am introducing today to

nullify the tariffs. Those who have expressed admiration for free trade or supply-side economics ought to support this bill as well. Those who are happy with the economic growth that we have recently achieved and are interested in seeing it continue ought to support this bill. We now have a better climate for economic growth on both the regulatory side and the tax side. If we enter a trade war, we risk reversing those gains we have made.

We in Congress cannot be complicit as this administration courts economic disaster in this fashion. I urge my colleagues to join me in exercising our constitutional oversight and to invalidate these irresponsible tariffs.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 430—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 9, 2018, AS A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE, LEGACY, AND MANY ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF BILLY FRANK, JR.

Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 430

Whereas, in the 1850s, the United States Government signed a series of treaties with Washington State Tribes under which the Tribes granted millions of acres of land to the United States in exchange for the establishment of reservations and the recognition of traditional hunting, fishing, and gathering rights;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., was born to Willie Frank, Sr., and Angeline Frank on March 9, 1931, at Frank's Landing on the banks of the Nisqually River in Washington State;

Whereas the tireless efforts and dedication of Billy Frank, Jr., led to a historic legal victory that ensured that the United States would honor promises made in treaties with the Washington Tribes;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., was first arrested in December of 1945, at the age of 14, for fishing for salmon in the Nisqually River;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., was subsequently arrested more than 50 times for exercising his treaty-protected right to fish for salmon;

Whereas over the years, Billy Frank, Jr., and other Tribal members staged ''fish-ins'' that often placed the protestors in danger of being arrested or attacked;

Whereas during these fish-ins, Billy Frank, Jr., and others demanded that they be allowed to fish in historically Tribal waters, a right the Nisqually had reserved in the Treaty of Medicine Creek;

Whereas declining salmon runs in Washington waters resulted in increased arrests of Tribal members exercising their fishing rights under the Treaty of Medicine Creek;

Whereas, on February 12, 1974, in the case of *United States* v. *Washington*, Judge George Hugo Boldt of the United States District Court for the Western District of Washington issued a decision that affirmed the right of Washington treaty Tribes to take up to half of the harvestable salmon in western Washington, reaffirmed Tribal treaty-reserved rights, and established the Tribes as comanagers of the salmon resource;

Whereas the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court of the United States upheld the Boldt decision;

Whereas after the Boldt decision, Billy Frank, Jr., continued his fight to protect natural resources, salmon, and a healthy environment;

Whereas the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission, where Billy Frank, Jr., served as chairman, assists its 20 member Tribes in managing fisheries and works to establish relationships with State agencies and non-Indian groups to restore and protect habitats, and protect Tribal treaty rights;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., refused to be bitter in the face of jail, racism, and abuse, and his influence was felt not just in Washington State but around the world;

Whereas Billy Frank, Jr., was awarded the Albert Schweitzer Prize for Humanitarianism, the Common Cause Award for Human Rights Efforts, the American Indian Distinguished Service Award, the Washington State Environmental Excellence Award, and the Wallace Stegner Award for his years of service and dedication to his battle;

Whereas, in 2015, Billy Frank, Jr., was posthumously awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Barack Obama;

Whereas, in 2015, Congress passed the Billy Frank Jr. Tell Your Story Act (Public Law 114–101), renaming the Nisqually National Wildlife Refuge in honor of Billy Frank, Jr., and establishing a national memorial at nearby McAllister Creek, where the Medicine Creek Treaty was signed in 1854 between the United States Government and the Nisqually, Muckleshoot, Puyallup, and Squaxin Island Tribes;

Whereas the legacy of Billy Frank, Jr., will live on in stories, in memories, and every time a Tribal member exercises his or her right to harvest salmon in Washington State; and

Whereas the legacy of Billy Frank, Jr., continues to inspire those still around today and those still to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate supports a national day of remembrance in honor of the life, legacy, and many accomplishments of Billy Frank, Jr.

SENATE RESOLUTION 431—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF ''INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION MONTH'' AND EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT CONGRESS SHOULD RAISE AWARENESS OF THE HARM CAUSED BY INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 431

Whereas thousands of children in the United States have been abducted from the United States by parents, separating those children from their parents who remain in the United States;

Whereas it is illegal under section 1204 of title 18, United States Code, to remove, or attempt to remove, a child from the United States or retain a child (who has been in the United States) outside of the United States with the intent to obstruct the lawful exercise of parental rights;

Whereas more than 600 children experienced international parental child abduction during 2015;

Whereas, during 2016, 1 or more cases of international parental child abduction involving children who are citizens of the United States were identified in 106 countries around the world;

Whereas the United States is a party to the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction, done at the Hague October 25, 1980 (TIAS 11670) (referred to in this preamble as the ''Hague Convention on Abduction''), which—

(1) supports the prompt return of wrongly removed or retained children; and

(2) calls for all participating parties to respect parental custody rights;

Whereas a significant number of children who were abducted from the United States have yet to be reunited with their custodial parents;

Whereas, during 2016, 13 countries were identified under the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.) as engaging in a pattern of noncompliance;

Whereas, during the 20-year period ending on the date of enactment of this resolution, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children has provided assistance for more than 6,000 international family abduction cases involving children wrongfully removed from or retained outside of the United States;

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recognized that family abduction—

(1) is a form of child abuse with potentially ''devastating consequences for a child'', that may include negative impacts on the physical and mental well-being of the child; and

(2) can cause a child to ''experience a loss of community and stability, leading to loneliness, anger, and fear of abandonment'';

Whereas, according to the 2010 Report on Compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction by the Department of State, research shows that an abducted child is at risk of significant short- and long-term problems, including ''anxiety, eating problems, nightmares, mood swings, sleep disturbances, [and] aggressive behavior'';

Whereas international parental child abduction has devastating emotional consequences not only for the child but also for the parent from whom the child is separated;

Whereas the United States has a history of promoting child welfare through institutions including—

(1) in the Department of Health and Human Services—

(A) the Administration for Children and Families; and

(B) the Children's Bureau; and

(2) in the Department of State, the Office of Children's Issues;

Whereas Congress has signaled a commitment to ending international parental child abduction by enacting the International Child Abduction Remedies Act (22 U.S.C. 9001 et seq.), the International Parental Kidnapping Crime Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–173; 107 Stat. 1998), and the Sean and David Goldman International Child Abduction Prevention and Return Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.);

Whereas, in 2012, the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 543, 112th Congress, agreed to December 4, 2012, which—

(1) condemned international parental child abduction;

(2) urged countries identified by the Department of State as noncompliant with the Hague Convention on Abduction to fulfill the commitment those countries made to implement the Hague Convention on Abduction; and

(3) expressed the sense of the Senate that the United States should—

(A) pursue the return, by all appropriate means, of each child abducted by a parent to another country;

(B) if a child is abducted by a parent and not returned to the United States, facilitate access to the abducted child for the parent remaining in the United States; and

(C) where appropriate, seek the extradition of the parent that abducted the child;

Whereas all 50 States and the District of Columbia have enacted laws criminalizing parental kidnapping;

Whereas, in 2016, the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children's Issues of the Department of State—

(1) fielded 2,537 inquiries from the general public relating to preventing a child from being removed from the United States; and

(2) enrolled 4,087 children in the Children's Passport Issuance Alert Program, which—

(A) is one of the most important tools of the Department of State for preventing international parental child abduction; and

(B) allows the Office of Children's Issues to contact the enrolling parent or legal guardian to verify whether the parental consent requirement has been met when a passport application has been submitted for an enrolled child;

Whereas, the Department of State cannot track the ultimate destination of a child through the use of the passport of the child issued by the Department of State if the child is transported to a third country after departing from the United States;

Whereas a child who is a citizen of the United States may have another nationality and may travel using a passport issued by another country, which—

(1) increases the difficulty in determining the whereabouts of the child; and

(2) makes efforts to prevent abductions all the more critical;

Whereas, in 2016, the Department of Homeland Security, in coordination with the Prevention Branch of the Office of Children's Issues of the Department of State, enrolled 131 children in a program aimed at preventing international parental child abduction;

Whereas, the Department of State, through the International Visitor Leadership Program and related initiatives with global partners of the United States, has reduced the number of children who have been reported abducted from the United States by 25 percent during the past 2 years; and

Whereas the United States should continue to play a leadership role in raising awareness about the devastating impacts of international parental child abduction by educating the public about the negative emotional, psychological, and physical consequences to children and parents victimized by international parental child abduction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes and observes ''International Parental Child Abduction Month'' during the period beginning on April 1, 2018, and ending on May 1, 2018, to raise awareness of, and opposition to, international parental child abduction.

SENATE RESOLUTION 432—CONGRATULATING THE BALTIC STATES OF ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA ON THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEIR DECLARATIONS OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 432

Whereas, in 1918, the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania declared their independence on February 24, November 18, and February 16, respectively, as sovereign, democratic countries;

Whereas, on July 28, 1922, the United States formally recognized Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as independent countries;

Whereas the United States refused to recognize the Soviet Union's forcible incorporation of the Baltic states;

Whereas, in August 1991, the Baltic states regained their de facto independence from the Soviet Union, and on September 2, 1991, President George H. W. Bush recognized the restoration of their independence, reestablishing full diplomatic relations between the United States and Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania several days later;

Whereas, in the United States, communities of Baltic descent have contributed significantly to American culture, prosperity, and security and have helped strengthen United States relations with the Baltic states;

Whereas relations between the United States and Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have developed into a robust partnership based on shared values and principles, including respect for the rule of law, human rights, freedom of speech, and free trade;

Whereas Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have shown their resolve as responsible and dedicated members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) by contributing to regional and global security, including to operations in Afghanistan;

Whereas the Baltic states have been leaders in addressing and combatting 21st century security threats, exemplified by their active leadership and advancement of the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence in Estonia, the NATO Strategic Communications Center of Excellence in Latvia, and the NATO Energy Security Center of Excellence in Lithuania; and

Whereas Russia's continued aggressive and provocative actions against its neighboring countries, including violations of sovereign Baltic airspace, test both the region and the NATO alliance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of their declarations of independence;

(2) commends the people and Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania for their successful reforms and remarkable economic growth since 1991;

(3) applauds the productive partnership the United States enjoys with the Baltic states in many spheres, including NATO;

(4) recognizes the determination of the Governments of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania to strengthen transatlantic security through defense spending and host nation support for NATO deployments;

(5) recognizes the commitment among the Baltic states to further respect for the values of democracy and human rights within their own countries and abroad; and

(6) reiterates the continued support of Congress for the European Deterrence Initiative as a means for enhancing deterrence and increasing military capabilities on NATO's eastern flank.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2192. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2193. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2194. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2195. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2196. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2197. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2198. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2199. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2200. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2201. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2202. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2203. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2204. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2205. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2206. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2207. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2208. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2152

proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2192. Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 105, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 106, line 7, and insert the following:

''(B) what constitutes appropriate proof.''.

SA 2193. Mr. CORKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 402.

SA 2194. Mr. WICKER (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. TREATMENT OF CERTAIN NONSIGNIFICANT INVESTMENTS IN THE CAPITAL OF UNCONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828), as amended by section 403(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(bb) TREATMENT OF NONSIGNIFICANT INVESTMENTS IN THE CAPITAL OF UNCONSOLIDATED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—For purposes of the final rules titled 'Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule' (78 Fed. Reg. 62018; published Oct. 11, 2013 and 79 Fed. Reg. 20754; published April 14, 2014) and any other regulation which incorporates a definition of the term 'nonsignificant investments in the capital of unconsolidated financial institutions', the appropriate Federal banking agencies shall provide that investments in trust preferred securities (pooled and individual instruments) by a depository institution with assets of less than $15,000,000,000 as of July 21, 2010, or a depository institution holding company with assets of less than $15,000,000,000 as of July 21, 2010, shall not be subject to deduction from the regulatory capital of such depository institution or depository institution holding company or any depository institution holding company of such an institution, provided such investments were held prior to July 21, 2010.''.

(b) AMENDMENT TO BASEL III CAPITAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than the end of the 3-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Comptroller of the Currency shall amend the final rules titled ''Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Implementation of Basel III, Capital Adequacy, Transition Provisions, Prompt Corrective Action, Standardized Approach for Risk-weighted Assets, Market Discipline and Disclosure Requirements, Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule, and Market Risk Capital Rule'' (78 Fed. Reg. 62018; published Oct. 11, 2013 and 79 Fed. Reg. 20754; published April 14, 2014) to implement the amendments made by this Act.

SA 2195. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RESTORING MAIN STREET INVESTOR PROTECTION AND CONFIDENCE.

(a) SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION ACT OF 1970 AMENDMENTS.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 5(b)(3) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78eee(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

''(3) APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEE AND ATTORNEY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the court issues a protective decree under paragraph (1), such court shall forthwith appoint, as trustee for the liquidation of the business of the debtor and as attorney for the trustee, such persons as the court determines best fit to serve as trustee and as attorney from among the persons selected by the Commission pursuant to subparagraph (B). The persons appointed as trustee and as attorney for the trustee may be associated with the same firm.

''(B) COMMISSION CANDIDATES.—The Commission shall maintain a list of candidates for the position of trustee and attorney for the trustee for a debtor in a liquidation proceedings, and shall periodically update the list, as appropriate. With respect to a debtor and upon the court issuing a protective decree under paragraph (1), the Commission shall forthwith provide the court with such list.

''(C) DISINTEREST REQUIREMENT.—No person may be appointed to serve as trustee or attorney for the trustee if such person is not disinterested within the meaning of paragraph (6), except that for any specified purpose other than to represent a trustee in conducting a liquidation proceeding, the trustee may, with the approval of SIPC and the court, employ an attorney who is not disinterested.

''(D) QUALIFICATION.—A trustee appointed under this paragraph shall qualify by filing a bond in the manner prescribed by section 322 of title 11, United States Code, except that neither SIPC nor any employee of SIPC shall be required to file a bond when appointed as trustee.

''(E) PROHIBITION ON TRUSTEE SERVING IN MULTIPLE LIQUIDATIONS.—A trustee may not be appointed under this paragraph if the trustee is currently serving as trustee for the liquidation of the business of another debtor under this Act.''.

(B) COMPENSATION FOR TRUSTEE AND ATTORNEY.—Section 5(b)(5) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78eee(b)(5)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by adding at the end the following: ''The court shall publicly disclose all such allowances that are granted.'';

(ii) by amending subparagraph (C) to read as follows:

''(C) AWARDING OF ALLOWANCES.—Whenever an application for allowances is filed pursuant to subparagraph (B), the court shall determine the amount of allowances, giving due consideration to the nature, extent, and value of the services rendered.''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) SIPC DISCLOSURES.—SIPC shall issue quarterly public reports on—

''(i) all payments made by SIPC to the trustee;

''(ii) all other costs in connection with the liquidation proceeding, including legal and accounting costs; and

''(iii) all additional expenses incurred by SIPC, and the nature of such expenses.''.

(C) APPLICATION.—The amendments made by this paragraph shall apply with respect to trustees and attorneys appointed after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) DEFINITION OF CUSTOMER STATUS.—Section 16(2)(B) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78lll(2)(B)) is amended—

(A) in clause (ii), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (iii), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iv) any person that had cash or securities that were converted or otherwise misappropriated by the debtor (or any person that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with the debtor, if such person was operating through the debtor), irrespective of whether the debtor held or otherwise had custody, possession, or control of such cash or securities; and

''(v) any other person that the Commission, in its discretion and without any need for court approval, deems a customer of the debtor.''.

(3) COMMISSION AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE SIPC ACTION.—Section 11(b) of the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78ggg(b)) is amended to read as follows:

''(b) COMMISSION AUTHORITY TO REQUIRE SIPC ACTION.—In the event of the refusal of SIPC to commit its funds or otherwise to act for the protection of customers of any member of SIPC, the Commission may require SIPC to discharge its obligations under this Act without court approval.''.

(b) APPLICATION.—Except as provided under subsection (a)(1)(C), the amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to a liquidation proceeding under the Securities Investor Protection Act of 1970 (15 U.S.C. 78aaa et seq.) that—

(1) was in progress on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) is initiated after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 2196. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for

other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 73, line 20, strike ''subcontractor'' and insert ''contractor''.

On page 73, line 23, strike ''The'' and insert ''In accordance with section 1106 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1306), the''.

On page 75, line 23, insert ''and any additional privacy and data security requirements that the Commissioner may require,'' before ''with respect to''.

On page 76, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

(5) Any other declaration, as determined necessary by the Commissioner.

On page 76, beginning on line 21, strike ''in section 106'' and all that follows through line 23 and insert the following: ''for purposes of section 3504 of title 44, United States Code, and must comply with any other requirements for obtaining the electronic consent of the individual that the Commissioner may require.''.

On page 77, line 11, insert ''electronic signature processes and'' before ''the database''.

On page 78, line 5, insert '', and the Commissioner may (in addition to any action taken by such agencies) suspend or terminate the provision of fraud protection data under this section to any permitted entity that violates this section or its certification under this section'' before the period.

On page 78, lines 7 and 8, by striking '', pursuant to an audit described in paragraph (1),''.

SA 2197. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 401(f), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), insert after ''Regulations,'' the following: ''or any intermediate holding company that meets the requirements under section 252.153 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations, as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to a foreign banking organization (as defined in section 211.21 of title 12, Code of Federal Regulations) that has been identified as a global systemically important bank by the Financial Stability Board,''.

Strike section 401(g).

SA 2198. Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. PAUL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL.

The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is repealed, and the provisions of law amended or repealed by that Act are restored or revived as if the Act had not been enacted.

SA 2199. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CUSTOMER PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term ''appropriate Federal banking agency''—

(i) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(ii) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(B) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ''depository institution''—

(i) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(ii) includes an insured credit union.

(C) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term ''insured credit union'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(2) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer, or a group of customers, unless—

(i) the agency has a valid reason for the request or order; and

(ii) the reason described in clause (i) is not based solely on reputation risk to the depository institution.

(B) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency has a belief described in clause (ii) of this subparagraph, that belief shall be deemed to satisfy the requirement under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a request or order described in that subparagraph.

(ii) BELIEF OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREAT.—A belief described in this clause is a belief by an appropriate Federal banking agency that a specific customer, or a group of customers, is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity that—

(I) poses a threat to national security;

(II) is involved in terrorist financing;

(III) is an agency of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the state sponsor of terrorism list;

(IV) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country described in subclause (III); or

(V) does business with any entity described in subclause (III) or (IV), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer, or group of customers, has exercised due diligence to avoid doing business with any such entity.

(3) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders that a depository institution terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, the appropriate Federal banking agency shall provide—

(i) the request or order to the depository institution in writing; and

(ii) along with the request or order provided under clause (i), a written justification for why the termination is needed, including any specific law or regulation that the appropriate Federal banking agency believes the customer, or group of customers, is violating, if any.

(B) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification provided under subparagraph (A)(ii) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution to which the justification is provided.

(4) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(A) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination provided by the appropriate Federal banking agency under paragraph (3)(A)(ii).

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(i) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, based on a belief that the customer, or group of customers, poses a threat to national security, or is otherwise described in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination of the account or accounts, as applicable.

(ii) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under subparagraph (A) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution that is required to provide the notice nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination of the account or accounts, as applicable.

(5) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall submit to Congress an annual report that contains—

(A) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered that a depository institution terminate during the year covered by the report;

(B) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making the requests and orders described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) the frequency with which the agency relied on each legal authority described in subparagraph (B).

SA 2200. Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FINANCIAL INSTITUTION CUSTOMER PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT TERMINATION REQUESTS AND ORDERS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL BANKING AGENCY.—The term ''appropriate Federal banking agency''—

(i) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(ii) means the National Credit Union Administration, in the case of an insured credit union.

(B) DEPOSITORY INSTITUTION.—The term ''depository institution''—

(i) has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813); and

(ii) includes an insured credit union.

(C) INSURED CREDIT UNION.—The term ''insured credit union'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1752).

(2) TERMINATION REQUESTS OR ORDERS MUST BE VALID.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An appropriate Federal banking agency may not formally or informally request or order a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, or to otherwise restrict or discourage a depository institution from entering into or maintaining a banking relationship with a specific customer, or a group of customers, unless—

(i) the agency has a valid reason for the request or order; and

(ii) the reason described in clause (i) is not based solely on reputation risk to the depository institution.

(B) TREATMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREATS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency has a belief described in clause (ii) of this subparagraph, that belief shall be deemed to satisfy the requirement under clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A) with respect to a request or order described in that subparagraph.

(ii) BELIEF OF NATIONAL SECURITY THREAT.—A belief described in this clause is a belief by an appropriate Federal banking agency that a specific customer, or a group of customers, is, or is acting as a conduit for, an entity that—

(I) poses a threat to national security;

(II) is involved in terrorist financing;

(III) is an agency of the Government of Iran, North Korea, Syria, or any country listed from time to time on the state sponsor of terrorism list;

(IV) is located in, or is subject to the jurisdiction of, any country described in subclause (III); or

(V) does business with any entity described in subclause (III) or (IV), unless the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the customer, or group of customers, has exercised due diligence to avoid doing business with any such entity.

(3) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency formally or informally requests or orders that a depository institution terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, the appropriate Federal banking agency shall provide—

(i) the request or order to the depository institution in writing; and

(ii) along with the request or order provided under clause (i), a written justification for why the termination is needed, including any specific law or regulation that the appropriate Federal banking agency believes the customer, or group of customers, is violating, if any.

(B) JUSTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—A justification provided under subparagraph (A)(ii) may not be based solely on the reputation risk to the depository institution to which the justification is provided.

(4) CUSTOMER NOTICE.—

(A) NOTICE REQUIRED.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), or as otherwise prohibited from being disclosed by law, if an appropriate Federal banking agency orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, the depository institution shall inform the specific customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination provided by the appropriate Federal banking agency under paragraph (3)(A)(ii).

(B) NOTICE PROHIBITED.—

(i) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN CASES OF NATIONAL SECURITY.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency requests or orders a depository institution to terminate a specific customer account, or a group of customer accounts, based on a belief that the customer, or group of customers, poses a threat to national security, or is otherwise described in paragraph (2)(B)(ii), neither the depository institution nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination of the account or accounts, as applicable.

(ii) NOTICE PROHIBITED IN OTHER CASES.—If an appropriate Federal banking agency determines that the notice required under subparagraph (A) may interfere with an authorized criminal investigation, neither the depository institution that is required to provide the notice nor the appropriate Federal banking agency may inform the specific customer, or group of customers, of the justification for the termination of the account or accounts, as applicable.

(5) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Each appropriate Federal banking agency shall submit to Congress an annual report that contains—

(A) the aggregate number of specific customer accounts that the agency requested or ordered that a depository institution terminate during the year covered by the report;

(B) the legal authority on which the agency relied in making the requests and orders described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) the frequency with which the agency relied on each legal authority described in subparagraph (B).

SA 2201. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REGULATIONS FROM THE EXECUTIVE IN NEED OF SCRUTINY.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2018''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

(c) CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.—Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 804(2);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

''(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

''(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995; and

''(iv) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

''§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.';

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'; and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such is deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the

_____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter:

''(1) The term 'Federal agency' means—

''(A) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System;

''(B) the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency;

''(C) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

''(D) the National Credit Union Administration;

''(E) the Securities and Exchange Commission;

''(F) the Commodity Futures Trading Commission;

''(G) the Federal Housing Finance Agency;

''(H) the Farm Credit Administration; and

''(I) the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions; or

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or on the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets.

''(3) The term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule.

''(4) The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term does not include—

''(A) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(B) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(C) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

''(5) The term 'submission or publication date', except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

''(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

''(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.''.

(d) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rules subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

(e) GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(B) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(C) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

SA 2202. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FAIR ATM FEES.

(a) AMENDMENT TO THE ELECTRONIC FUND TRANSFER ACT.—Section 904(d)(3) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693b(d)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking the subparagraph heading and inserting the following:

''(A) FEE DISCLOSURE.—'';

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) REGULATION OF FEES.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall require—

''(i) any fee charged by an automated teller machine operator for a transaction conducted at that automated teller machine to bear a reasonable relation to the cost of processing the transaction, and in no case shall any such fee exceed $2.00; and

''(ii) any fee charged by a financial institution for a transaction conducted at an automated teller machine to bear a reasonable relation to the cost of processing the transaction by the financial institution, and in no case shall any such fee exceed $2.00.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date that is 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall promulgate regulations to carry out this section and the amendments made by this section.

SA 2203. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT ON ERRORS BY CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.

The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection shall submit to Congress a report on the errors made by consumer reporting agencies that damage the credit of consumers.

SA 2204. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REQUIREMENT OF BANKS THAT RECEIVE TAXPAYER-FUNDED BAILOUTS TO DISCHARGE STUDENT LOAN DEBT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any bank that receives a taxpayer-funded bailout similar to the relief provided under the Troubled Asset Relief Program established under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) shall discharge any student loan debt held by the bank.

SA 2205. Ms. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. VISITORIAL POWERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The sixth undesignated paragraph of section 5240 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 484) is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A)—

''(i) lawfully authorized State auditors and examiners may, at reasonable times and upon reasonable notice to a bank, review its records solely to ensure compliance with applicable State unclaimed property or escheat laws upon reasonable cause to believe that the bank has failed to comply with such laws;

''(ii) an attorney general (or other chief law enforcement officer) of a State may issue subpoenas or administer oversight and examination to national banks or officers of national banks based upon reasonable cause to believe that the national bank or an officer of a national bank has failed to comply with applicable State laws; and

''(iii) national banks shall submit to an attorney general (or other chief law enforcement officer) of a State aggregate loan data, types of products, any other information that the national bank determines is appropriate for each State.''.

(b) REPORT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report on how many enforcement actions could have been initiated after the financial crisis if State attorneys general had visitorial powers.

SEC. _____. REQUIREMENT OF BANKS THAT RECEIVE TAXPAYER-FUNDED BAILOUTS TO DISCHARGE STUDENT LOAN DEBT.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any bank that receives a taxpayer-funded bailout similar to the relief provided under the Troubled Asset Relief Program established under title I of the Emergency Economic Stabilization Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5211 et seq.) shall discharge any student loan debt held by the bank.

SA 2206. Mr. LEE (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPEAL OF FIDUCIARY RULE OF DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

The final rule of the Department of Labor entitled ''Definition of the Term 'Fiduciary'; Conflict of Interest Rule—Retirement Investment Advice'', published April 8, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 20946), shall have no force or effect.

SA 2207. Mr. UDALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 106, strike lines 1 through 7.

SA 2208. Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2152 proposed by Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER) to the amendment SA 2151 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. WARNER)) to the bill S. 2155, to promote economic growth, provide tailored regulatory relief, and enhance consumer protections, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FAIR AND ACCURATE INFORMATION REPORTING FOR CONSUMERS.

(a) FREE AND EASY ACCESS TO PERSONAL DATA.—Section 612(a)(1) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681j(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(D) ONLINE CONSUMER PORTAL.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subparagraph, each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall develop an online consumer portal that gives each consumer—

''(I) unlimited free access to—

''(aa) the consumer report of the consumer;

''(bb) the means by which the consumer may exercise the rights of the consumer under subparagraph (E) and section 604(e)(2)(B);

''(cc) the ability to initiate a dispute with the consumer reporting agency regarding the accuracy or completeness of any information in a report in accordance with section 623(a)(3);

''(dd) the ability to freeze a consumer report for free;

''(ee) if the consumer reporting agency offers a product to consumers to prevent access to the consumer report of the consumer for the purpose of preventing identity theft, a disclosure to the consumer regarding the differences between that product and a credit freeze; and

''(ff) information on who has accessed the consumer report of the consumer and for what permissible purpose the consumer report was furnished in accordance with section 604 and section 609; and

''(II) access to a free, annual credit score of the consumer in accordance with section 609(f)(7)(A).

''(ii) NO WAIVER.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) may not require a consumer to waive any legal or privacy rights to access—

''(I) a portal established under this subparagraph; or

''(II) any of the services described in subclauses (I) or (II) of clause (i) that are provided through a portal established under this subparagraph.

''(iii) NO ADVERTISING OR SOLICITATIONS.—A portal established under this subparagraph may not contain any advertising, marketing offers, or other solicitations.

''(E) OPT-OUT OPTIONS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—If a consumer reporting agency sells or shares consumer information in a manner that is not a consumer report, the consumer reporting agency shall provide each consumer with a clear, free method, through a website, by phone, or in writing, by which the consumer may elect not to have the information of the consumer so sold or shared.

''(ii) NO EXPIRATION.—An election made by a consumer under regulations promulgated under clause (i) shall expire on the date on which the consumer expressly revokes the election through a website, by phone, or in writing.''.

(b) ACCURACY IN CREDIT REPORTS.—Section 607 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15

U.S.C. 1681e) is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) ENSURING ACCURACY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever a consumer reporting agency prepares a consumer report it shall follow reasonable procedures to assure maximum possible accuracy of the information concerning the individual about whom the report relates.

''(2) MATCHING.—In assuring the maximum possible accuracy under paragraph (1), each consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall ensure that, when including information in the file of a consumer, the consumer reporting agency matches all 9 digits of the social security number of the consumer with the information that the consumer reporting agency is including in the file.

''(3) PERIODIC AUDITS.—Each consumer reporting agency shall perform periodic audits on a representative sample of consumer reports to check for accuracy.''.

(c) IMPROVED DISPUTE PROCESS FOR CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—

(1) RESPONSIBILITIES OF FURNISHERS OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES.—Section 623(a)(8)(F)(i)(II) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2(a)(8)(F)(i)(II)) is amended by inserting '', and does not include any new or additional information that would be relevant to a reinvestigation'' before the period at the end.

(2) FTC OBMUDSPERSON.—Section 611(a) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681i(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(9) FTC OMBUDSPERSON.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, the Federal Trade Commission shall create the position of ombudsperson for the purpose of resolving persistent errors that are not resolved in a timely manner by a consumer reporting agency or addressing violations of paragraph (5).

''(B) CIVIL FINES.—The ombudsperson described in subparagraph (A) may levy a civil fine of not more than $3,500 per violation on a consumer reporting agency if the consumer reporting agency repeatedly fails to resolve disputes in a timely manner or to comply with paragraph (5).''.

(3) PROVISION AND CONSIDERATION OF DOCUMENTATION PROVIDED BY CONSUMERS.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 611 (15 U.S.C. 1681i)—

(i) in subsection (a)—

(I) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

''(D) OBLIGATIONS OF CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIES RELATING TO REINVESTIGATIONS.—Commensurate with the volume and complexity of disputes about which a consumer reporting agency receives notice, or reasonably anticipates to receive notice, under this paragraph, each consumer reporting agency shall—

''(i) maintain sufficient personnel to conduct reinvestigations of those disputes; and

''(ii) provide training with respect to the personnel described in clause (i).'';

(II) in paragraph (2)—

(aa) in subparagraph (A), in the second sentence, by inserting '', including all documentation provided by the consumer'' after ''received from the consumer or reseller''; and

(bb) in subparagraph (B), by inserting '', including all documentation provided by the consumer,'' after ''from the consumer or the reseller'';

(III) in paragraph (4), by inserting '', including all documentation,'' after ''relevant information''; and

(IV) in paragraph (6)(B)—

(aa) by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) a description of the actions taken by the consumer reporting agency regarding the dispute;

''(iv) if applicable, contact information for any furnisher involved in responding to the dispute and a description of the role played by the furnisher in the reinvestigation process;

''(v) a description of the results of the dispute, including if applicable the specific modification or deletion of information that was made to the file of the consumer following the reinvestigation; and

''(vi) the options available to the consumer if the consumer is dissatisfied with the result, including—

''(I) submitting documents in support of the dispute;

''(II) adding a consumer statement to the file;

''(III) filing a dispute with the furnisher; and

''(IV) submitting a complaint against the consumer reporting agency or furnishers through the consumer complaint database of the Bureau, the ombudsperson of the Federal Trade Commission, or the State attorney general for the State in which the consumer resides.'';

(ii) in subsection (e), by adding at the end the following:

''(6) NOTIFICATION OF DELETION OF INFORMATION.—A consumer reporting agency described in section 603(p) shall communicate with other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p) to ensure that a dispute initiated with one consumer reporting agency is reflected in a file maintained by the other consumer reporting agencies described in section 603(p).'';

(iii) in subsection (f)(2)(B)(ii), by inserting '', including all documentation,'' after ''relevant information''; and

(B) in section 623 (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2)—

(i) in subsection (a)(8)(E), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) review and consider all relevant information, including all documentation, provided by the consumer with the notice;''; and

(ii) in subsection (b)(1), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) review and consider all relevant information, including all documentation, provided by the consumer reporting agency under section 611(a)(2);''.

(4) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 616 (15 U.S.C. 1681n)—

(i) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' and inserting ''(a) DAMAGES.—'';

(ii) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively; and

(iii) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

''(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party costs and reasonable attorney's fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.''; and

(B) in section 617 (15 U.S.C. 1681o)—

(i) in subsection (a), in the subsection heading, by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' and inserting ''(a) DAMAGES.—'';

(ii) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(iii) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) INJUNCTIVE RELIEF.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other remedy under this section, a court may award injunctive relief to require compliance with the requirements imposed under this title with respect to any consumer.

''(2) COSTS AND ATTORNEY'S FEES.—In the event of any successful action for injunctive relief under this subsection, a court may award to the prevailing party costs and reasonable attorney's fees (as determined by the court) incurred by the prevailing party during the action.''.

(5) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 615(h)(8) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)(8)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''section'' and inserting ''subsection''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''This section'' and inserting ''This subsection''.

(d) INCREASED TRANSPARENCY.—

(1) DISCLOSURES TO CONSUMERS.—Section 609 of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681g) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(3)(B)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(ii) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) the address and telephone number of the person; and

''(iii) the permissible purpose of the person for obtaining the consumer report, including the specific type of credit product that is extended, reviewed, or collected, as described in section 604(a)(3)(A).'';

(B) in subsection (f)—

(i) by amending paragraph (7)(A) to read as follows:

''(A) supply the consumer with a credit score through the portal established under section 612(a)(1)(D) or as requested by the consumer, as applicable, that—

''(i) is derived from a credit scoring model that is widely distributed to users by the consumer reporting agency for the purpose of any extension of credit or other transaction designated by the consumer who is requesting the credit score; or

''(ii) is widely distributed to lenders of common consumer loan products and predicts the future credit behavior of the consumer; and'';

(ii) in paragraph (8), by inserting '', except that a credit score shall be provided free of charge to the consumer if requested in connection with a free annual consumer report described in section 612(a)'' before the period at the end; and

(C) in subsection (g)(1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by striking ''subparagraph (D)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (C)'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking ''consistent with subparagraph (C)'';

(iii) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(iv) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) through (G) as subparagraphs (C) through (F), respectively.

(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) ADVERSE INFORMATION NOTIFICATION.—The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.) is amended—

(i) in section 612 (15 U.S.C. 1681j), by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) FREE DISCLOSURE AFTER NOTICE OF ADVERSE ACTION OR OFFER OF CREDIT ON MATERIALLY LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which a consumer reporting agency receives a notification under subsection (a)(2) or (h)(6) of section 615, or from a debt collection agency affiliated with the consumer reporting agency, the consumer reporting agency shall make,

without charge to the consumer, all disclosures required in accordance with the rules prescribed by the Bureau.''; and

(ii) in section 615(a) (15 U.S.C. 1681m(a))—

(I) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively;

(II) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report that was used in the decision to take the adverse action to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b);''; and

(III) in paragraph (5), as so redesignated—

(aa) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''of the consumer's right'';

(bb) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) that the consumer shall receive a copy of the consumer report with respect to the consumer, free of charge, from the consumer reporting agency that furnished the consumer report; and''; and

(cc) in subparagraph (B), by inserting ''of the right of the consumer'' before ''to dispute''.

(B) NOTIFICATION IN CASES OF LESS FAVORABLE TERMS.—Section 615(h) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681m(h)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (6)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)'';

(ii) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (6)'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)'';

(iii) in paragraph (5)(C), by striking ''may obtain'' and inserting ''shall receive'';

(iv) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (7), (8), and (9), respectively; and

(v) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following:

''(6) REPORTS PROVIDED TO CONSUMERS.—A person who uses a consumer report as described in paragraph (1) shall notify and direct the consumer reporting agency that provided the consumer report to provide the consumer with the disclosures described in section 612(b).''.

(C) NOTIFICATION OF SUBSEQUENT SUBMISSIONS OF NEGATIVE INFORMATION.—Section 623(a)(7)(A)(ii) of the Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s–2(a)(7)(A)(ii)) is amended by striking ''account, or customer'' and inserting ''or account''.

(3) REGULATORY REFORM.—Section 621 of the Federal Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681s) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h) CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCY REGISTRY.—

''(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF REGISTRY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Federal Trade Commission shall establish a publicly available registry of consumer reporting agencies that includes—

''(A) each consumer reporting agency that compiles and maintains files on consumers on a nationwide basis;

''(B) each nationwide specialty consumer reporting agency;

''(C) all other consumer reporting agencies that are not included under section 603(p) or 603(x); and

''(D) links to any relevant websites.

''(2) REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT.—Each consumer reporting agency shall register with a registry established by the Federal Trade Commission under this subsection in a timeframe established by the Commission.''.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of Jason Klitenic, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, dated March 12, 2018.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of Jason Klitenic, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), until the ODNI and the Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community (IC IG) provide fulsome responses to questions posed and documents requested concerning the Acting IC IG's efforts to terminate the Executive Director for Intelligence Community Whistleblowing and Source Protection and to hamstring the whistleblower protection program in the intelligence community.

To be clear, I have no concerns regarding Mr. Klitenic's capabilities or qualifications, and ultimately no intent of withholding my support for him as soon as this matter is resolved.

On November 29, 2017, I sent a letter to ODNI Director Daniel Coats and to Acting IC IG Wayne Stone noting disturbing allegations my office received that the IC IG was moving to terminate the Executive Director as part of an effort to significantly weaken the IC IG's role in ensuring consistent and effective whistleblower protections throughout the intelligence community. I requested that the offices seek to preserve all information contained in the Executive Director's office, much of which concerned highly sensitive protected disclosures made by individuals within the intelligence community, as well as allegations of wrongdoing against senior officials within the IC IG. I also sought all documents related to the IC IG's efforts to place the Executive Director on administrative leave and pursue personnel action against him. At that time, I informed the Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence that I would object to any unanimous consent request to confirm Mr. Klitenic until I received an answer to my letter. To date, I have received no response.

Since that time, the IC IG has indeed moved to terminate the Executive Director, and I have continued to receive reports that this process has been marked by significant irregularities, conflicts of interest, and ongoing efforts to ''stack the decks'' in hiring prior to the arrival of a new permanent, Senate-confirmed head of that office, who rightfully should have the authority to make such decisions. Moreover I have reason to believe these latest efforts may be a direct response to displeasure within the IC IG with Congress's exercise of its constitutional responsibility to provide fully informed advice and consent with respect to the President's nomination of a permanent IG. If true, such behavior is totally unacceptable. It is an affront not only to this institution but to the President's prerogative to choose nominees, with the advice and consent of the Senate, to lead the agencies under his authority. On the contrary, I would note that there is no independent authority anywhere in the Constitution granted to freewheeling bureaucrats.

Based on these ongoing concerns, Senator RON WYDEN joined me in sending a letter on March 6, 2018 to Director Coats following up on my original letter and seeking a stay of any personnel action against the Executive Director until Congress has an opportunity to review this action and fully understand exactly how the IC IG is, or is not, appropriately administering the IC whistleblowing program. Until we have answers, I will object to Mr. Klitenic's confirmation.

RETURN OF PAPERS REQUEST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate request the return of the papers with respect to H.R. 1207.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, March 13; 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 further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of S. 2155. Finally, I ask that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. and that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on amendment No. 2151, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:49 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 13, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

INTER-AMERICAN FOUNDATION

KIMBERLY BREIER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE INTER–AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 20, 2020, VICE ADOLFO A. FRANCO, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KIMBERLY BREIER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (WESTERN HEMISPHERE AFFAIRS), VICE ROBERTA S. JACOBSON, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

DALLAS L. CARLSON, OF NORTH DAKOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE PAUL WARD, RETIRED.

SONYA K. CHAVEZ, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE CONRAD ERNEST CANDELARIA, RESIGNED.

GREGORY ALLYN FOREST, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KELLY MCDADE NESBIT, RETIRED.

BRENDAN O. HEFFNER, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE KENNETH F. BOHAC, RESIGNED.

BRADLEY A. MAXWELL, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DON SLAZINIK, RETIRED.

THEODOR G. SHORT, OF MAINE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE NOEL CULVER MARCH, RESIGNING.

MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD

DENNIS DEAN KIRK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD FOR THE TERM OF SEVEN YEARS EXPIRING MARCH 1, 2023, VICE SUSAN TSUI GRUNDMANN, TERM EXPIRED.

DENNIS DEAN KIRK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD, VICE SUSAN TSUI GRUNDMANN.

ANDREW F. MAUNZ, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE MERIT SYSTEMS PROTECTION BOARD FOR THE TERM OF SEVEN YEARS EXPIRING MARCH 1, 2025, VICE MARK A. ROBBINS, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DANIEL T. LASICA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. MARK H. BERRY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SCOTT A. STEARNEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. GREGORY N. TODD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MARK J. MOURISKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN S. LEMMON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. EILEEN H. LAUBACHER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) RONALD C. COPLEY
REAR ADM. (LH) KATHLEEN M. CREIGHTON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRIAN K. COREY
REAR ADM. (LH) LORIN C. SELBY
REAR ADM. (LH) JOHNNY R. WOLFE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5149:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DARSE E. CRANDALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ANN H. DUFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. KRISTEN B. FABRY
CAPT. JOSEPH D. NOBLE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOHN W. KORKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN NANCY S. LACORE
CAPTAIN THEODORE P. LECLAIR
CAPTAIN ERIC C. RUTTENBERG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN HEIDI K. BERG
CAPTAIN MICHAEL A. BROOKES
CAPTAIN WILLIAM E. CHASE III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. JOHN J. ADAMETZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. THOMAS J. ANDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN JAMES A. AIKEN
CAPTAIN RICHARD J. CHEESEMAN, JR.
CAPTAIN CRAIG A. CLAPPERTON
CAPTAIN KEITH B. DAVIDS
CAPTAIN JOSEPH A. DIGUARDO, JR.
CAPTAIN LEONARD C. DOLLAGA
CAPTAIN CHRISTOPHER S. GRAY
CAPTAIN JOHN E. GUMBLETON
CAPTAIN JAMES A. KIRK
CAPTAIN TIMOTHY J. KOTT
CAPTAIN FREDRICK R. LUCHTMAN
CAPTAIN BRENDAN R. MCLANE
CAPTAIN SCOTT W. PAPPANO
CAPTAIN RYAN B. SCHOLL
CAPTAIN LANCE G. SCOTT
CAPTAIN PHILIP E. SOBECK
CAPTAIN JOHN D. SPENCER
CAPTAIN DOUGLAS C. VERISSIMO
CAPTAIN GEORGE M. WIKOFF

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN J. MORRIS
MIN S. RO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S. C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

CHRISTOPHER M. BELL
ADRIANA B. DEJULIO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

MIKAL L. STONER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

TODD M. YOSICK

IN THE NAVY

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

JEFFREY G. BENTSON

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 lieutenant commander

NANA K. APPIAWIAH
DALE F. BUTLER
YIBO CHEN
ASHTON H. GOLDMAN
JOSEPH P. HARMON
MOFEI LIU
VICTOR M. MARWIN
BRANDON E. PRIORESCHI
ASHLIE N. WHITE
JOHNATHAN F. WILLIAMS
AUSTIN R. YOUNGER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

TUYVAN NGUYEN, OF TEXAS

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MICHAEL CALVERT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
JOSEPH CARREIRO, OF VIRGINIA
SHAKIR FARSAKH, OF NEW YORK
PAUL FROST, OF TEXAS
JEFFREY GEIGER, OF VIRGINIA
TYLER HACKING, OF WISCONSIN
DANIEL LEW, OF CALIFORNIA
ARLENE MAYEDA, OF VIRGINIA
ALLISON MELLO, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL MIDDLETON, OF VERMONT
RANDOLPH MOORE, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL MUTH, OF FLORIDA
PAUL OLIVA, OF CALIFORNIA
CHARLES PHILLIPS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RHONDA SINKFIELD, OF GEORGIA
MICHELE SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
CATHERINE WERNER, OF PENNSYLVANIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KYLE BARNETT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ROBERT BAKER, OF VIRGINIA
KITISRI SUKHAPINDA, OF VIRGINIA
DAMIEN FELTON, OF WISCONSIN
ANDREW EDLEFSEN, OF NEVADA
LAURA HAMMEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JENNIFER WOODS, OF WASHINGTON
BRAEDEN YOUNG, OF VIRGINIA
PETER MEHRAVARI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARVIN SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

BENJAMIN THOMAS ARDELL, OF CALIFORNIA
JORGE MARCELO ARELLANO, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL R. BAILEY, OF WASHINGTON
ABINET Y. BELACHEW, OF VIRGINIA
AARON JAMES BENNETT, OF CALIFORNIA
TEFFERA M. BETRU, OF COLORADO
NINA R. BOWEN, OF ALASKA
WILLIAM EDWIN BRADLEY, OF MINNESOTA
SOPHIA BREWER, OF OKLAHOMA
AMBER B. BROOKS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREA P. CAPELLAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
SANDRO CARRILLO, OF TEXAS
MELISSA RICKE CHIPILI, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MATT CURTIS, OF CALIFORNIA
MARY ELIZABETH DE BOER, OF OHIO
KEVIN ZACHARY DEAN, OF NEW YORK
KRISTA A. DESGRANGES ELKHAMRI, OF FLORIDA
NIKHIL M. DIVECHA, OF MARYLAND
JAIME L. DOMINGUEZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARY O. EDWARDS, OF FLORIDA
MELANIE LOVE EDWARDS, OF OREGON
KEISHA L. EFFIOM, OF MARYLAND
ALEI H. ELDORRY, OF VIRGINIA
KATRINA ERDAHL, OF VIRGINIA
ARMANDO ESPINOSA, OF MARYLAND
JOHN ROBERT EZELL, OF CALIFORNIA
SARA KATHERINE FARNSWORTH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
PAUL FIGUEROA, OF NEW MEXICO
RACHEL ELIZABETH GOLDSTEIN, OF CALIFORNIA
RAYMOND E. GRANT, OF VIRGINIA
AMINA HALIDOU GUEYE, OF TEXAS
DEBRA L. GUEYE, OF VIRGINIA
SHARON M. GULICK, OF MARYLAND
CHERRY M. GUMAPAS, OF WASHINGTON
BETHANY ANN HABERER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREW T. HABLE, OF ILLINOIS
AMY MELISSA HAMELIN, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH JEAN HARRISON, OF MARYLAND
MARK ADAM HENDERSON, OF FLORIDA
DANIEL RUSSELL HICKS, OF VIRGINIA
CHUNG WEI HUANG, OF MISSOURI
BENJAMIN H. ISQUITH, OF WASHINGTON
DEBBIE PATRICE JACKSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
GARY C. JAHN, OF VIRGINIA
RAYMUND JOHN JOHANSEN, OF NEVADA
ADAM CHRISTOPHER JUNG, OF OREGON
DAVID F. KAUPER, OF CALIFORNIA
STEFANIE K. KENDALL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MICHELLE S. KIM, OF CALIFORNIA
RICHARD E. KIMBALL, OF VIRGINIA
SAMUEL E. KRAEGEL, OF FLORIDA
SINU KURIAN, OF NEW YORK
ALEXANDER C. LANE, OF CALIFORNIA
JOSEPH LEINWEBER, OF ILLINOIS
ANDREW ALAN LUCAS, OF COLORADO
KIMBERLY LYNN LUDWIG, OF NEVADA
ERIK ANDRIS MARKOVS, OF MARYLAND
ROBIN MORRISON MARTZ, OF FLORIDA
SAIT MBOOB, OF TENNESSEE
MICHAEL A. MCBROOM, OF MICHIGAN
EDITH I. MCCLINTOCK, OF WASHINGTON
DONALD MCCUBBIN, OF MARYLAND
ROBERT CALVIN MCKENNEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
AMY ELIZABETH MCQUADE, OF TEXAS
PATRICIA JEPTOO MENGECH, OF TEXAS
EVAN MEYER, OF NEW YORK
ERIN MARIE MONE-MARQUEZ, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DANIEL MORRIS, OF NEW YORK
ADAM WESLEY NORIKANE, OF WASHINGTON
JENELLE M. NORIN, OF VIRGINIA
MAURICE O. OGUTU, OF ILLINOIS
RANDALL B. OLSON, OF MINNESOTA
JULIE R. OTA, OF OREGON
ROBERT EDWARD PIERCE, OF CALIFORNIA
CONOR JAMES POLITZ, OF PENNSYLVANIA
REBECCA MOANIKEALA ROBINSON, OF ARIZONA
PATRICK EDWARD ROBISON, OF FLORIDA
ALEXIS ROITER, OF MARYLAND
ZAKI MOHAMAD SAAD, OF VIRGINIA
NATHAN N. SAGE, OF CONNECTICUT
CHRISTOPHER M. SCHAAN, OF NEVADA
BENJAMIN JEFFREY SCHAPIRO, OF FLORIDA
JOSEPH ALAN SCHEIBEL, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHEN MATTHEW SCOTT, OF VIRGINIA
ROBIN SHARMA, OF FLORIDA
RITU W SINGH, OF TEXAS
JEFFREY M. SKARIN, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK DELINDE SMITH, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL ANTHONY SMITH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JESSIE SNAZA, OF NEVADA
ADAM P. STEFAN, OF TENNESSEE
AMY L. M. STENOIEN, OF MINNESOTA
ANDREA STONE, OF FLORIDA
ETHAN NATHANIEL TAKAHASHI, OF TEXAS
YASMEEN T. THOMASON, OF MARYLAND
JEFFREY D. TILTON, OF NEVADA
G. JESSICA TORRENS-SPENCE, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW K. UDZIELA, OF NORTH CAROLINA
ERUMIS MIGUEL URENA, OF UTAH
LUIS VELAZQUEZ, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTINE VEVERKA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHERYL YVETTE VOISARD, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ANN WALLACE, OF CALIFORNIA
STACY L. WALLICK, OF LOUISIANA
ADAM JOSEPH WALSH, OF FLORIDA
KATHLEEN K. WEBB, OF MARYLAND
ANI H. ZAMGOCHIAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CLAUDE J. ZULLO, OF MARYLAND
ALEXANDER ZVINAKIS, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ABIGAIL MARIE NGUEMA, OF VIRGINIA