United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, APRIL 4, 2019 No. 59

Senate

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

O Lord and Ruler, Your Name is great, and we see Your glory in the Heavens. We are grateful for this Nation and for the deliberative process of lawmaking, with its challenges and opportunities. As our Senators debate the issues that are vital to our freedom, give them wisdom, integrity, and courage. Lord, let them be fully persuaded in their minds about the course that will best bless America. Deliver them from a reluctance to respect honest differences as they remember their ultimate accountability to You. Bless and keep them now and always.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The Senate majority leader is recognized.

S. RES. 50

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate took an important step to restore sense and order to the way we approach the Executive Calendar. It is one of this body's most important responsibilities. Yet it has been hampered recently by a campaign of systematic and comprehensive obstruction that stands literally without precedent in American history.

I won't restate each part of our debate from the floor yesterday, but the objective facts of this situation are unambiguous. For the past 2 years, we have witnessed the accelerated erosion of the norms by which this body has historically considered Presidential nominations. We have seen a disappointing series of records broken in the process, such as 128 cloture votes on nominations in this President's first 2 years—more than 5 times as many as in the same period of every administration since Jimmy Carter, combined. Forty-two executive branch positions took cloture votes for the first time ever.

This has been a new level of paralysis, surrounding even the most qualified and least controversial nominees. In a way, it has been the natural outgrowth of the erosion on nominations that began back in 2003 when our current Democratic leader helped spur his side of the aisle to walk away from longstanding institutional norms and declare the Executive Calendar open season for regular, chronic filibuster tactics and forced cloture votes. That is when this relatively new mess began in earnest.

In 2013, in a truly bipartisan vote, a number of Republicans, including me, joined with Democrats to implement new expedited procedures for lower tier nominees. We put them in place right at the beginning of President Obama's second term, even as we on this side were still licking our wounds from the previous November's election result.

This week, our Democratic colleagues had the chance to reciprocate. They had the opportunity to do the parallel thing, exactly the same thing, and vote to limit undue Senate delays for this Republican administration the same way we Republicans did for President Obama's administration. Oh, but they weren't interested.

These days, I am sorry to say, the other side of the aisle seems to be dominated by pure partisanship over absolutely everything else. Remember, it wasn't long ago that this current behavior would have appeared unimaginable. Just a few decades ago, the idea of routinely forcing 60-vote thresholds and extra delays on nominations was firmly in third-rail territory. Well, a lot has happened since then, but I hope my colleagues share my belief that the Senate's traditions and norms are its greatest assets. In that respect, yesterday was a very good day for this body as an institution.

The Senate has historically been defined by two traditions. One has preserved the power of the minority in considering legislation—to pump the brakes or force a second look. That includes the legislative filibuster, which I know many of us on both sides are 100 percent committed to preserving. In my view and in the view of many, it is inseparable from the way this body was designed. It is what keeps the Senate from swinging wildly back and forth between each party's entire agenda.

I don't think my Democratic colleagues who are running for President and publicly toying with undermining the legislative filibuster would be too keen to see Republicans enact our entire, full-tilt conservative agenda with just 51 votes, because some day the shoe will be on the other foot. The shoe, in fact, always at some point ends up on the other foot.

That is one tradition.

The second tradition, concerning nominations, has always been different. For decades and decades, it allowed for a reasonable process for the vast majority of Presidents' nominees. Yesterday, even though Democrats walked away and Republicans had to act alone, we took a big step toward restoring that second part of Senate tradition.

I am sure yesterday's progress has not resolved every sore spot. I feel certain that we have not seen the last of our Democratic colleagues' addiction

to endlessly relitigating the 2016 elections instead of moving forward. But with yesterday's action, the Senate has begun to move past this particularly shameful new chapter. We have turned the page on the kind of systematic obstruction and purely partisan delays that were completely foreign to this Chamber a few years ago but have since become a daily routine. Now more progress can take place.

Yesterday, after two unopposed committee votes and more than a year and a half after Jeffrey Kessler was named as President Trump's choice for Assistant Secretary of Commerce, his nomination was subjected to a cloture vote, 95 to 3. Because of our new procedures, he was confirmed by voice vote just 2 hours later. Then we voted to end debate on the nomination of Roy Altman to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Florida—another uncontroversial, bipartisan nominee. Today we will confirm him as well. Then we will vote to end debate on the nomination of Mark Calabria to direct the Federal Housing Finance Agency, and then we will vote to confirm him too.

Nominees will now be moving at a more reasonable pace, and important jobs are finally being filled. Already there is real progress thanks to yesterday's pivot back to the Senate's historic tradition. We will keep working to clear the backlog of talented individuals who are still waiting patiently behind them.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mark Anthony Calabria, of Virginia, to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency for a term of five years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAPO. Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to speak in support of the nomination of Mark Calabria to be Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, FHFA, for a 5-year term.

For over a decade, the FHFA has served as the regulator and watchdog of the government-sponsored enterprises Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Federal Home Loan Bank System. Since 2008, when Fannie and Freddie were placed in conservatorship during the financial crisis, the FHFA has also served as conservator of these mortgage giants, charged with preserving and conserving their assets and helping to return them to stable financial footing.

As long as Fannie and Freddie remain in conservatorship, the FHFA Director will play an integral role in setting the strategic direction, the guardrails, and the day-to-day management of these companies, which have a combined $5 trillion in assets.

It is critically important for the Senate to quickly confirm a qualified, experienced individual to this important post. Fortunately, Mark Calabria meets these requirements.

Dr. Calabria is a leading expert on housing and mortgage finance and a respected Ph.D. economist. He has almost 30 years of experience interacting with the housing market from nearly every perspective—academia, industry, trade associations, think tanks, as a congressional staffer, and as a regulator.

He has dedicated the majority of his career to public service, including as Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, nearly a decade as a senior professional staff member on the Senate Banking Committee, and now as Chief Economist to Vice President MIKE PENCE. He has also worked for the National Association of Realtors, the National Association of Home Builders, the Farm Credit Council, the Harvard University Joint Center for Housing Studies, and recently at the CATO Institute as director of financial regulation studies.

Over the course of his public service career, Dr. Calabria has worked to champion market reforms that benefit consumers and enhance the safety and soundness of our housing finance system. He also has a long history of working across the aisle to deliver meaningful and lasting reforms.

As an official at HUD, Dr. Calabria oversaw HUD's regulation of the mortgage market, primarily under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, or RESPA.

During his time as a Senate staffer, he worked on over 20 pieces of legislation that became law, mostly in the areas of housing and mortgage finance.

In 2009, he worked on the Homeless Emergency Assistance and Rapid Transition to Housing Act, or the HEARTH Act, which strengthened our Nation's homelessness assistance programs.

Perhaps most notably, he played a key role in drafting the Housing and Economic Recovery Act of 2008, or HERA, which established the FHFA and created the position to which he is now nominated. From his work on HERA, Dr. Calabria has a keen understanding of the congressional intent behind the law and therefore also a respect for FHFA's responsibilities and boundaries as a regulator.

During his hearing a few weeks ago, Dr. Calabria made a commitment to carrying out the clear intent of Congress in protecting taxpayers while also underscoring the importance of maintaining access to affordable housing. Before considering any action, Dr. Calabria has said he will first ask: What does the statute say?

He is also committed to working with me and other Members of this body to reach a comprehensive solution on ending the conservatorship of Fannie and Freddie once and for all. He agrees with me and many others that the action on housing finance reform that is needed today is the prerogative of Congress and that after over a decade of conservatorship, it is long overdue.

As Fannie and Freddie continue to dwell in government control, it appears that the old, failed status quo is slowly beginning to take hold again, with the government in some ways expanding its reach even further, entering new markets where it has never been before.

This status quo is not a viable option, and finding a comprehensive solution remains a top priority for me and the Banking Committee. The FHFA can also play an important role in helping us to move toward a more sustainable housing finance system, facilitated by an engaged and strongly capitalized private sector.

If confirmed, I look forward to working with Dr. Calabria on these and other efforts. Dr. Calabria's nomination has been met with substantial support from the housing industry. Many key stakeholders have written to the Banking Committee to emphasize the experience and trusted perspective that Dr. Calabria will bring to the Agency.

The National Association of Home Builders wrote:

> Throughout his long career, Mark has proven himself to be a keen expert in housing finance policy, adding significant value to key policy discussions both on and off Capitol Hill. NAHB has full confidence that Mark is an excellent choice to be Director of the FHFA. We believe he will bring his usual high-level policy experience, outstanding communication skills, and consummate professionalism to this important regulatory Agency at a critical time for the housing finance industry.

The National Association of Realtors added:

> Dr. Calabria's decades of experience in housing and finance policy have prepared him to implement the FHFA's mission. It has also helped him to understand the need for enhanced transparency at the FHFA and a methodical approach in the development and enforcement of its policies.

The Mortgage Bankers Association noted:

> Dr. Calabria will utilize his significant experience in government and knowledge of both the single and multifamily business lines within the secondary mortgage market to protect taxpayers through an appropriate mix of risk-sharing and private capital, work

to maintain deep, stable, and liquid mortgage markets, and ensure sustainable access to affordable housing for all Americans.

The Manufactured Housing Institute added:

Without question, Dr. Calabria is well-qualified to lead the effort to strengthen the Nation's housing finance system and ensure access to safe, affordable homeownership alternatives.

It is important to have a Senate-confirmed leader at the FHFA, overseeing our mortgage markets and making sure taxpayers are well protected from another financial crisis.

Dr. Calabria is highly qualified, highly experienced, and well prepared for this new role. I support Dr. Calabria and urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on his nomination.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, under President Obama, our economy languished. Recovery from the recession was historically slow and economic growth for his last year in office was an anemic 1.6 percent. Of course, all of that meant reduced economic prospects for American families. Wages were stagnant, and jobs and opportunities were often few and far between. Republicans knew that if we wanted to improve life for American families, we needed to get our economy going again.

As soon as we took office in 2017, we got right to work. We knew the biggest thing we had to do was overhaul our outdated Tax Code, which was acting as a major drag on economic growth. The Tax Code has a huge effect on economic growth and the kinds of jobs, wages, and opportunities available to American workers.

A small business owner struggling to afford a heavy tax bill is unlikely to have the money to hire a new worker or expand her business. A larger business is going to find it hard to create jobs or improve benefits for employees if it is struggling to stay competitive against foreign businesses paying much less in taxes.

Prior to the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, our Tax Code was not helping American workers. It was taking too much money from Americans' paychecks. It was making it difficult for businesses to grow and create jobs. So we passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to put more money in Americans' pockets, to spur economic growth, and expand opportunities for American workers. We cut tax rates for American families, doubled the child tax credit, and nearly doubled the standard deduction.

We lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small- and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We lowered our Nation's massive corporate tax rate, which up until January 1 of last year was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world.

We expanded business owners' ability to recover the cost of investments that they make in their businesses, which frees up cash that they can reinvest in their operations and in their workers, and we brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century so American businesses are not operating at a competitive disadvantage next to their foreign counterparts.

I am proud to report that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is doing exactly what it was supposed to do. It is growing our economy. It is creating jobs, and it is expanding benefits and opportunities for American workers. Economic growth from the fourth quarter of 2017 to the fourth quarter of 2018 was a strong 3 percent. The unemployment rate dropped to 3.8 percent in February, the 12th straight month that unemployment has been at or below 4 percent. That is the longest streak in nearly 50 years.

The Department of Labor reports that the number of job openings has exceeded the number of job seekers for 11 straight months. The economy has added more than 5.3 million jobs since President Trump was elected. Job growth has averaged 209,000 jobs a month over the past 12 months, exceeding the 2017 average by 30,000 jobs a month.

Wage growth has accelerated. Wages are growing at a rate of 3.4 percent, the seventh straight month in which wages have grown at a rate of 3 percent or greater. Median household income is at an alltime high. Business investment is up, which means more jobs and opportunities for American workers. U.S. manufacturing is booming; small business hiring recently hit a record high; and the list goes on.

So what is the Democrats' response to tax reform success—continue or expand the policies that have made life better for American families? Well, the answer is no. Instead, Democrats are proposing policies that would result in massive tax hikes on just about every American.

Consider Democrats' Medicare for All proposal, which would strip Americans of their private health insurance. The pricetag for this program is estimated at $32 trillion over 10 years. To put that number in perspective, the entire Federal budget for 2019 is less than $5 trillion. Democrats are talking about increasing Federal spending by more than 70 percent. One Medicare expert estimates that doubling the amount of individual and corporate income tax collected in this country would not be enough to cover the cost of Medicare for All. I don't know about my Democratic colleagues, but I don't know too many working families who would be able to afford to have their tax bill double.

While $32 trillion is an insane pricetag, it is dwarfed by the pricetag for Democrat's comprehensive, socialist fantasy, the Green New Deal. An initial estimate suggests that the Green New Deal would cost $93 trillion over 10 years—$93 trillion. That is more money than the 2017 gross domestic product for the entire world. It is more money than the U.S. government has spent in its entire history.

Democrats like to talk about taxing the rich to pay for various initiatives, but the fact is, there aren't enough rich people in America to even come close to paying for the Green New Deal, even if you taxed every one of these people at a rate of 100 percent.

Democrats' socialist fantasies would be paid for on the backs of working families. Families would face huge tax hikes that would permanently lower their standard of living, but that is not all. Families would also see a steep decline in the jobs and opportunities available to them. Tax reform has enabled and encouraged businesses to invest in and grow, which is resulting in better wages and benefits and increased opportunities for American workers. None of the growth we are seeing from businesses would last under the tax hikes businesses would face to pay for Democrats' socialist fantasies. Instead of thinking about expanding, companies would be thinking about how they could shrink their workforces or move jobs and investments overseas. Instead of raising wages or improving benefits, companies would be avoiding wage hikes and looking to trim their benefit packages.

Under Democrats' socialist fantasies, American families would face a double economic blow: huge tax hikes, fewer jobs, lower wages, and reduced economic opportunity.

There is no one in Congress who doesn't want to make life better for American families. Socialism and the massive tax hikes it would bring is not the answer. Socialism would reduce opportunities for Americans, not expand them; it would decrease Americans' standard of living, not improve it; and it would rob Americans of their choices and many of their freedoms.

Republicans will continue to fight to expand economic opportunity for American families, and we will do everything we can to ensure that hard-working Americans never have to live under the miserable reality of Democrats' socialist fantasies.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 268

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, rather than spend time yesterday on a terribly destructive rules change, Leader MCCONNELL could have focused the Senate on an urgent matter that this Chamber has failed to act on: disaster relief.

In a few moments, Senator LEAHY and I will ask unanimous consent to have a vote on a new version of the emergency disaster relief that couldn't get through the Senate earlier this week. Our new amendment offers this Chamber a path forward from this week's impasse. It is a plan that meets everyone's needs. It doesn't say only aid this or only aid that; it recognizes

all American citizens deserve to be helped when disaster strikes.

The amendment Senator LEAHY and I will offer provides $16.7 billion in relief for Americans struck by natural disasters last year and in the last 2 years. It includes $2.5 billion in new funding—funding that the bill from the Republican side that failed, offered by Senators Shelby and Perdue, did not have—$2.5 billion in new funding for the recent flooding in Iowa, Nebraska, and Missouri. We all agree these communities need assistance now. This amendment also crucially includes aid for our fellow citizens in Puerto Rico and other territories. It doesn't say to pick one or to pick the other. It says to do both.

All of us in this Chamber should agree that we must do something now to help all Americans in need. This amendment offers our Republican friends—those who have said we need aid in the Middle West—the opportunity to do just that. So, if this Chamber wants to help families in Nebraska, in Iowa, in Missouri and if we want to help the families of Texas and of Florida, this amendment is the path forward. It is the key to moving forward. This is the solution that has the ability to pass the House. This is the option that has enough support to reach the President's desk. The Speaker of the House has said the original Republican bill wouldn't even have been put on the floor. This bill will.

Now, some will say and, I know, my dear friend from Alabama—and he is my good friend—will say that the President will not sign this. Well, I have something else to say. If my colleagues on the other side pass this measure, the President will dare not veto it. That is my prediction. We all know the President has huffed and puffed about vetoing bills in the past. He has said he would veto ''this,'' and he has said he would veto ''that.'' Yet, in most instances, when the Republicans in the Senate have stood up, he has caved. In this case in particular, he will not want to veto legislation that helps Nebraska and Iowa and Missouri and Texas and Florida. So let's not play this game.

We all know what happened. There was a bipartisan agreement. President Trump went to the Republican lunch and said: No aid for Puerto Rico. That is why we are in this mess, but we can change that. It is time to call the President's bluff. Elections have consequences. There is a Democratic House. The time has come for the Republicans of this Chamber and for the Republicans in the House to have a frank conversation with the President about what can and cannot pass the Congress.

If the President cares about farmers in Iowa and Texas and Missouri and all American citizens who have been affected by natural disasters, he will not veto this bill. We know that. The measure we are presenting today isn't some solution that has been cooked up out of left field; it is a simple proposal. We need disaster relief for all Americans, plain and simple.

Senators LEAHY and SHELBY worked in good faith earlier this year, as they always do, and I appreciate the great relationship our Appropriations Committee chair and ranking member—vice chair—have. It would have worked had the President not gone to that lunch. Who knows why, where, or when he pounded the table and said: No aid to Puerto Rico. He said that, OK? The only problem is when we are at the brink of a compromise, all too often, President Trump torpedoes things, and then the Republicans act powerless. They don't act.

If Leader MCCONNELL and the Senate Republicans will not support this measure—a measure that notes the needs of all affected Americans—then what is their plan that can pass the House and pass the Senate and go to the President's desk?

If this measure just had aid to Puerto Rico and not to the Middle West, the President might veto it, but he is not going to veto a bill that gives aid to the Middle West nor should he.

So, if an ''all of the above'' solution will not work, what on Earth will?

So far, the answer from this Chamber on the other side seems to be nothing—none of the above. That doesn't make sense. This is an emergency. People are suffering. People can't get back into their homes. Small businesses need help starting up again. This is not the time to duck, to look for cover, to know when the President has done something sort of wrongly and seemingly on a whim to just bow to what he says. We should agree on the need to do something now to help communities that are recovering from natural disasters. Our amendment offers the Republicans the opportunity to do just that.

Nobody—no Member of this body—should pick and choose which American citizens get help in times of crises. It is a profound shame that my colleagues on the other side, thus far, have allowed the President to derail this process and have gone along with appeasing him. I say the power of this Chamber is greater than they realize. If we vote on this package and if it passes the Senate and if it passes the House and reaches the President's desk, the President will sign it. He will not follow through on a veto threat even if he knows that doing so will be a profound betrayal of his promise to look after the well-being of all Americans.

I urge the Senators to support our amendment today that gives aid to the Middle West, to the South—those from Florida to Texas—and to the people of Puerto Rico.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that as in legislative session, the Senate resume consideration of H.R. 268; that all pending amendments be withdrawn; that Leahy amendment No. 246 be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, these unanimous consent requests are political and, I believe, are not productive at the moment. We know that for two reasons.

First, earlier this week, my Democratic colleagues rejected a disaster assistance package that contained assistance for the Midwest. Instead, they supported a different version that did nothing for folks in Iowa, in Nebraska, and in other States who have been the victims of catastrophic flooding. In fact, if the Democrats had gotten their way the other night, their bill would have gone straight to the President's desk.

That brings me to the second reason these procedural requests are empty gestures. My Democratic colleagues know that the measure they raise today does not have the President's support, not unlike the bill they supported earlier this week. Those measures cannot secure the President's signature.

My Democratic colleagues have regrouped today and have decided to provide assistance to the folks in the Midwest—the same folks they left stranded earlier in the week. Yet they are willing to help the Midwest only if Puerto Rico gets billions more in Federal assistance—billions more they cannot justify right now.

Look, we all want to help the people of Puerto Rico, and I know the Presiding Officer has been deeply involved in this. Congress, in its recognition of those needs, has already committed significant resources to the island. In fact, Puerto Rico is eligible for more than $90 billion in funding from the previous supplemental.

For example, FEMA estimates that Puerto Rico will be eligible to receive more than $60 billion from the Disaster Relief Fund as a result of the 2017 storms; yet Puerto Rico has only spent approximately $10 billion of this amount thus far.

Another example is Congress has approved $20 billion in Community Development Block Grant—or CDBG—funding for Puerto Rico—$20 billion.

In February 2018, the Department of Housing and Urban Development allocated $1.5 billion of this amount to the island; yet more than a year later, it has spent only $42,000 out of the $1.5 billion allocation. Still, HUD allocated another $8.2 billion just over a month ago. In addition, Puerto Rico has been granted an enormous amount of flexibility to expend these resources.

FEMA used its administrative authority to extend the 100-percent Federal cost share for emergency work in Puerto Rico longer than it has for any

other disaster in more than 10 years, and not once has FEMA denied Puerto Rico access to funding on the basis of its ability to provide its own share of the costs when required. More importantly, even if cost share were an issue, which I don't believe it is, Puerto Rico could use its ample CDBG funding to meet any cost share requirement.

However, it does not appear that access to resources for cost share is actually an issue in Puerto Rico. According to the Treasury Department, Puerto Rico has billions of dollars in unrestricted cash on hand. In fact, the Treasury Department reports it has $5.6 billion in unrestricted cash, to be precise. What is more, the land of Puerto Rico continues to collect tens—if not hundreds—of millions of dollars a month because revenues are exceeding costs on the island, which only adds to that $5.6 billion balance.

Despite all of these resources, we have agreed that the Government of Puerto Rico needs additional funding for nutrition assistance. My Democratic colleagues have been in the forefront. The question is, Why? It is that this money is actually being spent. In fact, it is running out. So not only did my Democratic colleagues leave folks in the Midwest behind when they rejected the Shelby amendment earlier this week, but they also passed up an opportunity to help the people of Puerto Rico immediately.

Where do we go from here?

I think we need to find areas of agreement, which we have before in my working with Senator LEAHY, Senator SCHUMER, and Senator MCCONNELL. I am pleased that my Democratic colleagues have discovered a newfound concern for the people in the Midwest. We want to stay on that too. It is promising that we not only agree on that but also that we should provide funding for nutrition assistance for the people of Puerto Rico now. Yet, when it comes to additional funding beyond nutrition assistance for Puerto Rico, I believe that our constituents—the American taxpayers—deserve a detailed explanation of exactly why existing funding is insufficient and why the resources that we have provided have not been spent.

How do we know Puerto Rico needs more when it hasn't come close to spending what we have already provided it? Communities, meanwhile, that experienced disasters in 2018 are truly suffering because Congress has provided them with nothing.

Unless my Democratic colleagues can demonstrate this urgency, I believe they should stop holding hostage those who are suffering in the Midwest and those who have been impacted by disasters all over the United States. These people are in urgent need of funding so they can begin the rebuilding process, and many of them have been waiting for months and months for relief.

I hope we can come together and work this out in a deliberate and fact-based manner. Until then, I will continue to object to these haphazard unanimous consent requests that will get us nowhere.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 6 minutes regarding the Schumer-Leahy amendment. I realize this will put off the time slightly for the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am sorry that the Republicans objected to the earlier legislation we brought up, which would have helped the Midwest. It had money in it. Of course, we are not, by any means, asking for billions more for Puerto Rico in this amendment. In total, this amendment would add $3.2 billion, of which only $462 million is for Puerto Rico. The rest is for the Midwest floods, Alabama tornado, Florida, California, Georgia and other states.

I think it is unfortunate we have reached an impasse on the emergency disaster supplemental appropriations bill.

For months, I urged Senate Republican leadership to take up and pass H.R. 268. For nearly 3 months, it wouldn't. During those 3 months, American communities suffered, and new disasters struck the Midwest and the Southeast. The new criticism from the Republican leadership was, with the Democrats' pushing for more comprehensive aid to Puerto Rico in H.R. 268, that they must not care about the American communities that have been affected by more recent disasters.

But I would remind the Chamber that it was the Republican leadership that rejected my amendment to H.R. 268 that would have accommodated all of these other communities.

I would also remind the Chamber that the Trump administration has not asked for one dime for Hurricanes Michael and Florence, the Alabama tornadoes, or the Midwest flooding. To the Trump administration, it is as though they never happened.

I have always stood with victims of disaster around this country. When my own State of Vermont was devastated by Tropical Storm Irene, Members of this body came to me, not as Republicans or Democrats but as concerned American citizens looking to help, just as I always have, whatever State it might be. Red State, blue State, or purple State, I have always voted to support them, and today this Vermonter is here to stand with all the American communities affected by recent natural disasters.

I have not given up on finding a path forward. Today Leader SCHUMER and I offered a substitute that would provide $2.5 billion in new funding to address the needs of communities affected by the 2019 disasters, such as flooding in the Midwest and tornadoes in Alabama. It would also accommodate the needs of the American citizens—remember that they are Americans—in Puerto Rico and other Territories by including increased funding for the community development block grant and grants to help rebuild damaged water systems. It also includes Medicaid funding for the Northern Mariana Islands and cost match waivers for the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Finally, it mandates that HUD speed up the release of billions in previously appropriated CDBG funding which the Trump administration has unnecessarily withheld from disaster-stricken communities in Puerto Rico, in Texas, in Louisiana, in the U.S. Virgin Islands, in Florida, in South Carolina, in North Carolina, in West Virginia, in California, in Missouri, and in Georgia. We want to get help to all of those States.

I am disappointed that once again Senate Republicans have objected to this critical assistance. We are the United States of America. We are all Americans. We cannot pick and choose which American citizens to help in times of crisis.

Frankly, I was offended when the White House referred to Puerto Rico as ''that country'' that ''only takes from the U.S.A.'' I would remind the White House to look at a history book. Puerto Rico is part of the U.S.A. These are our fellow American citizens. We in the Senate must be better than that. We must stand with all American citizens in times of crisis.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Altman nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

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

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 62 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Alexander	Blunt	Burr
Barrasso	Boozman	Capito
Blackburn	Braun	Cardin

Cassidy	Hoeven	Roberts
Collins	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cornyn	Inhofe	Rosen
Cortez Masto	Isakson	Rounds
Cotton	Johnson	Rubio
Cramer	Jones	Sasse
Crapo	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Daines	Lankford	Shaheen
Duckworth	Lee	Shelby
Enzi	Manchin	Sinema
Ernst	McConnell	Sullivan
Feinstein	McSally	Tester
Fischer	Moran	Thune
Gardner	Murkowski	Tillis
Graham	Murphy	Toomey
Grassley	Perdue	Warner
Hassan	Portman	Wicker
Hawley	Risch	Young

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hirono	Sanders
Blumenthal	King	Schatz
Booker	Klobuchar	Schumer
Brown	Leahy	Smith
Cantwell	Markey	Stabenow
Carper	Menendez	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Van Hollen
Coons	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Paul	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

The nomination was confirmed.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Madam President.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Madam President.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 63 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—1

Harris

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

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Tennessee.

CHINA

Mr. ALEXANDER. Thank you, Madam President.

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

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

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

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

President Xi, the President of China, deserves the thanks of the American people for making this decision because our Drug Enforcement Agency is convinced that this decision by China and its senior officials will save thousands of American lives.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HEALTHCARE

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

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

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

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

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

That is why Senator MURRAY, the lead Democrat on the Senate's Health Committee, and I are working with Senator GRASSLEY and Senator WYDEN, the senior leaders on the Senate Finance Committee, which shares jurisdiction over healthcare. We are working together on developing specific, bipartisan steps to help deal with the startling fact—which has come by way of experts who come before our Health Committee—that up to half of what Americans spend on healthcare is unnecessary. That is according to Dr. Brent James of the National Academies in testimony before our committee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hear from doctors about administrative burden. Dr. Lee Gross, a Florida direct primary care doctor, testified at one of our hearings that insurance and government regulations were making primary care too expensive. Dr. Gross founded one of the first direct primary care practices. This is where a patient might pay $60 a month for an adult, $25 for the first child, $10 for each child after, and receive all their primary care—strep tests, vaccines, minor surgical procedures, and more. He calls it ''NetFlix for healthcare. After you pay your membership, you don't have to pay for each episode of care.''

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

One suggestion we have heard is to change Internal Revenue Service rules that block Americans from using their health savings accounts to pay for the monthly direct primary care fee.

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

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

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

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

Then there is surprise billing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

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

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

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

MUELLER REPORT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H. CON. RES. 24

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

NATO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The alliance has expanded from an original 12 to now 29 member nations. These allies are our friends in times of peace, they are our partners in times of turmoil, and they are our defenders in times of war.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have made real progress on burden sharing, and today we celebrate 70 years of NATO achievements. NATO has helped bring about the democratic and economic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe. NATO has enabled European and Canadian soldiers to fight alongside U.S. forces on the frontlines of the war on terror. NATO supported U.S. sanctions against Russia and insisted on Russia's compliance with international law. Without a doubt, NATO is the most successful security alliance in our Nation's history.

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

NOMINATION OF MARK ANTHONY CALABRIA

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

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

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

UNREALIZED GAIN PROPOSAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

NATO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF MARK ANTHONY CALABRIA

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Mr. President.

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

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

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

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

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

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

He is not being nominated for the Secretary of the Interior. He is not being nominated for the EPA. He is being nominated for the Federal Housing Finance Agency. It is a critical job.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

American families, especially people of color.

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

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

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

''MOVE OVER'' LAW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Two days ago, April 1, was Illinois State Trooper Day—a day set aside each year to honor the dedicated men and women of the Illinois State Police.

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

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I will hold it up.

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

I thank the Senator from New York.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

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

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

NOMINATION OF MARK ANTHONY CALABRIA

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

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

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

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

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

What the heck are we doing around here?

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

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

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

All postcloture time is expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 64 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—4

Booker	Lee
Harris	Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before I speak, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action on the Calabria and Altman nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGLISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

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

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

PRESIDENTIAL TAX RETURNS

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

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

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

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

conducted a review at all. So why are the Democrats considering these changes to the Tax Code now? Why didn't they raise the issue under President Obama or President Bush or President Clinton? The answer of course is that nothing has changed.

There is no reason to believe the IRS is doing any less due diligence in its review of President Trump's taxes than it has for any other President in our memory. The letter also states the committee needs to know the scope of the audit that the IRS conducts when it looks at a President's tax returns; that it needs to know whether there is a review of underlying business activities reported by the President. If Democrats are truly interested in finding out the level of scrutiny given to a President's tax returns, why not simply just ask the IRS to describe its audit procedure? That is a very straightforward question, and I am sure Commissioner Rettig would be happy to oblige with a straightforward answer. Why is there a need to seek President Trump's tax returns in order to get an answer to those questions? I want to give you a hint: There isn't one.

The letter also states that the committee is looking into how the IRS is doing its job of enforcing tax laws in a fair and impartial manner. In a statement yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee said it especially wants to know whether or not audits of Presidential tax returns are fully and appropriately being conducted.

Along those lines, in addition to asking for President Trump's tax returns and those of his businesses for the last 6 years, the Democrats have asked for information on the status of all audits of those tax returns that have been conducted. It sounds like they are planning to conduct their own review of the President's tax returns to see whether the IRS has been doing its job. Now, there is a problem with that.

The IRS audits more than 1 million tax returns every year. While audits of the President and Vice President might happen automatically, the audit process that is followed for them ought to be the same as it is for everyone else. Every member of the Ways and Means Committee knows that as well.

In members' remarks yesterday, they said the committee has a responsibility to conduct oversight of the tax system to determine how Americans, including those in elected office, are complying with the law. In other words, the President and the Vice President ought to be held to the same high standards as every other American—not a different standard but the same standard. There is no reason to believe this isn't already happening. Democrats haven't offered a shred of evidence to suggest the IRS hasn't done its job auditing President Trump, his taxes, or anybody else's for that matter.

By the way, if Democrats are really so concerned about enforcement, then why not ask the Treasury inspector general to conduct a review of the IRS audit process? Well, I want to tell you why they might not do that. It is because they are not concerned about oversight of the IRS enforcement process at all. What they are interested in is using their oversight responsibilities to collect as much information about this President's finances as they can get their hands on, and that is really the bottom line, isn't it?

This letter from the House Democrats doesn't make sense when taken at face value because you can't take it at face value. Democrats say they are interested in the tax returns of all Presidents when they are really just interested in one—President Trump's.

If the effort to get the President's tax returns isn't part of a grand reform effort, as they would have us believe, then what is it motivated by? I want to tell you what it is motivated by. It is motivated by the Democrats' intense dislike of this President. It is motivated by their frustration over losing an election they thought they would easily win. It is motivated by their desire to use all of the resources at their disposal to find something—anything—to bring this President down.

Just take a look at how this whole effort to request the President's tax return has unfolded. That will tell you a real story. Democrats started making calls for President Trump to release his tax returns while he was still a candidate during the 2016 election. At the time, Democratic calls for the release of his tax returns were clearly just a political attack, not a policy issue as they now want us to believe.

Secretary Clinton said: ''There must be something really terrible in those tax returns.''

Her communications director used the issue to chide then-candidate Trump for ''hiding behind fake excuses and backtracking on . . . previous promises.''

In his speech before the Democratic National Convention, Mrs. Clinton's running mate questioned then whether then-Candidate Trump had been paying his fair share, at once calling for him to release his tax returns and asking: ''Donald, what are you hiding?''

Since the election, these calls have continued, as you see yesterday. Democrats have just come up with more inventive excuses for making these calls, although I suspect the underlying political reasons are the same today as they were in 2016. Consider how those reasons have changed over time.

Not long after the election, at the beginning of the last Congress, 93 House Democrats signed a resolution of inquiry directing the Secretary of Treasury to turn over the President's tax returns. That request to turn over his tax returns was to be provided to the full House of Representatives and not to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The House Democrats' portion of that resolution committee report, signed by the ranking member and current chairman, is filled with complaints about the President's refusal to release his tax returns, none of which ever mentioned reviewing IRS audits or even inquiring about IRS audit procedures.

In that report, Democrats say that the President has ''rebuked over 40 years of tradition'' by refusing to release his tax returns. They say that the President's tax returns should be released because he has a vast domestic and international business empire. They say they should be released because he is ''not the average American.'' They say they should be released because he is President of the United States and has the power to sign bills into law, and that is supposed to serve as some kind of justification for demanding and releasing his tax returns. I can tell you that the law does not support that argument.

Under section 6103 of the Federal Tax Code, the tax returns of all Americans, including even the President of the United States, are considered to be private information.

Without an individual's permission, tax information can't be released except under the most limited circumstances. Let's not forget that our Tax Code reads that way for a very good reason.

Congress reformed the modern IRS privacy law in 1976, not long after President Nixon left office. Nixon had used his power over the IRS to target his political enemies. By passing that law in 1976, Congress wanted to make sure that never happened again. Congress was determined to put protections in place that would prevent any kind of abuse of that IRS power in the future. Congress wanted to ensure private tax information was never used for political purposes again. But if you strip away all of the pretense and trace this current effort back to its roots, that sounds an awful like what is happening right now with the efforts of the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

I stopped listing them, but Democrats have had plenty of other reasons in the past for claiming to need President Trump's tax returns.

In 2017, Democrats also said the President's taxes should be released because he stood to benefit from the tax reform that Congress passed and the President then signed into law. Apparently, because the President is wealthy and successful, they figured he must have had a self-interest in supporting that reform.

A more recent effort to get the President's returns is contained in a bill the House Democrats recently sent to the Senate, known as H.R. 1. That bill contains a provision requiring that candidates for President and Vice President, as well as the sitting President and Vice President, release their last 10 years of individual tax returns. Assuming the proposal lives on, even if the bill doesn't, I wonder if that is one of the items they were hoping to evaluate through their current oversight efforts.

Maybe they want to see the President's tax returns in order to evaluate their proposal to see the President's tax returns. That sounds like a lot of circular logic to me.

Democrats have also made a big deal out of the fact that under section 6103, the Secretary of the Treasury ''shall'' turn over relevant tax records to the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee if he requests it. That is exactly right, as long as the committee has a legitimate legislative purpose in asking for them, as opposed to this perceived political reason for why they want to do it.

For decades, the courts have been clear that congressional requests for information, like those tax returns or anything else we are trying to do, must have a legitimate legislative purpose. That is where the Democrats come up very, very short.

See, they don't have a purpose. All they have are a lot of excuses. Let me tell you something. Introducing legislation that would essentially require the President to release his tax returns and then using that to somehow justify requesting the President's tax returns is one of the worst excuses I have ever heard of.

You would think, considering the amount of time and practice they have had trying to rationalize all of this and make it sound so very good, they would be able to come up with something a little bit better than that. Apparently not, and that really speaks volumes, doesn't it?

The fact is, the reasons the Democrats have offered for wanting President Trump's tax returns back in 2016 and 2017 don't pass muster any better than the ones they are trying to peddle right now. That is because they are not requesting the tax returns in order to investigate a problem in need of oversight at all. All they really care about is finding a pretext to bring this President down.

As a Member of Congress who knows firsthand the importance of good oversight, that is what concerns me the most about this whole campaign that is going on in the other body.

I happen to know a thing or two about oversight. Over my career, I have conducted oversight of the last seven Presidential administrations—Democrat and Republican. I have called out both parties for doing things they shouldn't be doing. In that spirit, I have always said that every single Member of Congress is dutybound to conduct oversight of the Federal Government. In fact, I remind every new Member that I run into in this body—and the Presiding Officer has heard me tell him this—that if you want to get a bill passed, you have to have 51 votes to get it passed, but if you want to do oversight, you have to have one vote—your own decision to do that oversight.

The responsibility to conduct oversight is and ought to be regarded by each and every one of us as sacrosanct. The power to conduct oversight flows directly from the Constitution.

As Members of Congress, we owe it to the people we represent to preserve and protect its use as a tool for carrying out our legitimate constitutional responsibilities. I don't believe for a minute that when the Framers created article I—the power of Congress to legislate—what they had in mind was Members using these powers to collect personal information on their political opponents in an effort to destroy those political opponents.

In all my years of conducting oversight, I have never started with an end result and then worked backward in search of a reason for making it happen. That is not how oversight is done.

Oversight is about advocating for transparency, and with transparency comes accountability in order to fix problems and to improve government. It is not about searching for ways to sow division and tear down your political opponents. What Democrats are doing now looks a lot more like the latter than the former. If that is what they are up to, it is not oversight at all.

When you strip away all of their pretexts and when you strip out their circular logic, all you have are Democrats who want to go after the President in any way they can. They dislike him with a passion, and they want his tax returns to destroy him. That is all this whole process is about, and it is Nixonian to the core.

I yield.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

H.R. 268

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Senate debated a disaster relief funding bill that would have provided $13½ billion in assistance to States and territories that have been touched by recent hurricanes, wildfires, and other natural disasters. I share my colleagues' commitment to provide necessary assistance to get affected Americans back on their feet.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I believe we should always consider the budgetary effects of any legislation pending before this body. Supplemental appropriations bills highlight a real challenge in controlling Federal spending. How should we budget for inevitable natural disasters and emergencies?

Answering this question is important because the Federal Government continues to spend more money than it takes in and will soon confront annual deficits exceeding $1 trillion a year. These surging deficits add to our rising debt, which stands today at $22 trillion, or more than $65,000 per person. That is regardless of age—the baby who was born this morning owes $65,000. By 2029, if nothing is done, the national debt will grow to more than $33 trillion, or more than $94,000 per person.

Adding urgency to this situation is the surge in autopilot spending, which now represents more than two-thirds of what the Federal Government spends each year. Two-thirds of what we spend is not actually voted on; it happens automatically.

As our population ages, rising healthcare and interest costs will compound our fiscal problems. In 10 years, nearly 80 cents of every dollar the government spends will be on mandatory programs and interest on the debt. We need to do everything we can to improve our fiscal situation, and that includes improving the way we provide disaster relief.

Some of my colleagues may not realize that since the passage of the Budget Control Act in 2011, Congress has spent $250 billion outside of the discretionary caps responding to natural disasters and other emergencies.

This spending has received special designations under the law that exempt it from discretionary spending limits, but such spending still has the very real effect of further increasing the Federal budget deficit—and the Federal debt. One designation that is often used is the ''emergency'' designation, which implies it is for something Congress did not anticipate. But as we all know, natural disasters happen on an annual basis, and in recent years we have had multiple natural disasters in a fiscal year.

I want to applaud my friend from Utah, Senator ROMNEY, for offering an amendment that recognizes the challenge of budgeting for disasters and emergencies. Disaster relief funding must be built into our base budgets, which is why I have incorporated these costs in recent budget resolutions, including the one that passed through our Budget Committee last week.

While there is no silver bullet to this problem, I am willing and eager to work with any of my colleagues who believe there is a better way to anticipate these costs.

The Senate Budget Committee recently held a hearing that partially touched on ideas to better budget for disaster funding. One option is to offset emergency spending increases with spending reductions in other areas. Another option could require a dedicated fund for emergencies, similar to how some States budget for these events. I have also considered whether a new actuarially sound insurance program could appropriately assess the risk for such disasters while maintaining affordable premiums. Budgeting for emergencies and disasters is not a precise science, but I believe Congress can do a lot better than just calling an emergency and adding to the debt.

While we work to more honestly budget for these annual costs, there are

other ways we can lower the costs of natural disasters. The Federal Emergency Management Agency has found that every $1 spent mitigating against natural disasters saves an average of $6. Last year, Congress passed the Disaster Recovery Reform Act, which I was proud to support. This bill included programs that encouraged mitigation activities. Congress should be open to any idea that could help our country better plan for annual costs of these natural disasters. This would allow us to respond to natural disasters more efficiently, while also reducing the burden on American taxpayers.

With our country more than $22 trillion in debt and quickly approaching $1 trillion annual deficits, we must do everything in our power to put our country on a more fiscally sustainable path. Better budgeting for natural disasters will not fix all of our financial problems, but it is a good place to start.

Before I conclude, I want to touch on another area of concern, and that is the growing prevalence of directed scorekeeping. That is a way of saying: We are not going to count that, even though we are going to spend it, and we can spend it more than once.

Congressional budget statutes have established scoring rules that are intended to provide standardized accounting to ensure that lawmakers have the best possible information upon which to base fiscal decisions. In recent years, however, we have seen more and more attempts to undermine that process and instead direct the scoring outcomes.

Last week, the Senate Budget Committee, which I chair, approved a fiscal year 2020 budget resolution that aims to crack down on this process by allowing a surgical point of order to be raised against any such provision. What that means is that the offending provision can be stricken from the underlying measure unless 60 Senators vote to retain it.

Unfortunately, the disaster bill which was brought to the floor this week included a provision that would essentially direct the appropriations from the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund, up to a limit, to be scored as costing zero dollars. The effect of this change would allow Congress to spend an additional $2 billion above the statutory spending caps each year, while obscuring the real budgetary impacts from the American people. I filed an amendment that would solve that.

It is long past time for an honest conversation about the fiscal challenges facing our country. In the Budget Committee, we tried to advance that conversation with the budget that was approved last week. Unfortunately, the directed scorekeeping provision in the disaster bill considered earlier this week would set that effort back. I hope that when Congress returns to consideration of disaster legislation, it abandons that multiple-spending effort.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NATO

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today following our colleague Senator TILLIS to join him in talking about the importance of NATO and expressing our deep appreciation for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Senator TILLIS and I are the cochairs of the newly established Senate NATO Observer Group, which builds on the effort that was started back in the 1990s, by Tom Daschle and Trent Lott, to address the expansion of NATO, following the fall of the Berlin Wall. Our task is not just to shepherd through the Senate any changes in NATO that require Senate approval, but it is also to remind all of us and to remind the American public just how important NATO is.

Over the last seven decades, the NATO alliance has stood by its members in the darkest hours, including in Afghanistan, after the United States was attacked on September 11.

As Secretary General Stoltenberg reminded us yesterday, the only time article 5, the mutual aid clause of the NATO charter, has been invoked was after September 11, after the United States was attacked by terrorists.

Our Transatlantic bond has been critical to the United States and NATO, and, in particular, it has sustained a period of unprecedented global security and stability. While people may not recognize it, every day the United States sees the benefit of NATO. Whether we need to use NATO bases to evacuate American troops from conflict or to ensure that American goods and people travel safely across the Atlantic Ocean, NATO plays a critical role.

As NATO marks its 70th anniversary—today, in fact—the fact is that the alliance makes us stronger around the world and safer at home. So it is no wonder that Americans are very supportive of this organization. Any implication that Americans don't like or understand NATO is just simply wrong.

This week the Pew Research Center unveiled research to show that nearly 8 in 10 Americans, or 77 percent of Americans, including large majorities in both the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, agree that being a member of NATO is good for the United States.

We have also seen that the Chicago Council on Global Affairs has recorded a steady increase in NATO favorability across generations of Americans. Even the millennials, the generation born between 1981 and 1996, which are now the largest voting bloc in the United States, value our alliances, and 72 percent back the United States' contribution to NATO.

Boosted by these numbers, Congress has been more active than at any time in my memory in expressing its support for NATO. In 2017 and 2018, Congress took more votes in support of the United States' enduring commitment to article 5 and NATO than at any time since the fall of the Soviet Union. That is why Senators TILLIS and I reestablished the Senate NATO Observer Group last year. Since then, we have enjoyed a diverse and active membership across the Republican and Democratic Parties, as well as the enduring support of the Senate's leadership—both Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, and Senator SCHUMER, the Democratic leader.

Further, Congress continues to put its word into action by allocating significant levels of funding to help Europe deter threats that emanate from NATO's eastern and southern borders, already having provided $6.5 billion in the last year alone for the European Deterrence Initiative.

I have no doubt that as the Senate prepares to provide its advice and consent to NATO's 30th member, North Macedonia, Members of Congress will, once again, rally to NATO's side and push forward on initiatives to further strengthen NATO.

I should just call out the Republic of North Macedonia, as well as the country of Greece, for reaching an agreement around the name change for North Macedonia that both countries have agreed to and that the Parliaments of both countries have supported.

So as China and Russia struggle to maintain allies and resort to coercion and force to keep countries in their sphere, NATO has proven to be an enduring American advantage in an uncertain world.

Our NATO allies continue to magnify the strength of our military, and they stand ready to protect us and protect our shared interests and values worldwide. For this reason, I thank our allies for what they have done for the United States and for the people of Europe who are part of our partner nations.

While we may have our differences, we will always remain stronger with allies. As the Secretary General said yesterday, ''it is good to have friends.''

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 21.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Daniel Desmond Domenico, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Daniel Desmond Domenico, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 27.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Patrick R. Wyrick, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patrick R. Wyrick, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 105.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

John Thune, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, James Lankford, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Pat Roberts, Richard Burr, David Perdue, Roger F. Wicker, Lindsey Graham, James E. Risch, Mitch McConnell.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 173.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, John Thune, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Lindsey Graham, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Shelley Moore Capito.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 31.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Holly A. Brady, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Holly A. Brady, of Indiana, to be

United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of David Steven Morales, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of David Steven Morales, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Lindsey Graham.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO JOHN STURGEON

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Thursday afternoon on the Senate floor, and it is one of my favorite times of the week because I get to come down and talk about an Alaskan who has made a difference in my State and in the country sometimes. This one, by the way, is a big one. I think I am being a little bit presumptuous, but the pages, I think, view this as kind of one of their favorite speeches of the week because you learn about Alaska, and I get to brag about my wonderful State.

Now, I have been hearing a little bit back home that people like to watch this sometimes, but the gentleman I am going to talk about is John Sturgeon. That is him right there in front of the U.S. Supreme Court, and that is him with his hovercraft in Alaska when he is out moose hunting. This is an epic tale—epic, and it just happened. So I am going to be a little bit more long-winded on this ''Alaskan of the Week'' speech because it is actually really important for Alaskans; it is really important for my colleagues; and it is really, really important for Federal judges who rule on things that relate to Alaska.

We had an epic, huge U.S. Supreme Court case that just came down last week relating to this heroic figure, John Sturgeon, related to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, ANILCA—that is a mouthful; that is a huge statute that was passed by this body in 1980—and how that has been interpreted over the years, over the decades. The Supreme Court just last week interpreted this case in a way that we Alaskans think it should have been interpreted, but unfortunately Federal Agencies for 40 years have been interpreting it another way. So I am going to talk a little bit about that.

I will begin by talking about John Sturgeon and this battle he waged. Literally, they are going to make a movie out of this someday. Trust me. This is an epic—an American classic—12-year legal battle that he waged so he could go hunt a moose off the Nation River, a river in Alaska, and the Feds were saying he couldn't. So he fought and he fought, and he went to the Supreme Court not once but twice. So are we ready? This is one epic story that, again, I guarantee you they are going to make a movie out of someday.

So let me begin by talking about John Sturgeon, the 74-year-old man right there and what brought him to Alaska. Well, he is from Minnesota, originally and, like so many Alaskans, soon-to-be Alaskans—people watching, we want you to come up and visit, by the way. We want you to come up and live there. He felt the pull of Alaska very early in life.

John says he remembers dreaming about Alaska as a child. When he was graduating from high school, he applied for a few jobs as a hunting and fishing guide, but like many patriotic Americans—actually, many of my fellow Alaskans—he joined the military instead. My State has more veterans per capita than any State in the country. After he finished two tours in Vietnam in the Navy—so we are talking a real heroic guy here—he formed a plan. He was going to go to college, get a degree in forestry, and then head north to Alaska. That is what he did. He stuck with the plan.

As soon as he finished his last exam in college, he put it on the professor's desk, and without even getting his diploma, he jumped into his car and drove all the way out to Alaska. He didn't even wait for graduation.

So, initially, he moved to Wrangell in Southeast Alaska, and then he became director of the division of forestry for the State of Alaska—a great job, a really important job. It was a position he held until 1986, and then he formed his own timber company, which he runs today with his son.

Now, throughout all this time, John Sturgeon, like many Alaskans, loved to get out to see our great outdoors, to hunt, to fish. There was a particular area in the interior part of Alaska that he discovered that was particularly good for moose hunting. For those of you who have been up to Alaska or haven't, we have very large moose, and we have a lot of them, a lot of moose.

To get to this area, however, he had to cross a river—the Nation River, within the Yukon-Charley National Preserve, which is a preserve that was actually created by Congress. I am going to get to that. The Nation River, in a lot of areas, is very shallow. It is very shallow, so the best way to traverse the Nation River is via hovercraft. You are looking at John Sturgeon's hovercraft right there.

It was 2007, and John was in his hovercraft when the steering cable broke, and he and two friends lugged the hovercraft to a sandbar to fix the cable—just like this. This is the sandbar right here at the Nation River.

Three park rangers then showed up. We love our park rangers up in Alaska, but we also have a little more skepticism than most States about Federal agencies saying they can control what we can and can't do. John says that they were very cordial, asking all sorts of questions about hunting in the area.

He said: I just thought they were interested in the hunting. Then one of them pulled out a thick rule book.

Uh-oh. They found and pointed to a section in the rule book in which hovercrafts aren't allowed in Federal parks or preserves. They told him they were going to cite him for violating this Federal regulation if he didn't move his hovercraft.

I talked earlier about this big law, a giant law that passed in 1980. Most Alaskans didn't want it passed.

Think about this. Unfortunately, this happens a fair amount to my State. There are laws that come from the Federal Government that we don't want; yet Senators and Congressmen pass them anyway and tell Alaskans how to live their lives. That is what ANILCA did. It is a huge law.

Of course, back then, our Senators fought for provisions that protected Alaskans' interests, even though they didn't really like the law. I will talk a little later about what that law did.

John Sturgeon knew ANILCA specifically said that in Alaska—ANILCA is only about Alaska—navigable waters and submerged lands within a park or reserve were governed by State laws and regulations, not Federal laws and Federal regulations. It gets a little complicated, but Senators like Ted Stevens and Congressman YOUNG fought this bill. They said: Look, if you are going to pass it, you have to make sure things are in there to protect our citizens.

So John Sturgeon looked at these park rangers and said: Look, I am on State land and State water. You can't cite me. You shouldn't even be on these lands.

They said that it didn't matter, that they still had the authority, just as they had the authority to ban hovercrafts on all parks and preserves across the country, and they showed him this regulation book.

John Sturgeon thought they were wrong, but he moved his hovercraft anyway without getting cited. But this issue still really gnawed him. If you are being told by a Federal official to do something and you think it is wrong—well, he thought it was time to fight it.

John had personally seen when ANILCA passed—and a lot of people predicted it—this huge bill that gave so much of Alaska away to the Federal Government. Little by little, Federal agencies and Federal officials started telling Alaskans: Hey, you can't do this. You can't do that. We have authority over you on this.

It was this creeping maneuver, which we thought was ignoring provisions of ANILCA and treating the public lands in Alaska as if they were in the lower 48, but they are different. Most people who have been impacted over the years by this overreach of the Federal Government, quietly but aggressively telling Alaskans what they can and can't do according to the law, couldn't do anything about it. Going against the Federal Government—a lawsuit, for example—is time-consuming. It is expensive. As John said, ''You just can't fight the beast.'' So most went away, and the Federal power kept creeping, creeping, and creeping.

After consulting with some lawyers about 12 years ago, John Sturgeon decided, you know what, I am going to fight this. I am going to fight it.

So guess what. He did it. He filed a suit. He lost in district court. He lost in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. Trust me, I am going to talk about that court of appeals, which, unfortunately, has jurisdiction over 40 percent of the entire country and one in five Americans. They very frequently get the cases wrong. This is another great example of their completely blowing it.

It went to the U.S. Supreme Court not once but, as I said, twice. We just got the second case last week, and, boy, was it a big decision for Alaska.

That was 12 years ago. He has been fighting this for 12 years. Guess how much it cost John Sturgeon to do this; guess why people don't do this. It took $1.2 million in legal fees to vindicate the rights of the State of Alaska and his fellow Alaskans. Just for that reason, he should be Alaskan of the Week.

The final, unanimous decision by the Supreme Court that came down is a historic—historic—decision for the State of Alaska in favor of John Sturgeon and completely against the Park Service and the Federal Government's abuse of power.

This decision is celebrated across the great State of Alaska, and it also upheld a very important subsistence provision for Alaska Natives as well.

Every argument that the Park Service made in holding up its aggressive use of its authority over John Sturgeon ''ran aground,'' in Justice Kagan's words. She was the author of this very important decision last week.

Let's talk a little bit about ANILCA and Justice Kagan's decision. By the way, it was a 9-to-0 decision. We always hear about the Supreme Court being divided. It was 9-zip. This is the second time this went in front of the Ninth Circuit, and the U.S. Supreme Court said: This is not hard, Ninth Circuit and Federal agents.

It was 9 to 0 in favor of John Sturgeon and the great State of Alaska.

As I mentioned, ANILCA passed here in 1980. It is a huge bill, several hundred pages. Few—even the experts—have actually read the text of ANILCA to understand why the provisions in it are so important. But to their credit, the members of the U.S. Supreme Court clearly read this statute.

As I mentioned, the decision written by Justice Kagan will serve as a guide on how lands are to be regulated by the Federal Government in Alaska according to Federal law.

In the decision, Justice Kagan begins with some history. By the way, I highly recommend that all of my fellow Alaskans read the decision. Pages, you guys should read it too. Anyone watching who cares about Alaska should read this decision. It is quite a big one.

Justice Kagan goes through great pains to try to explain a very complicated topic and writes in very plain language. It is quite a good opinion. She begins by talking about some Alaskan history.

The Federal Government, as most know, bought Alaska from Russia in 1867—365 million acres of land. That is well over the size of Texas.

Sorry, Senator CRUZ and Senator CORNYN. I know you guys like to talk about the size of Texas, but we are way, way bigger.

For the first 90 years, all of the land was owned and controlled by the Federal Government, which completely neglected the land and the people in it, who were mostly Alaska Natives.

Justice Kagan wrote in her opinion: ''By the 1950s, Alaskans hankered for both statehood and land—and Congress decided to give them both.''

Along with statehood came 103 million acres for the State of Alaska to manage in order to create a tax base. The Statehood Act also gave Alaska ''title to an ownership of the lands beneath the navigable waters,'' such as the Nation River, which is where John Sturgeon was hunting. But statehood didn't resolve all of the land disputes at all.

The Alaska Native people rightfully demanded jurisdiction over the lands that had been their ancestral lands and that they had lived on for thousands of years. So in 1971, Congress, this body, passed the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, which resulted in the formation of Alaska Native corporations that were able to choose up to 40 million acres of land for the Alaska Native people. That is roughly the size of Pennsylvania.

More land claims and disputes came about, given the large size of Alaska and given the different land holdings. All of this takes us to the very large statute, ANILCA, which passed here in 1980, which was at the heart of the lawsuit that we just heard about and that the Supreme Court ruled on last week.

In 1980, after a very long and contentious battle—one that resulted in protests all across Alaska, which, as Justice Kagan noted in her opinion, involved a modern-day Paul Revere galloping through crowds in Alaska, shouting ''The Feds are coming! The Feds are coming!''—104 million acres of land were set aside by Congress for preservation in Alaska. Think about that.

I say to the Presiding Officer, you are from the great State of Indiana. If the Federal Government, over your objection, came and said, ''We are going to take a huge chunk of Indiana, and we are going to keep it and preserve it,'' you probably wouldn't have voted for that.

Our Senators didn't like this, but the Congress overruled them. That happens sometimes when your State is so big. It is something we still have to focus on—when people focus on my State and want to lock it up.

So here is what they did: 104 million acres were set aside for preservation. Ten new national parks, monuments, and preserves were created, and three existing ones were expanded. These areas were called conservation units. It is essentially a national park. All of this did not come without challenges because, unlike in the lower 48, these new areas—103 million acres—that is bigger than California. It is huge. These new preservation units, conservation units, had within them private land, Native land, and State land. So it was very complicated.

These are what are called inholdings in Alaska—a patchwork of inholdings. Our Senators did a great job of saying that the inholdings can't be regulated by the Federal agencies. They are private lands; they are Alaska Native corporation lands; they are State lands, so the Feds can't regulate them. We believe that was in ANILCA. That was part of the deal, part of the settlement.

Part of the reason is that, as one writer put it, while many Americans come to Alaska to view our parks—and we are glad they do; they are beautiful—''many Alaskans think of those same parks as some combination of home, office, grocery store, and source of renewal. They have known these lands intimately, from one year to perhaps ten thousand years.''

As Justice Kagan also noted in her opinion:

[R]ivers function as the roads of Alaska. . . . Over three-quarters of Alaska's 300 communities live in regions unconnected to the State's road system.

Let me repeat that. We have over 200 communities, villages, that are not connected by roads. We need a lot more infrastructure in Alaska. So you either have to get there by taking an airplane or, in the winter, a snow machine or a boat on a river, if the village is on a river.

I am still quoting Justice Kagan. She says: ''Residents of these areas include many of Alaska's poorest citizens, who rely on rivers for access to necessities like food and fuel.''

You are starting to get the picture. Our Senators fought to make sure the Federal Government couldn't regulate these areas because we need them for economic development, to get food, to hunt, and to get fuel. Slowly but surely, the Federal Government, whether Democrats or Republicans, started to say: No, no, no. We control this.

We are going to tell you Alaskans how to live your life, despite the fact that we thought ANILCA said they can't.

Congress, as I mentioned, particularly Alaska's delegation, understood that this was something they had to balance. Yes, we need to protect the lands, but at the same time—and again I am quoting Justice Kagan here—the law had to ''provide adequate opportunity for satisfaction of the economic and social needs of the State of Alaska and its people.''

You can't just go to a State, over the objections of their own representatives in Congress, and say: We are going to nationalize all of this, and all of you citizens who live there, we are going to tell you what to do with your lives.

Now, this body needs to understand this because sometimes, even today, we still have issues where some of my colleagues want to lock up and shut down the great State of Alaska, and they don't take into account the people I actually represent. It is a frustration, but it is something we will continue to guard against.

Well, our Senators did a good job of guarding us in the ANILCA Act, but the Federal Government kind of ignored a lot of what was in there, and certainly the Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals did.

So, as Justice Kagan put it, if you continue to read her opinion, she says: ''So if . . . you see some tension within the [ANILCA] statute, you are not mistaken [when you see that tension]: It arises from Congress's twofold ambitions [when they passed ANILCA in 1980].''

She described it as ''a grand bargain,'' the ''Janus-faced nature in its statement of purpose, reflecting the century-long struggle over federal regulation of Alaska's resources.''

That is her quote. Here is how it was supposed to work, the twofold ambitions. It was supposed to balance the ideas of preservation of Alaska's lands with also allowing the State, not the Federal Government, to regulate those inholdings I am talking about—private land, State of Alaska land, and Native corporation land. That is what this law was reflected to do when it was written.

It can be confusing. It is a very big law, particularly for Federal employees who see it as their job to preserve and keep people out of these parks and not to—remember, you have Alaskans who have lived there for thousands of years or who had private property in there prior to this law being passed.

As Justice Kagan wrote—and here is a quote from her, which is a really important one for Alaska. She said:

If [John] Sturgeon lived in any other State, his [law]suit would not have a prayer of success. . . . Except that Sturgeon lives in Alaska. And as we—

The Supreme Court—

have said before, ''Alaska is often the exception, not the rule'' [when it comes to these kind of Federal laws in Federal parks].

Alaska, as the Justices say over and over in this monumental decision brought down from the Supreme Court last week, is different. John Sturgeon understood this. The Ninth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals, which unfortunately handles all of the Federal appeals from Alaska district courts, does not understand this. They haven't for decades, unfortunately.

The first time John Sturgeon took this case up through the courts, he went to the Ninth Circuit, and they, of course, said: No. Sorry. Federal agents win. John Sturgeon, you lose. You now have the right to move your hovercraft on the Nation River because the Federal officials have all the power over that river.

The U.S. Supreme Court—this is about 3 years ago—actually said: No, we don't think that is the case. We are going to reverse this and send it back to the Ninth Circuit.

So what did the Ninth Circuit do? They held again that Sturgeon is going to lose. The Federal Government wins. They just came up with a different reason. I read that Ninth Circuit opinion. It was one of the most remarkable opinions I have ever read of a court of appeals—Federal court of appeals ignoring the U.S. Supreme Court. It is breathtaking how they just ignored the U.S. Supreme Court in their second opinion.

Now, sometimes the U.S. Supreme Court doesn't like to be ignored. I was a law clerk on the Ninth Circuit. I have seen them do that a lot. What did the Supreme Court do? They essentially said: You can't ignore us. So they took it again. They took it again, and they came out with a 9-to-0 opinion. If you are a Ninth Circuit judge, you have to be embarrassed—embarrassed—because the U.S. Supreme Court took you to task. They essentially said you cannot have Federal agents in Alaska who can do whatever they believe is in their power with ignoring ANILCA. ANILCA says: ''Alaskans have to be able to regulate, to use, and to control areas within these Federal preserves if they are inholdings, private land, State land, or Alaska Native corporation land.'' This is something the Federal agencies have ignored and certainly the Ninth Circuit has ignored.

One of our jobs here, as you know, is to confirm judges who have been nominated. Any Ninth Circuit judge who is now coming before this body for confirmation, the first thing I am going to do is hand them this Sturgeon opinion from the U.S. Supreme Court last week and say: Read this. Read it and understand it because the Ninth Circuit has been getting the issues of Federal power over Alaska wrong for decades, and this U.S. Supreme Court decision finally sets them right—finally sets them right. This is a monumentally important decision for my State, and I believe other States, but certainly for my State.

So after a 12-year battle and after spending $1.2 million on legal fees, our Alaskan of the Week for today, John Sturgeon, right there in front of the U.S. Supreme Court, made history—made history. A moose hunter said: I am not going to be pushed around by the Federal Government. I think I have the right to do this, and I think my State, not the Feds, controls this area of Alaska.

He was right. Despite the Federal district court telling him he was wrong and despite the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit telling him he was wrong twice, he was right. He simply wouldn't give up. Because of John Sturgeon, Alaskans will have firm ground to fight on the legal subject that comes before the courts in my State all the time in the Ninth Circuit, which is how much power the Federal Government has to control Alaskans, our economy, and our future.

As Justice Kagan wrote, in those areas, like the Nation River, [ANILCA] ''makes clear, Park Service administration does not replace local [and State] control.'' This body said that. Unfortunately, Federal agencies have ignored it and so has the Ninth Circuit, but now the Supreme Court has spoken and has spoken very, very definitively.

''It makes you feel patriotic,'' John Sturgeon said recently when we contacted him. ''One little guy from Alaska—a moose hunter—can be heard by the U.S. Supreme Court [two times]. That just blew me away.''

It does make you feel patriotic. It does make you feel that if one man thinks he is right, he can fight and win

in the courts of the United States, although it took 12 years and over a million dollars—and again, he didn't just win. He won 9 to 0—9 to 0. That is as good as it gets in the U.S. Supreme Court.

In Alaska, this man is a hero. He doesn't accept the label. He is too modest. He does acknowledge he wouldn't have gotten as far as he did without the help of some excellent attorneys, all of whom I know and have had the opportunity in my life to work with and become friends with: Matt Findley, Ruth Botstein, and Jon Katchen, who wrote an amicus brief in both hearings, including one for the congressional delegation that the U.S. Supreme Court used a lot. He also had an amazing outpouring of support from the community all over the State. People across the State of Alaska, Democrats and Republicans—it didn't matter—they knew what he was fighting for. He also had an amazing of support from the community, groups and individuals who stood with him throughout the years and who, all told, raised all but $100,000 to pay for the legal bills.

Justice Kagan said this decision means ''Sturgeon can again rev up his hovercraft in search of moose.'' That is Justice Kagan in her opinion, and he is planning to do just that. He is ready. He has been working on the hovercraft. Again, there it is in the picture. It was in his garage over the past few months. It has a new engine, and he recently fired it up just like Justice Kagan told him to do, and he says it is running fine. He can't wait to get out and moose hunt.

But this story, as you probably have gathered, is bigger than one man and his moose. ''Alaska is different,'' John said, and, by the way, that is what the Supreme Court was saying throughout the entire opinion. ''It's special. And it's meant to be that way and should be treated differently by the law. The people of Alaska truly won'' in this very important case.

Thank you, John Sturgeon, for never giving up. Thank you for your hard work and your determination, and thank you for being our Alaskan of the Week. I also want to give a big thanks to our nine Justices on the Supreme Court. Justice Kagan, who wrote an exceptional decision, shows that she and the other eight Justices on the Court understand that Alaska is different, as they say probably five times in their opinion. We can love our lands, we can protect them fiercely, and we can live and play and earn a living on them as well. So for her very well-reasoned decision, maybe she should be an honorary Alaskan of the Week as well. I don't think Justice Kagan is from Alaska, though, but for today, all our thanks and praise and gratitude goes to John Sturgeon for really an incredible legal battle that is going to go down in the history books as a superduper important day for Alaska.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT of Florida). The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING FRANK TREADWAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I would like to remember the life of Frank Treadway, who passed away earlier this year at the age of 96.

Born in Bell County in southeast Kentucky, Frank was one of 12 children, and much of his childhood was spent helping on the family farm in Noetown. During his teenage years, Frank worked at the Middlesboro Country Club as a golf caddy, developing a lifelong love for the game. Like so many members of the Greatest Generation, Frank proudly answered his Nation's call to service, and he enlisted in the U.S. Navy during World War II. Aboard the U.S.S. *Kyne*, Frank served throughout the Pacific. For their meritorious participation in combat, the crew received multiple commendations.

After Frank returned home from the war, Frank married the love of his life, Inez. They spent 70 years together and raised seven children. Farming remained an enduring passion, and one of Frank's proudest accomplishments was the founding and continued success of his local farm market, Treadway Gardens. Throughout his life, Frank remained loyal to his childhood home and always held the people of southeast Kentucky in high regard. Elaine and I commend this hero for his service, and we send our condolences to Inez, their children, family, and friends.

LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2019

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I wish to reaffirm my partnership on the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2019 with my good friend, Senator TAMMY BALDWIN, who I would like the record to reflect is an original lead cosponsor of S. 995. As the longstanding coauthors of this legislation, Senator BALDWIN and I have been working together to provide the necessary resources to State respite agencies to ensure that caregivers have access to the respite services they need. Following the introduction of the legislation earlier this week, we heard testimony in the Senate Special Committee on Aging that reaffirmed the importance of respite care for the millions of caregivers who are caring for loved ones with Alzheimer's and other dementias. I look forward to continuing to work with Senator BALDWIN to advance S. 995.

RECOGNIZING THE MASSACRE RIM WILDERNESS STUDY AREA

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I come forward today to recognize the Massacre Rim Wilderness Study Area's designation as an International Dark Sky Sanctuary. Located 150 miles north of Reno in Washoe County, NV, Massacre Rim Wilderness Study Area is a region with rolling hills, buttes, plateaus, and narrow canyons, covered in sagebrush and junipers. Massacre Rim is a natural, undisturbed, and isolated environment that offers visitors rare opportunities to enjoy scenic vistas of up to 60 miles, as well as solitude away from development and distraction. Thanks to the location's remoteness, Massacre Rim's night views are completely uninhibited by light pollution. These unique qualities allow for nearly unparalleled stargazing, which has attracted visitors from around the world.

On March 30, 2019, the International Dark-Sky Association designated the Massacre Rim Wilderness Study Area as an International Dark Sky Sanctuary, only the fourth location to achieve this distinction in the United States and the seventh in the entire world. The International Dark-Sky Association deemed Massacre Rim worthy of this honor due to its qualifications as ''land that has an exceptional or distinguished quality of starry nights and a nocturnal environment that is protected for its scientific, natural, or educational value, its cultural heritage and/or public enjoyment.''

For most of human history, a night sky teeming with stars and shooting comets was a regular occurrence for our ancestors. Prior to the Industrial Revolution, one could look to the sky and find awe-inspiring wonder, intrigue, and entertainment. For most of us, that is no longer the case. According to a 2016 National Geographic article, 80 percent of Americans cannot see the Milky Way due to light pollution. While light pollution is a necessary and small consequence to our growth and development as a society, it is imperative that we recognize the significant value in our increasingly rare dark sky places, such as Massacre Rim. Fortunately, for visitors and residents of the great State of Nevada, views of both the Milky Way and our neighboring galaxy, Andromeda, are available at Massacre Rim.

Our State's booming outdoor recreation economy is a testament to the success of our public lands and highlights the importance of keeping our invaluable natural resources available for all to utilize and enjoy. I commend the nonprofit organization, Friends of Nevada Wilderness, for spearheading the Massacre Rim Wilderness Study Area's Dark Sky Sanctuary designation, and for continuing to educate others about the natural wonders available in the Silver State.

From Massacre Rim, to the Lake Tahoe Basin, to the Ruby Mountains, residents and visitors can attest that

our public lands allow us to connect with our collective past and preserve our shared treasures for future generations.

REMEMBERING HARRIS LLEWELLYN WOFFORD, JR.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to remember and pay tribute to former Senator Harris Llewellyn Wofford, Jr. and his life of dedicated service to our country and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Harris lived a life of service, committed to advancing civil rights and ending injustice. Early in his career, Harris went to India to study nonviolence and the teachings of Gandhi. The lessons he learned during that time would become indispensable as Harris got to know Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and became involved in the civil rights movement, helping to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1957, the first civil rights legislation since reconstruction.

When John F. Kennedy was running for President in 1960, Harris was an adviser on his campaign. Days before the election, Dr. King was unjustly imprisoned, and Wofford urged Kennedy and his team to call Coretta Scott King to comfort her and demonstrate his commitments to civil rights. Once Kennedy was elected, Harris Wofford served as Special Assistant to the President for Civil Rights and chairman of the Subcabinet Group on Civil Rights. He urged the President and Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy to pursue civil rights legislation. Wofford would join Martin Luther King and others in the Selma to Montgomery Civil Rights marches in 1965 in support of voting rights for African-Americans.

While serving in the Kennedy administration, Wofford worked with R. Sargent Shriver on the creation of the Peace Corps, eventually leaving the White House to serve as the Peace Corps' special representative to Africa and director of operations in Ethiopia, as well as associate director. He would also play a role in the creation of Volunteers in Service to America, a domestic version of the Peace Corps.

In 1991, when former Pennsylvania Senator H. John Heinz was killed in a plane crash, my father, Governor Robert P. Casey, turned to Harris Wofford to fill the vacancy. Harris went on to win a special election and served until 1994 when he narrowly lost reelection. While in office, he worked to pass the National and Community Service Act, creating AmeriCorps, the Senior Corps and Learn and Serve America. Harris would go on to serve as the head of AmeriCorps.

If one tried to sum up Harris Wofford's life in one word, it would be service. He truly believed that through service every individual could contribute to the betterment of his or her community, State, country, and the world. Harris Wofford's friend, Martin Luther King, Jr., said ''everyone can be great, because everyone can serve.'' Today we honor Harris Wofford's life of service which will continue to inspire Americans to serve one another and our Nation.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE UNIVERSITY OF MONTANA WESTERN WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing the University of Montana Western women's basketball team for their first ever NAIA Division I national championship.

The University of Montana Western women's basketball team won the NAIA Division I national championship game 75–59 over Oklahoma City University and finished their season with 30 wins and only 4 losses. These ladies have done an incredible job exemplifying the hard work that all Montanans are known for.

The team also received several individual awards for coaches and players. Their head coach, Lindsay Woolley, was awarded the NAIA Coach of the Year. The Montana Western Bulldogs also had the NAIA Player of the Year, Brianna King. Ms. King set a University of Montana Western single-season scoring record with 771 points.

Congratulations to the University of Montana Western women's basketball team on an incredible season and a memorable outcome as the NAIA Division I National Champions.●

TRIBUTE TO FIRST LIEUTENANT KATIE KIENTZ

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and pay tribute to United States Army 1LT Kate M. Kientz, a proud Oklahoman who is currently serving her country in Kosovo. I had the pleasure of meeting and speaking with Lieutenant Kientz back in February during a congressional delegation trip to the region, and I was proud to see a strong Oklahoman such as herself representing our State and our country so well. I would like to express my sincere thanks for the excellent work of Lieutenant Kientz in advancing the mission in Europe. Her dedication to duty is instrumental to prepare ready forces, ensure strategic access, deter conflict, enable the NATO alliance, strengthen partnerships, and counter transnational threats in order to protect and defend the United States.

Lieutenant Kientz was raised in my home city of Tulsa, OK, and attended Bishop Kelley High School. She continued her education at the University of Oklahoma and graduated in 2017 with a degree in political science and letters. Following graduation, she interned at the Oklahoma House of Representatives and participated in Reserve Officers' Training Corps exchanges in Beijing and Slovakia. These experiences were the foundation of a strong background that prepared her for a successful career in military intelligence.

As of January 2018, Lieutenant Kientz has been the chemical officer and S4 in charge of logistics in the 1st Squadron, 89th Cavalry Regiment. She arrived in Kosovo in October of 2018 and plans to then finish her time as a lieutenant at Fort Drum before transitioning into military intelligence.

Meeting Lieutenant Kientz in Kosovo had an impact on me and reassured me that the next generation is in great hands with leaders such as herself. On behalf of Congress and the United States of America, I thank 1LT Kate M. Kientz and her family for their commitment, sacrifice, and contribution to our great Nation. I join my colleagues in wishing her future success in all aspects of life as she continues to serve as a role model for service, sacrifice, and leadership.●

REMEMBERING LILLA WEINBERGER

● Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish today to recognize the life of Lilla Weinberger, a beloved daughter, friend, and activist who devoted her life to the causes of democracy and the literary arts.

Lilla Weinberger was born in 1941 in Pasadena, CA. She became involved in the women's movement while at CalArts. After college, she worked at the Library of Congress and carried out research and worked on speeches for President Lyndon Johnson's landmark education legislation. She moved to Lenox, MA, and there, she was integral to the building of the first-ever domestic violence shelter in the Commonwealth.

In 1991, Lilla moved to Sonoma, CA, and founded Readers' Books, which became a cherished institution. She became deeply involved in the independent bookstore community and served on the board of the Northern California Independent Booksellers Association from 1997–2003.

Lila was a strong believer in political participation and grassroots democracy. She was an active member of the Barack Obama Presidential campaigns in 2008 and 2012. She became the northern California regional head of the Obama campaign in 2012 and later became Obama's field director in Maryland. In 2013, Lilla returned to Massachusetts and became the regional field director for my first U.S. Senate campaign. She was our warrior in western Massachusetts and became an indispensable member of our campaign operation.

I am honored to commemorate the remarkable achievements of Lilla Weinberger, a distinguished leader, our dear friend, and a truly great American.●

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN JOHN ''JACK'' FREDERICK WILSON

● Mr. ROMNEY. Mr. President, it is my honor to pay tribute to Captain John ''Jack'' Frederick Wilson, who celebrated his 100th birthday this past Tuesday, April 2.

Born on April 2, 1919, and raised in Park City, UT, Jack is one of only a small handful of pilots trained at Brigham Young University. He joined the Army Air Corps on December 11, 1941, just 4 days after the Japanese surprise attack on Pearl Harbor.

After training in the B–24 Liberator bomber, he was made a pilot in the 90th Bombing Group in the Fifth Air Force of the Army Air Corps and was deployed to New Guinea. He and his crew were eventually assigned to reconnaissance missions in the North China Sea tracking the Japanese fleet, and his B–24 was stripped of all bombs, machineguns, and defensive measures to be replaced with extra fuel tanks. Jack said of that time, ''My career as a B–24 pilot basically consisted of long periods of boredom punctuated with moments of terror.''

He was a member of the Jolly Rogers and has carried his membership card his entire life, which says, ''Having been assigned to the best damned heavy bomb group, and having paid his dues, Captain Jack F. Wilson is hereby considered a member in good standing of the Jolly Rogers.''

As a typhoon threatened the island airstrip where he was stationed, locals from Okinawa showed him a cave that he and his B–24 crew sheltered in, saving their lives. Despite popular opinion at the time, Jack never demonized the Japanese people. He believed ''there are good people everywhere'' and taught his children and grandchildren the same.

After the war, Jack used his flying skills to help locate wildfires and pioneered the ''interagency'' concept, establishing the National Interagency Fire Center in Boise, ID. The main headquarters building bears his name.

In honor of a native Utahn and one of the last remaining B–24 pilots from World War II, the U.S. Congress extends warm greetings to Mr. Wilson on April 2, 2019, his 100th birthday. We commend him for his life of service and his valor in defense of his country.●

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL S. LIONEL

● Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, it is my distinct honor to recognize Samuel S. Lionel, who is celebrating his 100th birthday. Considered the ''Dean'' of the Nevada Bar, Sam's defense of Nevada values stands as a strong reminder of the tremendous work he has done for our State.

For decades, Sam has represented one of the largest law firms in Nevada, fighting for critically important issues such as our thriving tourism industry and defending Nevada's unique western heritage. The dedication he has placed into his practice has strengthened our State's economy and helped shape the Las Vegas Valley that we know and love today. In fact, it was Sam who played a key role in the conception and development of many of the hotels and casinos on the Las Vegas Strip, setting the stage for Nevada's unprecedented growth and its booming entertainment scene.

Sam is known for his philanthropic heart. He remains particularly active in Jewish philanthropy, and we share a long history of working together in our synagogue, Congregation Ner Tamid. Sam has also been a central benefactor of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, endowing the namesake Samuel S. Lionel Professor of Intellectual Property Law position at the William S. Boyd School of Law in 2016. I know firsthand the wonderful leader Sam is, and his philanthropic work has distinguished him in the Jewish and legal communities not only in Nevada but also throughout the United States. Sam's name is and will always remain synonymous with his professional and philanthropic dedication to the Silver State.

Happy birthday to Sam, a loving husband, father, grandfather, great-grandfather, servant leader, and loyal friend.●

TRIBUTE TO WHIT ARMSTRONG

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the retirement of Whit Armstrong, a native of Montgomery, AL, from the Alabama Power Company board of directors, effective on April 26, 2019. Whit is an acknowledged leader in the financial and investment arena with over 30 years in the banking industry, including service as a member of the Alabama State Banking Board. He has provided decades of service to improve the quality of life in his community and across the State of Alabama with numerous civic, economic development, educational, and business organizations.

Mr. Whit Armstrong previously served as president, chief executive officer, and chairman of the board of The Citizens Bank in Enterprise, AL, and of its holding company, Enterprise Capital Corporation, Inc. He currently serves as managing member of Creeke Capital Investments, LLC, also located in Enterprise, AL.

Whit has earned many recognitions for his contributions, among them a Silver Beaver Award for Outstanding Service to the Boy Scouts and the 1975 Alabama Jaycees' Outstanding Young Man of Alabama Award. He earned his bachelor's degree and master of science in finance with a focus in banking from the University of Alabama.

At home in the Wiregrass, Whit is married to Dr. Rebecca Brown Armstrong. They have a son, Whit Junior, and four grandchildren, Whit III, Charlotte, James, and Katrina Armstrong. An engaged resident in his community, Whit is an active member of First United Methodist Church of Enterprise.

His extensive experience in business and civic life, along with his seasoned judgment and knowledge of the Alabama Power Company, have provided great value to Alabama Power's board of directors.

What is truly remarkable are Whit Armstrong's many accomplishments and contributions to the State. I am proud to take this time to recognize him for his service on the Alabama Power Company board of directors, which has benefitted the customers of Alabama Power, the people of Alabama, and the State. His achievements and dedication to advancing the industry have not gone unnoticed. I join Whit Armstrong's friends, family, and colleagues in wishing him the best of luck as he transitions into a new chapter of his life, and I thank him for his commitment to Alabama.●

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGMA NU FRATERNITY

● Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I am pleased to advise the Senate of the 150th anniversary of Sigma Nu Fraternity, a principles-based men's fraternal organization with more than 160 chapters on college campuses in the United States, approximately 12,000 current collegiate members, and more than 250,000 initiates in its history. This year, Sigma Nu celebrates the 150th anniversary of its public founding on January 1, 1869, at the Virginia Military Institute in Lexington, VA. Cadets James Frank Hopkins, James McIlvaine Riley, and Greenfield Quarles joined together to form Sigma Nu as a brotherhood committed to the principles of love, honor, and truth and in firm opposition to hazing. Sigma Nu Fraternity remains the only men's college fraternity founded in direct opposition to hazing. Its history and its mission to develop ethical leaders for today's society are worthy of the highest esteem.

Originally founded as the Legion of Honor, Sigma Nu's central founding value is honor, and the concept that a man's character and conduct should always be governed by a high sense of honor guides all its work. This value is as relevant 150 years later as it was then.

For 150 years, members of Sigma Nu have led in their respective communities, professions, and families. From NASA to the Pentagon, from the arts to the sciences, and from business to public service, there are few facets of American life and history in which a Sigma Nu initiate has not made his mark.

When this Nation has called upon its citizen-soldiers, Sigma Nu initiates have answered that call. They have fought and died in every major conflict since the Civil War. Its members are veterans of every branch of the Armed Forces, including two Medal of Honor recipients. Sigma Nus have understood the price of freedom and been willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for it.

The 12,000 collegiate members on campuses across the country today serve their communities in student government, interfraternity councils, athletic teams, and other student organizations. Last year, these young future leaders of our Nation performed over 375,000 hours of community service and raised over $2 million for philanthropic causes.

Whether it is through its award-winning ethical leadership development program, LEAD, or through the mentorship of more than 2,000 volunteer advisors, Sigma Nu continues to be at the forefront of developing the minds, hearts, and character of its initiates, inspiring them to excel with the timeless value of honor.

Today, in its 150th year, Sigma Nu Fraternity calls upon its initiates to renew that legacy, to reflect on the principles of its founders, and to commit to a strong future for this esteemed brotherhood. As a proud initiate of Sigma Nu Fraternity, I would like to congratulate the fraternity on achieving 150 years of love, honor, and truth and to wish it many more years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Ridgway, 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 and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 11:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 276. An act to direct the Secretary of Education to establish the Recognizing Inspiring School Employees (RISE) Award Program recognizing excellence exhibited by classified school employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through high school.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 23. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Countering 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.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 27. A resolution calling for a prompt multinational freedom of navigation operation in the Black Sea and urging the cancellation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with an amended preamble:

S. Res. 35. A resolution supporting democratic principles and standards in Bolivia and throughout Latin America.

S. Res. 67. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the importance and vitality of the United States alliances with Japan and the Republic of Korea, and our trilateral cooperation in the pursuit of shared interests.

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 95. A resolution recognizing the 198th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

S. Res. 96. A resolution commending the Government of Canada for upholding the rule of law and expressing concern over actions by the Government of the People's Republic of China in response to a request from the United States Government to the Government of Canada for the extradition of a Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd. executive.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

*Aimee Kathryn Jorjani, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation for a term expiring January 19, 2021.

*David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Interior.

By Mr. GRAHAM for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Daniel P. Collins, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Kenneth Kiyul Lee, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

James Wesley Hendrix, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Sean D. Jordan, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas.

Mark T. Pittman, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

Nick Edward Proffitt, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia for the term of four years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. CASEY (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1026. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow workers an above-the-line deduction for union dues and expenses and to allow a miscellaneous itemized deduction for workers for all unreimbursed expenses incurred in the trade or business of being an employee; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. STABENOW):

S. 1027. A bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. BENNET, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1028. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for a new rule regarding the application of the Act to marihuana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1029. A bill to allow the use of certified facility dogs in criminal proceedings in Federal courts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. LEE):

S. 1030. A bill to allow individuals to choose to opt out of the Medicare part A benefit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 1031. A bill to implement recommendations related to the safety of amphibious passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1032. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the definition of income for purposes of determining the tax-exempt status of certain corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 1033. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. REED, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1034. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the maximum age for children eligible for medical care under the CHAMPVA program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HAWLEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr.

RISCH, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. ENZI, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 1035. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit dismemberment abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KING, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1036. A bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students and improve textbook price information; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 1037. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize provisions relating to rural health clinics under Medicare; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER:

S. 1038. A bill to strengthen highway funding in the near term, to offer States additional financing tools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1039. A bill to limit the use of funds for kinetic military operations in or against Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1040. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to identify each alien who is serving, or has served, in the Armed Forces of the United States on the application of any such alien for an immigration benefit or the placement of any such alien in an immigration enforcement proceeding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1041. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to establish a veterans visa program to permit veterans who have been removed from the United States to return as immigrants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1042. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to allow certain alien veterans to be paroled into the United States to receive health care furnished by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. COTTON, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. WICKER, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. ROUNDS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. MORAN, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1043. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1044. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. JONES):

S. 1045. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to expand the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to permit nurses to practice in health care facilities with critical shortages of nurses through programs for loan repayment and scholarships for nurses; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 1046. A bill to establish the Office of Internet Connectivity and Growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1047. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to create a dependency and indemnity compensation allowance for surviving spouses receiving dependency and indemnity compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. REED, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1048. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for a Reducing Youth Use of E-Cigarettes Initiative; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1049. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 1050. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase the ability of a State to administer a permit program under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1051. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to establish a program to allow States to assume certain Federal responsibilities under that Act with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1052. A bill to authorize the Office of Fossil Energy to develop advanced separation technologies for the extraction and recovery of rare earth elements and minerals from coal and coal byproducts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1053. A bill to establish a universal personal savings program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CRUZ, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1054. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish a program to allow States to assume certain Federal responsibilities under that title with respect to agency actions applicable to highway projects within the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1055. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 regarding the procurement of certain items related to national security interests for Department of Homeland Security frontline operational components, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. HYDE–SMITH:

S. 1056. A bill to clarify oversight and jurisdiction over the regulation, inspection, and labeling of cell-cultured meat and poultry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. SINEMA):

S.J. Res. 18. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 141. A resolution celebrating the heritage of Romani Americans; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 142. A resolution condemning the Government of the Philippines for its continued detention of Senator Leila De Lima, calling for her immediate release, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 143. A resolution recognizing Israeli-American culture and heritage and the contributions of the Israeli-American community to the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LANKFORD, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. Res. 144. A resolution designating May 5, 2019, as the ''National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Res. 145. A resolution commemorating the bicentennial of the birth of Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise and the 130th anniversary of the founding of the Central Conference of American Rabbis; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 146. A resolution recognizing the centennial of the Institute of International Education; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. RISCH):

S. Con. Res. 13. A concurrent resolution reaffirming the United States commitment to Taiwan and to the implementation of the Taiwan Relations Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to amend title VII of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the treatment of core seasonal industries affected by antidumping or countervailing duty investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 66

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 66, a bill to regulate assault weapons, to ensure that the right to keep and bear arms is not unlimited, and for other purposes.

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 169

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 169, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exemption from gross income for civil damages as recompense for trafficking in persons.

S. 246

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 246, a bill to block the implementation of certain presidential actions that restrict individuals from certain countries from entering the United States.

S. 260

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 260, a bill to assist employers providing employment under special certificates issued under section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to transform their business and program models, to support individuals with disabilities to transition to competitive integrated employment, to phase out the use of such special certificates, and for other purposes.

S. 286

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 286, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 431

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 431, a bill to promote registered apprenticeships and on-the-job training for small and medium-sized businesses within in-demand industry sectors, through the establishment and support of eligible partnerships.

S. 517

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 517, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 567, a bill clarifying that it is United States policy to recognize Israel's sovereignty over the Golan Heights.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for direct payment to physician assistants under the Medicare program for certain services furnished by such physician assistants.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain funeral benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 684

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 684, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high-cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on medical devices.

S. 729

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 729, a bill to prohibit the use of funds to Federal agencies to establish a panel, task force, advisory committee, or other effort to challenge the scientific consensus on climate change, and for other purposes.

S. 792

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 792, a bill to require enforcement against misbranded milk alternatives.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 874

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 874, a bill to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children, and for other purposes.

S. 879

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 879, a bill to provide a process for granting lawful permanent resident status to aliens from certain countries who meet specified eligibility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 950

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 950, a bill to require the Director of the United States Geological Survey to perform a nationwide survey of perfluorinated compounds, and for other purposes.

S. 952

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas

(Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 952, a bill to provide that the Federal Communications Commission may not prevent a State or Federal correctional facility from utilizing jamming equipment, and for other purposes.

S. 962

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 962, a bill to provide funding for Federally qualified health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. 995

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 995, a bill to amend title XXIX of the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program under such title relating to lifespan respite care.

S. 1022

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1022, a bill to clarify the effect of certain final rules and determinations of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to greenhouse gas emissions standards for light-duty vehicles.

S.J. RES. 13

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 13, a joint resolution to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 9

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 9, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that tax-exempt fraternal benefit societies have historically provided and continue to provide critical benefits to the people and communities of the United States.

S. RES. 98

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 98, a resolution establishing the Congressional Gold Star Family Fellowship Program for the placement in offices of Senators of children, spouses, and siblings of members of the Armed Forces who are hostile casualties or who have died from a training-related injury.

S. RES. 120

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 120, a resolution opposing efforts to delegitimize the State of Israel and the Global Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions Movement targeting Israel.

S. RES. 123

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 123, a resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments.

S. RES. 135

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 135, a resolution expressing the gratitude and appreciation of the Senate for the acts of heroism and valor by the members of the United States Armed Forces who participated in the June 6, 1944, amphibious landing at Normandy, France, and commending those individuals for leadership and bravery in an operation that helped bring an end to World War II.

AMENDMENT NO. 246

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 246 intended to be proposed to H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. KING, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1036. A bill to expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students and improve textbook price information; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

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

S. 1036

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 ''Affordable College Textbook Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The high cost of college textbooks continues to be a barrier for many students in achieving higher education.

(2) According to the College Board, during the 2017–2018 academic year, the average student budget for college books and supplies at 4-year public institutions of higher education was $1,240.

(3) The Government Accountability Office found that new textbook prices increased 82 percent between 2002 and 2012 and that although Federal efforts to increase price transparency have provided students and families with more and better information, more must be done to address rising costs.

(4) The growth of the internet has enabled the creation and sharing of digital content, including open educational resources that can be freely used by students, teachers, and members of the public.

(5) According to the Student PIRGs, expanded use of open educational resources has the potential to save students more than a billion dollars annually.

(6) Federal investment in expanding the use of open educational resources could significantly lower college textbook costs and reduce financial barriers to higher education, while making efficient use of taxpayer funds.

(7) Educational materials, including open educational resources, must be accessible to the widest possible range of individuals, including those with disabilities.

SEC. 3. OPEN TEXTBOOK GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(2) OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE.—The term ''open educational resource'' has the meaning given the term in section 133 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015b).

(3) OPEN TEXTBOOK.—The term ''open textbook'' means an open educational resource or set of open educational resources that either is a textbook or can be used in place of a textbook for a postsecondary course at an institution of higher education.

(4) RELEVANT FACULTY.—The term ''relevant faculty'' means both tenure track and contingent faculty members who may be involved in the creation or use of open textbooks created as part of an application under subsection (d).

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

(6) SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL.—The term ''supplemental material'' has the meaning given the term in section 133 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015b).

(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—From the amounts appropriated under subsection (k), the Secretary shall make grants, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to support projects that expand the use of open textbooks in order to achieve savings for students while maintaining or improving instruction and student learning outcomes.

(c) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—In this section, the term ''eligible entity'' means an institution of higher education, a group of institutions of higher education, or States on behalf of institutions of higher education.

(d) APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible entity desiring a grant under this section, after consultation with relevant faculty, shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Secretary may reasonably require.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted under paragraph (1) shall include a description of the project to be completed with grant funds and—

(A) a plan for promoting and tracking the use of open textbooks in postsecondary

courses offered by the eligible entity, including an estimate of the projected savings that will be achieved for students;

(B) a plan for evaluating, before creating new open textbooks, whether existing open textbooks could be used or adapted for the same purpose;

(C) a plan for quality review and review of accuracy of any open textbooks to be created or adapted through the grant;

(D) a plan for assessing the impact of open textbooks on instruction and student learning outcomes at the eligible entity;

(E) a plan for disseminating information about the results of the project to institutions of higher education outside of the eligible entity, including promoting the adoption of any open textbooks created or adapted through the grant; and

(F) a statement on consultation with relevant faculty, including those engaged in the creation of open textbooks, in the development of the application.

(e) SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give special consideration to applications that demonstrate the greatest potential to—

(1) achieve the highest level of savings for students through sustainable expanded use of open textbooks in postsecondary courses offered by the eligible entity;

(2) expand the use of open textbooks at institutions of higher education outside of the eligible entity; and

(3) produce—

(A) the highest quality open textbooks;

(B) open textbooks that can be most easily utilized and adapted by faculty members at institutions of higher education;

(C) open textbooks that correspond to the highest enrollment courses at institutions of higher education;

(D) open textbooks created or adapted in partnership with entities within institutions of higher education, including campus bookstores, that will assist in marketing and distribution of the open textbook; and

(E) open textbooks that are accessible to students with disabilities.

(f) USE OF FUNDS.—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use the grant funds to carry out any of the following activities to expand the use of open textbooks:

(1) Professional development for any faculty and staff members at institutions of higher education, including the search for and review of open textbooks.

(2) Creation or adaptation of open textbooks.

(3) Development or improvement of supplemental materials and informational resources that are necessary to support the use of open textbooks, including accessible instructional materials for students with disabilities.

(4) Research evaluating the efficacy of the use of open textbooks for achieving savings for students and the impact on instruction and student learning outcomes.

(g) LICENSE.—For each open textbook, supplemental material, or informational resource created or adapted wholly or in part under this section that constitutes a new copyrightable work, the eligible entity receiving the grant shall release such textbook, material, or resource to the public under a non-exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual, and irrevocable license to exercise any of the rights under copyright conditioned only on the requirement that attribution be given as directed by the copyright owner.

(h) ACCESS AND DISTRIBUTION.—The full and complete digital content of each open textbook, supplemental material, or informational resource created or adapted wholly or in part under this section shall be made available free of charge to the public—

(1) on an easily accessible and interoperable website, which shall be identified to the Secretary by the eligible entity;

(2) in a machine readable, digital format that anyone can directly download, edit with attribution, and redistribute; and

(3) in a format that conforms to accessibility standards under section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d), where feasible.

(i) REPORT.—Upon an eligible entity's completion of a project supported under this section, the eligible entity shall prepare and submit a report to the Secretary regarding—

(1) the effectiveness of the project in expanding the use of open textbooks and in achieving savings for students;

(2) the impact of the project on expanding the use of open textbooks at institutions of higher education outside of the eligible entity;

(3) open textbooks, supplemental materials, and informational resources created or adapted wholly or in part under the grant, including instructions on where the public can access each educational resource under the terms of subsection (h);

(4) the impact of the project on instruction and student learning outcomes; and

(5) all project costs, including the value of any volunteer labor and institutional capital used for the project.

(j) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives detailing—

(1) the open textbooks, supplemental materials, and informational resources created or adapted wholly or in part under this section;

(2) the adoption of such open textbooks, including outside of the eligible entity;

(3) the savings generated for students, States, and the Federal Government through projects supported under this section; and

(4) the impact of projects supported under this section on instruction and student learning outcomes.

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as are necessary.

SEC. 4. TEXTBOOK PRICE INFORMATION.

Section 133 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

''(6) OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCE.—The term 'open educational resource' means a teaching, learning, or research resource that is offered freely to users in at least one form and that resides in the public domain or has been released under an open copyright license that allows for its free use, reuse, modification, and sharing with attribution.''; and

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking ''textbook that'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''textbook that may include printed materials, computer disks, website access, and electronically distributed materials.'';

(2) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''or other person or adopting entity in charge of selecting course materials'' and inserting ''or other person or entity in charge of selecting or aiding in the discovery and procurement of course materials''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(E) Whether the college textbook or supplemental material is an open educational resource.'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''ISBN''; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''disclose, on the institution's Internet course schedule and in a manner of the institution's choosing, the International Standard Book Number and retail price information'' and inserting ''verify and disclose (on, or through a link from, the institution's Internet course schedule and in a manner of the institution's choosing) the International Standard Book Number and retail price information'';

(II) by striking ''and retail price'' and inserting '', retail price, and any applicable fee'';

(III) by inserting '', and whether each required and recommended textbook and supplemental material is an open educational resource,'' after ''supplemental materials''; and

(IV) by striking ''used for preregistration and registration purposes''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''for a college textbook or supplemental material, then the institution shall so indicate by placing the designation 'To Be Determined' '' and inserting ''or available for a college textbook or supplemental material, then the institution shall indicate the status of such information'';

(4) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION FOR COLLEGE BOOKSTORES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—An institution of higher education receiving Federal financial assistance shall assist a college bookstore that is operated by, or in a contractual relationship or otherwise affiliated with, the institution, in obtaining required and recommended course materials information and such course schedule and enrollment information as is reasonably required to implement this section so that such bookstore may—

''(A) verify availability of such materials;

''(B) source lower cost options, including presenting lower cost alternatives to faculty for faculty to consider, when practicable; and

''(C) maximize the availability of format options for students.

''(2) DUE DATES.—In carrying out paragraph (1), an institution of higher education may establish due dates for faculty or departments to notify the campus bookstore of required and recommended course materials.'';

(5) in subsection (f)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (4) and (5); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) available open educational resources;''; and

(6) by striking subsection (g) and redesignating subsections (h) and (i) as subsections (g) and (h), respectively.

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that institutions of higher education should encourage the consideration of open textbooks by faculty within the generally accepted principles of academic freedom that establishes the right and responsibility of faculty members, individually and collectively, to select course materials that are pedagogically most appropriate for their classes.

SEC. 6. GAO REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit a report to the Committee on Health,

Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives on the cost of textbooks to students at institutions of higher education. The report shall particularly examine—

(1) the implementation of section 133 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1015b), as amended by section 4, including—

(A) the availability of college textbook and open educational resource information on course schedules;

(B) the compliance of publishers with applicable requirements under such section; and

(C) the costs and benefits to institutions of higher education and to students;

(2) the change in the cost of textbooks;

(3) the factors, including open textbooks, that have contributed to the change of the cost of textbooks;

(4) the extent to which open textbooks are used at institutions of higher education; and

(5) how institutions are tracking the impact of open textbooks on instruction and student learning outcomes.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BROWN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 1044. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 1044

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Fentanyl Sanctions Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimate that from June 2017 through June 2018 more than 48,000 people in the United States died from an opioid overdose, with synthetic opioids (excluding methadone), contributing to a record 31,500 overdose deaths. While drug overdose deaths from methadone, semi-synthetic opioids, and heroin have decreased in recent months, overdose deaths from synthetic opioids have continued to increase.

(2) The objective of preventing the proliferation of synthetic opioids though existing multilateral and bilateral initiatives requires additional efforts to deny illicit actors the financial means to sustain their markets and distribution networks.

(3) The People's Republic of China is the world's largest producer of illicit fentanyl, fentanyl analogues, and their immediate precursors. From the People's Republic of China, those substances are shipped primarily through express consignment carriers or international mail directly to the United States, or, alternatively, shipped directly to transnational criminal organizations in Mexico, Canada, and the Caribbean.

(4) In 2015, Mexican heroin accounted for 93 percent of the total weight of heroin seized in the United States, transported to the United States by transnational criminal organizations that maintain territorial influence over large regions in Mexico and remain the greatest criminal drug threat to the United States.

(5) The United States and the People's Republic of China, Mexico, and Canada have made important strides in combating the illicit flow of opioids through bilateral efforts of their respective law enforcement agencies.

(6) Insufficient regulation of synthetic opioid production and export and insufficient law enforcement efforts to combat opioid trafficking in the People's Republic of China and Mexico continue to contribute to a flood of opioids into the United States.

(7) While the Department of the Treasury used the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1901 et seq.) to sanction the first synthetic opioid trafficking entity in April 2018, precision economic and financial sanctions policy tools are needed to address the flow of synthetic opioids.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the United States should apply economic and other financial sanctions to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids to protect the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States; and

(2) it is imperative that the People's Republic of China follow through on the commitments it made to the United States on December 6, 2018, through the Group of Twenty—

(A) to schedule the entire category of fentanyl-type substances as controlled substances; and

(B) to change its national and provincial laws and increase provincial law enforcement efforts to prosecute traffickers of fentanyl substances.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ALIEN; NATIONAL; NATIONAL OF THE UNITED STATES.—The terms ''alien'', ''national'', and ''national of the United States'' have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees and leadership'' means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Speaker and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(3) CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE; LISTED CHEMICAL.—The terms ''controlled substance'', ''listed chemical'', ''narcotic drug'', and ''opioid'' have the meanings given those terms in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802).

(4) ENTITY.—The term ''entity'' means a partnership, joint venture, association, corporation, organization, network, group, or subgroup, or any form of business collaboration.

(5) FOREIGN OPIOID TRAFFICKER.—The term ''foreign opioid trafficker'' means any foreign person that the President determines plays a significant role in opioid trafficking.

(6) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person''—

(A) means—

(i) any citizen or national of a foreign country; or

(ii) any entity not organized under the laws of the United States or a jurisdiction within the United States; and

(B) does not include the government of a foreign country.

(7) KNOWINGLY.—The term ''knowingly'', with respect to conduct, a circumstance, or a result, means that a person has actual knowledge, or should have known, of the conduct, the circumstance, or the result.

(8) OPIOID TRAFFICKING.—The term ''opioid trafficking'' means any illicit activity—

(A) to cultivate, produce, manufacture, distribute, sell, or knowingly finance or transport illicit opioids, controlled substances that are opioids, listed chemicals that are opioids, or active pharmaceutical ingredients or chemicals that are used in the production of controlled substances that are opioids;

(B) to attempt to carry out an activity described in subparagraph (A); or

(C) to assist, abet, conspire, or collude with other persons to carry out such an activity.

(9) PERSON.—The term ''person'' means an individual or entity.

(10) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) any citizen or national of the United States;

(B) any alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States;

(C) any entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States (including a foreign branch of such an entity); or

(D) any person located in the United States.

TITLE I—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN OPIOID TRAFFICKERS

SEC. 101. IDENTIFICATION OF FOREIGN OPIOID TRAFFICKERS.

(a) PUBLIC REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, in accordance with subsection (c), a report—

(A) identifying the foreign persons that the President determines are foreign opioid traffickers;

(B) detailing progress the President has made in implementing this title; and

(C) providing an update on cooperative efforts with the Governments of Mexico and

the People's Republic of China with respect to combating foreign opioid traffickers.

(2) IDENTIFICATION OF ADDITIONAL PERSONS.—If, at any time after submitting a report required by paragraph (1) and before the submission of the next such report, the President determines that a foreign person not identified in the report is a foreign opioid trafficker, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership an additional report containing the information required by paragraph (1) with respect to the foreign person.

(3) EXCLUSION.—The President shall not be required to include in a report under paragraph (1) or (2) any persons with respect to which the United States has imposed sanctions before the date of the report under this title or any other provision of law with respect to opioid trafficking.

(4) FORM OF REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report required by paragraph (1) or (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(B) AVAILABILITY TO PUBLIC.—The unclassified portion of a report required by paragraph (1) or (2) shall be made available to the public.

(b) CLASSIFIED REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, in accordance with subsection (c), a report, in classified form—

(A) describing in detail the status of sanctions imposed under this title, including the personnel and resources directed toward the imposition of such sanctions during the preceding fiscal year;

(B) providing background information with respect to persons newly identified as foreign opioid traffickers and their illicit activities;

(C) describing actions the President intends to undertake or has undertaken to implement this title; and

(D) providing a strategy for identifying additional foreign opioid traffickers.

(2) EFFECT ON OTHER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) is in addition to the obligations of the President to keep Congress fully and currently informed pursuant to the provisions of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.).

(c) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter until the date that is 5 years after such date of enactment, the President shall submit the reports required by subsections (a) and (b) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

(d) EXCLUSION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—

(1) INTELLIGENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a report required by subsection (a) or (b) shall not disclose the identity of any person if the Director of National Intelligence determines that such disclosure could compromise an intelligence operation, activity, source, or method of the United States.

(2) LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a report required by subsection (a) or (b) shall not disclose the identity of any person if the Attorney General, in coordination, as appropriate, with the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration, the head of any other appropriate Federal law enforcement agency, and the Secretary of the Treasury, determines that such disclosure could reasonably be expected—

(A) to compromise the identity of a confidential source, including a State, local, or foreign agency or authority or any private institution that furnished information on a confidential basis;

(B) to jeopardize the integrity or success of an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution;

(C) to endanger the life or physical safety of any person; or

(D) to cause substantial harm to physical property.

(3) NOTIFICATION REQUIRED.—If the Director of National Intelligence makes a determination under paragraph (1) or the Attorney General makes a determination under paragraph (2), the Director or the Attorney General, as the case may be, shall notify the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(e) PROVISION OF INFORMATION REQUIRED FOR REPORTS.—The Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Homeland Security, and the Director of National Intelligence shall consult among themselves and provide to the President and the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy the appropriate and necessary information to enable the President to submit the reports required by subsection (a).

SEC. 102. SENSE OF CONGRESS AND REPORTING ON INTERNATIONAL OPIOID CONTROL REGIME.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in order to apply economic and other financial sanctions to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids to protect the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States—

(1) the President should instruct the Secretary of State to commence immediately diplomatic efforts, both in appropriate international fora such as the United Nations, the Group of Seven, the Group of Twenty, trilaterally and bilaterally with partners of the United States, to establish a multilateral sanctions regime against foreign opioid traffickers; and

(2) the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, may consider forming a new coalition of countries to establish a multilateral sanctions regime against foreign opioid traffickers if certain countries in existing multilateral fora fail to cooperate with respect to establishing such a regime.

(b) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall include, in each report required by section 101(b), an assessment conducted by the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, of the extent to which any diplomatic efforts described in subsection (a) have been successful.

(2) ELEMENTS.—Each assessment required by paragraph (1) shall include an identification of—

(A) the countries the governments of which have agreed to undertake measures to apply economic or other financial sanctions to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids and a description of those measures; and

(B) the countries the governments of which have not agreed to measures described in subparagraph (A), and, with respect to those countries, other measures the Secretary of State recommends that the United States take to apply economic and other financial sanctions to foreign traffickers of illicit opioids.

SEC. 103. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.

The President shall impose 5 or more of the sanctions described in section 104 with respect to each foreign person that is an entity, and 4 or more of such sanctions with respect to each foreign person that is an individual, that—

(1) is identified as a foreign opioid trafficker in a report submitted under section 101(a); or

(2) the President determines is owned, controlled, directed by, supplying or sourcing precursors for, or acting for or on behalf of, such a foreign opioid trafficker.

SEC. 104. DESCRIPTION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions that may be imposed with respect to a foreign person under section 103 are the following:

(1) LOANS FROM UNITED STATES FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The United States Government may prohibit any United States financial institution from making loans or providing credits to the foreign person.

(2) PROHIBITIONS ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS.—The following prohibitions may be imposed with respect to a foreign person that is a financial institution:

(A) PROHIBITION ON DESIGNATION AS PRIMARY DEALER.—Neither the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System nor the Federal Reserve Bank of New York may designate, or permit the continuation of any prior designation of, the financial institution as a primary dealer in United States Government debt instruments.

(B) PROHIBITION ON SERVICE AS A REPOSITORY OF GOVERNMENT FUNDS.—The financial institution may not serve as agent of the United States Government or serve as repository for United States Government funds.

The imposition of either sanction under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be treated as one sanction for purposes of section 103, and the imposition of both such sanctions shall be treated as 2 sanctions for purposes of that section.

(3) PROCUREMENT BAN.—The United States Government may not procure, or enter into any contract for the procurement of, any goods or services from the foreign person.

(4) FOREIGN EXCHANGE.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transactions in foreign exchange that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and in which the foreign person has any interest.

(5) BANKING TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any transfers of credit or payments between financial institutions or by, through, or to any financial institution, to the extent that such transfers or payments are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and involve any interest of the foreign person.

(6) PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe, prohibit any person from—

(A) acquiring, holding, withholding, using, transferring, withdrawing, transporting, importing, or exporting any property that is subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and with respect to which the foreign person has any interest;

(B) dealing in or exercising any right, power, or privilege with respect to such property; or

(C) conducting any transaction involving such property.

(7) BAN ON INVESTMENT IN EQUITY OR DEBT OF SANCTIONED PERSON.—The President may, pursuant to such regulations or guidelines as the President may prescribe, prohibit any United States person from investing in or purchasing significant amounts of equity or debt instruments of the foreign person.

(8) EXCLUSION OF CORPORATE OFFICERS.—The President may direct the Secretary of State to deny a visa to, and the Secretary of Homeland Security to exclude from the United States, any alien that the President determines is a corporate officer or principal of, or a shareholder with a controlling interest in, the foreign person.

(9) SANCTIONS ON PRINCIPAL EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.—The President may impose on the

principal executive officer or officers of the foreign person, or on individuals performing similar functions and with similar authorities as such officer or officers, any of the sanctions described in paragraphs (1) through (8) that are applicable.

(b) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out subsection (a) shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under this section shall not apply with respect to any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.) or to any authorized intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—The authority to impose sanctions under subsection (a)(6) shall not include the authority to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(3) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under subsection (a)(8) shall not apply to an alien if admitting the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other applicable international obligations.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION; REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this section.

(2) REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—The President shall issue such regulations, licenses, and orders as are necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 105. WAIVERS.

(a) WAIVER FOR STATE-OWNED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN COUNTRIES THAT COOPERATE IN MULTILATERAL ANTI-TRAFFICKING EFFORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, on a case-by-case basis, waive for a period of not more than 12 months the application of sanctions under this title with respect to a financial institution that is owned or controlled, directly or indirectly, by a foreign government or any political subdivision, agency, or instrumentality of a foreign government, if the President, not less than 30 days before the waiver is to take effect, certifies to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership that the foreign government is closely cooperating with the United States in efforts to prevent opioid trafficking.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—The President may certify under paragraph (1) that a foreign government is closely cooperating with the United States in efforts to prevent opioid trafficking if that government is—

(A) implementing domestic laws to schedule all fentanyl analogues as controlled substances; and

(B) doing 2 or more of the following:

(i) Implementing substantial improvements in regulations involving the chemical and pharmaceutical production and export of illicit opioids.

(ii) Implementing substantial improvements in judicial regulations to combat transnational criminal organizations that traffic opioids.

(iii) Increasing efforts to prosecute foreign opioid traffickers.

(iv) Increasing intelligence sharing and law enforcement cooperation with the United States with respect to opioid trafficking.

(3) SUBSEQUENT RENEWAL OF WAIVER.—The President may renew a waiver under paragraph (1) for subsequent periods of not more than 6 months each if, not less than 30 days before the renewal is to take effect, the Director of National Intelligence certifies to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership that the government of the country to which the waiver applies has effectively implemented and is effectively enforcing the measures that formed the basis for the certification under paragraph (2).

(b) WAIVERS FOR NATIONAL SECURITY AND ACCESS TO PRESCRIPTION MEDICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under this title with respect to a person if the President determines that the application of such sanctions with respect to that person would significantly harm—

(A) the national security of the United States; or

(B) subject to paragraph (2), the access of United States persons to prescription medications.

(2) MONITORING.—The President shall establish a monitoring program to verify that a person receiving a waiver under paragraph (1)(B) is not trafficking illicit opioids.

(3) NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 21 days after making a determination under paragraph (1) with respect to a person, the President shall notify the appropriate congressional committees and leadership of the determination and the reasons for the determination.

(c) HUMANITARIAN WAIVER.—The President may waive, for renewable periods of 180 days, the application of the sanctions under this title if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership that the waiver is necessary for the provision of humanitarian assistance.

SEC. 106. PROCEDURES FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If a finding under this title, or a prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding, is based on classified information (as defined in section 1(a) of the Classified Information Procedures Act (18 U.S.C. App.)) and a court reviews the finding or the imposition of the prohibition, condition, or penalty, the President may submit such information to the court ex parte and in camera.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to confer or imply any right to judicial review of any finding under this title, or any prohibition, condition, or penalty imposed as a result of any such finding.

SEC. 107. BRIEFINGS ON IMPLEMENTATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Fentanyl Sanctions Act, and every 180 days thereafter until the date that is 5 years after such date of enactment, the President, acting through the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall provide to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a comprehensive briefing on efforts to implement this title.

TITLE II—COMMISSION ON COMBATING SYNTHETIC OPIOID TRAFFICKING

SEC. 201. COMMISSION ON COMBATING SYNTHETIC OPIOID TRAFFICKING.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established a commission to develop a consensus on a strategic approach to combating the flow of synthetic opioids into the United States.

(2) DESIGNATION.—The commission established under paragraph (1) shall be known as the ''Commission on Synthetic Opioid Trafficking'' (in this section referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Commission shall be composed of the following members:

(i) The Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

(ii) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

(iii) The Secretary of Defense.

(iv) The Secretary of the Treasury.

(v) The Secretary of State.

(vi) Two members appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, one of whom shall be a Member of the Senate and one of whom shall not be.

(vii) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, one of whom shall be a Member of the Senate and one of whom shall not be.

(viii) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be a Member of the House of Representatives and one of whom shall not be.

(ix) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, one of whom shall be a Member of the House of Representatives and one of whom shall not be.

(B)(i) The members of the Commission who are not Members of Congress and who are appointed under clauses (vi) through (ix) of subparagraph (A) shall be individuals who are nationally recognized for expertise, knowledge, or experience in—

(I) transnational criminal organizations conducting synthetic opioid trafficking;

(II) the production, manufacturing, distribution, sale, or transportation of synthetic opioids; or

(III) relations between—

(aa) the United States; and

(bb) the People's Republic of China, Mexico, or any other country of concern with respect to trafficking in synthetic opioids.

(ii) An official who appoints members of the Commission may not appoint an individual as a member of the Commission if the individual possesses any personal or financial interest in the discharge of any of the duties of the Commission.

(iii)(I) All members of the Commission described in clause (i) shall possess an appropriate security clearance in accordance with applicable provisions of law concerning the handling of classified information.

(II) For the purpose of facilitating the activities of the Commission, the Director of National Intelligence shall expedite to the fullest degree possible the processing of security clearances that are necessary for members of the Commission.

(2) CO-CHAIRS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall have 2 co-chairs, selected from among the members of the Commission, one of whom shall be a member of the majority party and one of whom shall be a member of the minority party.

(B) SELECTION.—The individuals who serve as the co-chairs of the Commission shall be jointly agreed upon by the President, the majority leader of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(c) DUTIES.—The duties of the Commission are as follows:

(1) To define the core objectives and priorities of the strategic approach described in subsection (a)(1).

(2) To weigh the costs and benefits of various strategic options to combat the flow of

synthetic opioids from the People's Republic of China, Mexico, and other countries.

(3) To evaluate whether the options described in paragraph (2) are exclusive or complementary, the best means for executing such options, and how the United States should incorporate and implement such options within the strategic approach described in subsection (a)(1).

(4) To review and make determinations on the difficult choices present within such options, among them what norms-based regimes the United States should seek to establish to encourage the effective regulation of dangerous synthetic opioids.

(5) To report on efforts by actors in the People's Republic of China to subvert United States laws and to supply illicit synthetic opioids to persons in the United States, including up-to-date estimates of the scale of illicit synthetic opioids flows from the People's Republic of China.

(6) To report on the deficiencies in the regulation of pharmaceutical and chemical production of controlled substances and export controls with respect to such substances in the People's Republic of China and other countries that allow opioid traffickers to subvert such regulations and controls to traffic illicit opioids into the United States.

(7) To report on the scale of contaminated or counterfeit drugs originating from the People's Republic of China and India.

(8) To report on how the United States could work more effectively with provincial and local officials in the People's Republic of China and other countries to combat the illicit production of synthetic opioids.

(9) In weighing the options for defending the United States against the dangers of trafficking in synthetic opioids, to consider possible structures and authorities that need to be established, revised, or augmented within the Federal Government.

(d) FUNCTIONING OF COMMISSION.—The provisions of subsections (c), (d), (e), (g), (h), (i), and (m) of section 1652 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232) shall apply to the Commission to the same extent and in the same manner as such provisions apply to the commission established under that section, except that—

(1) subsection (c)(1) of that section shall be applied and administered by substituting ''30 days'' for ''45 days'';

(2) subsection (g)(4)(A) of that section shall be applied and administered by inserting ''and the Attorney General'' after ''Secretary of Defense''; and

(3) subsections (h)(2)(A) and (i)(1)(A) of that section shall be applied and administered by substituting ''level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316'' for ''level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315''.

(e) TREATMENT OF INFORMATION RELATING TO NATIONAL SECURITY.—

(1) RESPONSIBILITY OF DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.—The Director of National Intelligence shall assume responsibility for the handling and disposition of any information related to the national security of the United States that is received, considered, or used by the Commission under this section.

(2) INFORMATION PROVIDED BY CONGRESS.—Any information related to the national security of the United States that is provided to the Commission by the appropriate congressional committees and leadership may not be further provided or released without the approval of the chairperson of the committee, or the Member of Congress, as the case may be, that provided the information to the Commission.

(3) ACCESS AFTER TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, after the termination of the Commission under subsection (h), only the members and designated staff of the appropriate congressional committees and leadership, the Director of National Intelligence (and the designees of the Director), and such other officials of the executive branch as the President may designate shall have access to information related to the national security of the United States that is received, considered, or used by the Commission.

(f) REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership—

(1) not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, an initial report on the activities and recommendations of the Commission under this section; and

(2) not later than 270 days after the submission of the initial report under paragraph (1), a final report on the activities and recommendations of the Commission under this section.

(g) LIMITATION ON FUNDING.—Of amounts made available under sections 302, 303, and 304 to carry out this Act, not more than $5,000,000 shall be available to the Commission in any of fiscal years 2020 through 2025.

(h) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, and all the authorities of this section, shall terminate at the end of the 120-day period beginning on the date on which the final report required by subsection (f)(2) is submitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

(2) WINDING UP OF AFFAIRS.—The Commission may use the 120-day period described in paragraph (1) for the purposes of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to Congress concerning the final report required by subsection (f)(2) and disseminating the report.

TITLE III—OTHER MATTERS

SEC. 301. DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE PROGRAM ON USE OF INTELLIGENCE RESOURCES IN EFFORTS TO SANCTION FOREIGN OPIOID TRAFFICKERS.

(a) PROGRAM REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of National Intelligence shall, with the concurrence of the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, carry out a program to allocate and enhance use of resources of the intelligence community, including intelligence collection and analysis, to assist the Secretary of the Treasury and the Administrator of the Drug Enforcement Administration in efforts to identify and impose sanctions with respect to foreign opioid traffickers under title I.

(2) FOCUS ON ILLICIT FINANCE.—To the extent practicable, efforts described in paragraph (1) shall—

(A) take into account specific illicit finance risks related to narcotics trafficking; and

(B) be developed in consultation with the Undersecretary of the Treasury for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, appropriate officials of the Office of Intelligence and Analysis of the Department of the Treasury, the Director of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, and appropriate Federal law enforcement agencies.

(b) REVIEW OF COUNTERNARCOTICS EFFORTS OF THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The Director of National Intelligence shall, in coordination with the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, carry out a comprehensive review of the current intelligence collection priorities of the intelligence community for counternarcotics purposes in order to identify whether such priorities are appropriate and sufficient in light of the number of lives lost in the United States each year due to use of illegal drugs.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) QUARTERLY REPORTS ON PROGRAM.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report on the status and accomplishments of the program required by subsection (a) during the 90-day period ending on the date of the report. The first report under this paragraph shall also include a description of the amount of funds devoted by the intelligence community to the efforts described in subsection (a) during each of fiscal years 2017 and 2018.

(2) REPORT ON REVIEW.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence and the Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy shall jointly submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a comprehensive description of the results of the review required by subsection (b), including whether the priorities described in that subsection are appropriate and sufficient in light of the number of lives lost in the United States each year due to use of illegal drugs. If the report concludes that such priorities are not so appropriate and sufficient, the report shall also include a description of the actions to be taken to modify such priorities in order to assure than such priorities are so appropriate and sufficient.

(d) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning given that term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

SEC. 302. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDING.

(a) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—Subject to subsection (b), amounts authorized to be appropriated for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2025 for the Department of Defense for operation and maintenance shall be available for operations and activities described in subsection (c).

(b) LIMITATION ON AMOUNT AVAILABLE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount available under subsection (a) in a fiscal year to carry out operations and activities described in subsection (c) may not exceed the following:

(A) In fiscal year 2020, $25,000,000.

(B) In each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, $35,000,000.

(2) EXCLUSION OF FUNDS FOR US SOUTHCOM FROM LIMITATION.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated for a fiscal year for operation and maintenance and available for such fiscal year for the United States Southern Command for operations and activities described in subsection (c)(2) shall not count toward the limitation applicable to such fiscal year under paragraph (1).

(c) OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES.—The operations and activities described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The operations and activities of any department or agency of the United States Government (other than the Department of Defense) in carrying out this Act.

(2) The operations and activities of the Department of Defense in support of any other department or agency of the United States Government in carrying out this Act.

(d) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may transfer funds authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense as described in subsection (a) to any other department or agency of the United States Government to carry out this Act.

(2) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Any transfer under this subsection shall not be subject to

any reprogramming requirements under law. However, a notice on any such transfer shall be provided to the appropriate committees of Congress.

(3) INAPPLICABILITY OF TRANSFER LIMITATIONS.—Any transfer under this subsection in a fiscal year shall not count toward or apply against any limitation on amounts transferrable by the Department of Defense in such fiscal year, including any limitation specified in an annual defense authorization Act for such fiscal year.

SEC. 303. DEPARTMENT OF STATE FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State to carry out the operations and activities described in subsection (b)—

(1) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

(2) $35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(b) OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—The operations and activities described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The operations and activities of any department or agency of the United States Government (other than the Department of State) in carrying out this Act.

(2) The operations and activities of the Department of State in support of any other department or agency of the United States Government in carrying out this Act.

(c) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), amounts authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) may not be obligated until 15 days after the date on which the President notifies the appropriate committees of Congress of the President's intention to obligate such funds.

(2) WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may waive the notification requirement under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

(B) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—If the Secretary exercises the authority provided under subparagraph (A) to waive the notification requirement under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress of the President's intention to obligate amounts authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after obligating such funds.

(d) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State may transfer funds authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) to any other department or agency of the United States Government to carry out this Act.

(2) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Any transfer under this subsection shall not be subject to any reprogramming requirements under law. However, a notice on any such transfer shall be provided to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 304. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out the operations and activities described in subsection (b)—

(1) $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2020; and

(2) $35,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025.

(b) OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—The operations and activities described in this subsection are the following:

(1) The operations and activities of any department or agency of the United States Government (other than the Department of the Treasury) in carrying out this Act.

(2) The operations and activities of the Department of the Treasury in support of any other department or agency of the United States Government in carrying out this Act.

(c) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), amounts authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) may not be obligated until 15 days after the date on which the President notifies the appropriate committees of Congress of the President's intention to obligate such funds.

(2) WAIVER.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may waive the notification requirement under paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

(B) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT.—If the Secretary exercises the authority provided under subparagraph (A) to waive the notification requirement under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress of the President's intention to obligate amounts authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) as soon as practicable, but not later than 3 days after obligating such funds.

(d) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury may transfer funds authorized to be appropriated by subsection (a) to any other department or agency of the United States Government to carry out this Act.

(2) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS.—Any transfer under this subsection shall not be subject to any reprogramming requirements under law. However, a notice on any such transfer shall be provided to the appropriate committees of Congress.

SEC. 305. APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 141—CELEBRATING THE HERITAGE OF ROMANI AMERICANS

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

S. RES. 141

Whereas the Romani people trace their ancestry to the Indian subcontinent;

Whereas Roma have been a part of European immigration to the United States since the colonial period and particularly following the abolition of the enslavement of Roma in the historic Romanian principalities;

Whereas Roma live across the world and throughout the United States;

Whereas the Romani people have made distinct and important contributions in many fields, including agriculture, art, crafts, literature, medicine, military service, music, sports, and science;

Whereas, on April 8, 1971, the First World Romani Congress met in London, bringing Roma together from across Europe and the United States with the goal of promoting transnational cooperation among Roma in combating social marginalization and building a positive future for Roma everywhere;

Whereas April 8 is therefore celebrated globally as International Roma Day;

Whereas Roma were victims of genocide carried out by Nazi Germany and its Axis partners, and an estimated 200,000 to 500,000 Romani people were killed by Nazis and their allies across Europe during World War II;

Whereas, on the night of August 2–3, 1944, the so-called ''Gypsy Family Camp'' where Romani people were interned at Auschwitz-Birkenau was liquidated, and in a single night, between 4,200 and 4,300 Romani men, women, and children were killed in gas chambers;

Whereas 2019 is the 75th anniversary of that tragic event;

Whereas many countries are taking positive steps to remember and teach about the genocide of Roma by Nazi Germany and its Axis partners; and

Whereas the United States Congress held its first hearing to examine the situation of Roma in 1994: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) remembers the genocide of Roma by Nazi Germany and its Axis partners and commemorates the 75th anniversary of the destruction of the ''Gypsy Family Camp'' where Romani people were interned at Auschwitz;

(2) commends the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum for its role in promoting remembrance of the Holocaust and educating about the genocide of Roma;

(3) supports International Roma Day as an opportunity to honor the culture, history, and heritage of the Romani people in the United States as part of the larger Romani global diaspora; and

(4) welcomes the Department of State's participation in ceremonies and events celebrating International Roma Day and similar engagement by the United States Government.

SENATE RESOLUTION 142—CONDEMNING THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINES FOR ITS CONTINUED DETENTION OF SENATOR LEILA DE LIMA, CALLING FOR HER IMMEDIATE RELEASE, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 142

Whereas extrajudicial killings perpetrated by the Government of the Philippines as part of a Government-directed antidrug campaign present the foremost human rights challenge in the Philippines;

Whereas the Department of State's 2017 Human Rights Report notes numerous human rights concerns, including the persecution of human rights defenders and the detention of political prisoners in the Philippines, stating, ''The most significant human rights issues included: killings by security forces, vigilantes and others allegedly connected to the government, and by insurgents; torture and abuse of prisoners and detainees by security forces; often harsh and life threatening prison conditions; warrantless arrests by security forces and cases of apparent government disregard for

legal rights and due process; political prisoners; killings of and threats against journalists; official corruption and abuse of power; threats of violence against human rights activists; violence against women; and forced labor.'';

Whereas, on February 23, 2017, an arrest warrant was issued for Philippine Senator Leila De Lima for allegations related to drug trafficking, and as of April 4, 2019, Senator de Lima had been detained for 770 days;

Whereas the charges brought against Senator De Lima followed a history of criticizing extrajudicial killings in the Philippines and the Rodrigo R. Duterte administration's antidrug campaign, including—

(1) in 2009, in her capacity as Chair of the Commission on Human Rights, Senator De Lima investigated the alleged involvement of then-Mayor of Davao City Rodrigo R. Duterte in the extrajudicial killings executed by the so-called ''Davao Death Squad'';

(2) on December 15, 2014, then-Secretary of Justice De Lima led a raid of the national penitentiary which resulted in the confiscation of drugs, firearms, and contraband items and the extraction of 19 drug lords and high-profile inmates involved in the facility's drug network;

(3) on July 13, 2016, Senator De Lima, in her capacity as Chair of the Senate Committee on Justice and Human Rights, filed Senate Resolution No. 9 calling for an investigation into extrajudicial killings and summary executions of suspected drug offenders arising from President Duterte's ''War on Drugs'';

(4) on August 22, 2016, Senator De Lima conducted Senate hearings during which alleged former death squad members detailed extrajudicial killings executed as part of the antidrug campaign and one member testified that Duterte participated in extrajudicial killings as mayor of Davao City; and

(5) on August 2, 2016, and September 19, 2016, Senator De Lima delivered two privileged speeches on the Senate floor calling on President Duterte to end the killings;

Whereas President Duterte vowed to publicly destroy Senator De Lima;

Whereas the charges against Senator De Lima were supported by testimony from inmates whose illegal activities were disrupted by her 2014 raid;

Whereas the United Nations Human Rights Council's Working Group on Arbitrary Detention adopted an Opinion on August 24, 2018, finding several categories of arbitrary detention and concluding, ''Ms. De Lima's political views and convictions are clearly at the centre of the present case and that the authorities have displayed an attitude towards her that can only be characterized as targeted and discriminatory. Indeed, she has been the target of partisan persecution and there is no explanation for this other than her exercise of the right to express such views and convictions as a human rights defender.'';

Whereas the Department of State's 2017 Human Rights Report highlighted due process obstructions in the case of Senator De Lima, stating, ''During the year prosecutors used a variety of legal tactics, including filing new and amending previous charges, to delay arraignment.'';

Whereas the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention recommended that the Government of the Philippines adopt certain measures, including—

(1) the immediate release of Senator De Lima;

(2) an independent investigation of the circumstances surrounding the arbitrary detention; and

(3) the provision of compensation and other reparations, including reinstatement to the positions from which she was ousted;

Whereas, on July 20, 2017, the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission of the United States Congress held a hearing on The Human Rights Consequences of the War on Drugs in the Philippines, during which Human Rights Watch testified about the ''relentless government campaign'' against Senator De Lima ''in evident response to her outspoken criticism of Duterte's 'war on drugs' and her calls for accountability'';

Whereas Amnesty International finds Senator De Lima's detention to be based solely on her criticism of the Government of the Philippines, her political beliefs, and her peaceful defense of human rights, and considers her a Prisoner of Conscience; and

Whereas the immediate release of Senator De Lima has been called for by nongovernmental organizations, human rights groups, parliamentary bodies, and individuals including the European Parliament, the Australian Parliament, the Inter-Parliamentary Union, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, Liberal International, ASEAN Parliamentarians for Human Rights, and many of Senator De Lima's colleagues in the Senate minority bloc;

Whereas Maria Ressa, an investigative journalist who founded the online news platform *Rappler*, has been arrested several times on charges against her and her news organization widely viewed by human rights observers and a number of governments as part of a pattern of ''weaponizing the rule of law'' to repress independent media; and

Whereas Ms. Ressa has been released on bail, but she and *Rappler* still face charges and will soon be standing trial: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns—

(A) the Government of the Philippines for its role in state-sanctioned extrajudicial killings by police and other armed individuals as part of the ''War on Drugs'';

(B) the arrest and detention of human rights defenders and political leaders who exercise their rights to freedom of expression;

(C) the harassment, arrest, and unjustified judicial proceedings against the media and journalists, in particular, the proceeding against *Rappler* and Maria Ressa; and

(D) the continued detention of Senator Leila De Lima;

(2) considers Senator De Lima to be a prisoner of conscience, detained solely on account of her political views and the legitimate exercise of her freedom of expression;

(3) calls on the Government of the Philippines to immediately release Senator De Lima, drop all charges against her, remove restrictions on her personal and work conditions, and allow her to fully discharge her legislative mandate, especially as Chair of the Committee on Social Justice;

(4) urges the Government of the Philippines to recognize the importance of human rights defenders and their work and allow them to operate freely without fear of reprisal; and

(5) urges the Government of the Philippines to guarantee the right to the freedom of the press, and to drop all the charges against Maria Ressa and *Rappler*.

SENATE RESOLUTION 143—RECOGNIZING ISRAELI-AMERICAN CULTURE AND HERITAGE AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE ISRAELI-AMERICAN COMMUNITY TO THE UNITED STATES

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

S. RES. 143

Whereas Israeli-Americans are a vibrant immigrant community contributing to the diversity of the United States;

Whereas Israeli-Americans, including those on college campuses in the United States, have been subject to forms of discrimination and desire to connect with their culture and celebrate their heritage free from bigotry and bias;

Whereas the United States is a nation of immigrants, and Israeli-Americans contribute invaluable skills that promote the economy and protect the national security of the United States;

Whereas the contributions of Israeli-Americans in the fields of astrophysics, mathematics, chemistry, aerospace engineering, biotech, agriculture, and Internet technologies have been invaluable to the United States;

Whereas Israeli-Americans have helped to form a strong bond between the people of the United States and the people of Israel, reinforcing the shared values and interests between the two countries; and

Whereas countless Israeli-Americans have enriched the society of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that the Israeli-American community has contributed immensely to the society and culture of the United States; and

(2) condemns all forms of discrimination that aim to marginalize or disenfranchise members of the Israeli-American community.

SENATE RESOLUTION 144—DESIGNATING MAY 5, 2019, AS THE ''NATIONAL DAY OF AWARENESS FOR MISSING AND MURDERED NATIVE WOMEN AND GIRLS''

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LANKFORD, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 144

Whereas, according to a study commissioned by the Department of Justice, in some Tribal communities, American Indian women face murder rates that are more than 10 times the national average murder rate;

Whereas, according to the most recently available data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 2017, homicide was the sixth leading cause of death for American Indian and Alaska Native females between 1 and 44 years of age;

Whereas little data exist on the number of missing American Indian and Alaska Native women in the United States;

Whereas, on July 5, 2013, Hanna Harris, a member of the Northern Cheyenne Tribe, was reported missing by her family in Lame Deer, Montana;

Whereas the body of Hanna Harris was found 5 days after she went missing;

Whereas Hanna Harris was determined to have been raped and murdered, and the individuals accused of committing those crimes were convicted;

Whereas the case of Hanna Harris is an example of many similar cases; and

Whereas Hanna Harris was born on May 5, 1992: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 5, 2019, as the ''National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls''; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups—

(A) to commemorate the lives of missing and murdered American Indian and Alaska Native women whose cases are documented and undocumented in public records and the media; and

(B) to demonstrate solidarity with the families of victims in light of those tragedies.

SENATE RESOLUTION 145—COMMEMORATING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF RABBI ISAAC MAYER WISE AND THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 145

Whereas March 29, 2019, marks the bicentennial of the birth of Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise (referred to in this preamble as ''Rabbi Wise'') on March 29, 1819;

Whereas Rabbi Wise—

(1) moved to Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1854; and

(2) resided in Cincinnati, Ohio, until his death in 1900;

Whereas Rabbi Wise is widely recognized as—

(1) the pioneering architect of Reform Judaism in the United States; and

(2) the founding organizer of Reform Jewish institutions in the United States;

Whereas the United States is home to the largest Reform Jewish community in the world, which considers Rabbi Wise to be 1 of the preeminent founders;

Whereas in 1873, Rabbi Wise founded the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, now known as the Union for Reform Judaism;

Whereas in 1875, Rabbi Wise founded Hebrew Union College, now known as Hebrew Union College–Jewish Institute of Religion, which, as of March 2019—

(1) has campuses in—

(A) Cincinnati, Ohio;

(B) Los Angeles, California;

(C) New York, New York; and

(D) Jerusalem;

(2) is the premier Jewish seminary in North America; and

(3) is the academic, spiritual, and professional leadership development center of Reform Judaism;

Whereas in 1889, Rabbi Wise founded the Central Conference of American Rabbis;

Whereas in 2019—

(1) the annual convention of the Central Conference of American Rabbis shall be held in Cincinnati, Ohio; and

(2) the Central Conference of American Rabbis shall celebrate the 130th anniversary of the founding of the Central Conference of American Rabbis at that convention;

Whereas the Senate congratulates the Central Conference of American Rabbis for reaching the significant milestone of 130 years as an organization; and

Whereas, for 130 years, the Central Conference of American Rabbis has made invaluable contributions to the cultural and religious fabric of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes March 29, 2019, as the bicentennial of the birth of Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise (referred to in this resolving clause as ''Rabbi Wise'');

(2) recognizes the outstanding accomplishments of Rabbi Wise, which have had an enduring effect on life, culture, and religion in the United States;

(3) recognizes the extraordinary role of Rabbi Wise in the history of the United States; and

(4) congratulates the Central Conference of American Rabbis on the 130th anniversary of the founding of the conference by Rabbi Wise.

SENATE RESOLUTION 146—RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. WICKER (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 146

Whereas 2019 marks the 100th anniversary of the founding of the Institute of International Education (referred to in this preamble as the ''IIE''), the oldest educational exchange organization in the United States;

Whereas the trustees of the IIE and the students and scholars associated with the IIE have contributed to their societies in numerous ways and have been recognized with 108 Nobel Prizes;

Whereas the IIE was founded by former Secretary of State Elihu Root, President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University, and Professor Stephen Duggan, Sr., of the College of the City of New York, with support from the Carnegie Corporation of New York;

Whereas the IIE was established to demonstrate that the international exchange of people and ideas can transcend borders and promote greater understanding and peace;

Whereas the IIE is privileged to administer 200 programs that promote mutual understanding and enhance the national security and economic competitiveness of the United States, including—

(1) the Fulbright Program, the flagship international exchange program sponsored by the United States Government;

(2) the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, which enables high-performing United States undergraduate students of limited financial means to study or intern abroad;

(3) the Hubert H. Humphrey Fellowship Program, which provides a year of enrichment in the United States for experienced professionals from designated countries undergoing development or political transition;

(4) Open Doors, the comprehensive information resource on—

(A) international students and scholars studying or teaching at higher education institutions in the United States; and

(B) students from the United States studying abroad for academic credit at their home colleges or universities;

(5) EducationUSA, the network of over 425 international student advising centers in 178 countries that promotes higher education in the United States to students around the world;

(6) the International Visitor Leadership Program, the premier professional exchange program of the Department of State;

(7) TechWomen, a mentorship and exchange program pairing emerging international women leaders in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics with women professionals in the United States;

(8) the Boren Awards and The Language Flagship, initiatives of the National Security Education Program that invests in the next generation of leaders in the United States by supporting United States undergraduate and graduate students in learning languages critical to United States interests; and

(9) Project Global Officer, a Department of Defense initiative providing summer scholarships and year-round language training to Reserve Officers' Training Corps students for critical language study and cultural learning;

Whereas the IIE has been rescuing scholars, artists, and students threatened by war, civil and religious conflict, terrorism, and dictatorships and other forms of repression continuously since 1920;

Whereas, in 2002, the IIE endowed a permanent Scholar Rescue Fund (referred to in this preamble as the ''IIE-SRF'') to aid scholars threatened by conflict and repression in their home countries by—

(1) vetting the scholars;

(2) providing the scholars with funding; and

(3) placing the scholars at host institutions;

Whereas, since the endowment of the IIE-SRF in 2002, the IIE-SRF has—

(1) placed 793 scholars from 59 countries at 393 host institutions in 44 countries; and

(2) saved entire national academies;

Whereas building economies, helping governments and corporations develop an educated workforce, and preparing students and professionals for success in the global economy is fundamental to the work of the IIE;

Whereas there are more than 27,000 annual participants in programs developed, managed, and implemented by the IIE; and

Whereas the IIE is at the foundation of a network of colleges, universities, and communities that host over 1,000,000 international students annually, at a benefit of over $42,000,000,000 to the economy of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes—

(1) on the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Institute of International Education (referred to in this resolution as the ''IIE'') the many accomplishments of—

(A) the members and staff of the IIE; and

(B) the participants in programs administered by the IIE;

(2) the contributions of the members and staff of the IIE to—

(A) national security;

(B) economic development;

(C) advancement of cultural awareness; and

(D) cooperation among nations;

(3) the effectiveness of the IIE at promoting opportunity by—

(A) providing scholarships and administering programs that benefit underserved populations;

(B) rescuing and assisting threatened and displaced scholars, students, and artists; and

(C) encouraging teaching and learning across cultures into the future; and

(4) the important role of the IIE as a distinguished partner with the—

(A) United States Government;

(B) private sector; and

(C) nonprofit and philanthropic communities.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13—REAFFIRMING THE UNITED STATES COMMITMENT TO TAIWAN AND TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE TAIWAN RELATIONS ACT

Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 13

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act (referred to in this resolution as the ''TRA''), which was signed into law on April 10, 1979, codified into law the basis for continued commercial, cultural, and other relations between the people of the United States and the people of Taiwan, and serves as the foundation to preserve and promote continued bilateral bonds;

Whereas the TRA enshrines the United States commitment to make available to Taiwan such defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability;

Whereas pursuant to section 1206 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003 (Public Law 107–228; 22 U.S.C. 2321k note.), Taiwan is to be treated as though it were designated a major non-NATO ally for transfers of defense articles or defense services;

Whereas in 1982, President Ronald Reagan further clarified the importance and resilience of the United States-Taiwan relationship by agreeing to the Six Assurances;

Whereas the TRA and the Six Assurances are cornerstones of United States policy with respect to Taiwan, as was reaffirmed—

(1) by the House of Representatives with the adoption of H. Con. Res. 88 on May 16, 2016; and

(2) by the Senate with the adoption of S. Con. Res. 38 on July 6, 2016;

Whereas the TRA and the Six Assurances have been essential components in helping to maintain peace, security, and stability in the Western Pacific, thereby furthering the political, security, and economic interests of the United States and Taiwan;

Whereas the United States and Taiwan have forged ever closer economic and security relations during the last 4 decades based on—

(1) their shared commitment to democracy, human rights, the rule of law, and free market principles; and

(2) their willingness to partner in efforts to combat global terrorism and to address other global challenges, such as challenges related to the environment, public health, energy security, education, women's empowerment, digital economy, poverty, and natural disasters;

Whereas the United States-Taiwan global partnership was further strengthened in June 2015, with a memorandum of understanding between the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States, which established the Global Cooperation and Training Framework, and has allowed the 2 parties to cohost many workshops on critical topics, including a December 2018 workshop on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief that was attended by 10 regional governments;

Whereas Taiwan has the expertise, willingness, and capability to engage in international efforts to mitigate global challenges related to such issues as public health, aviation safety, crime, and terrorism, but its participation in such efforts has been constrained by conditions imposed by the People's Republic of China;

Whereas successive Congresses have called upon the executive branch to develop strategies to obtain meaningful participation for Taiwan in international organizations, such as the World Health Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, and the International Criminal Police Organization (commonly known as ''INTERPOL'');

Whereas the House of Representatives passed H.R. 353 on January 22, 2019, which expresses support for Taiwan's participation at the World Health Organization's World Health Assembly as an observer;

Whereas communication on bilateral security, cultural, and commercial interests would be greatly enhanced with the full implementation of the Taiwan Travel Act (Public Law 115–135), which was signed into law on March 16, 2018, and which states ''the United States Government should encourage visits between officials from the United States and Taiwan at all levels'';

Whereas the United States and Taiwan have built a strong economic partnership in which—

(1) the United States is Taiwan's third largest trading partner; and

(2) Taiwan is the 11th largest trading partner of the United States and a key destination for United States agricultural exports;

Whereas strong United States-Taiwan economic relations have been a positive factor in stimulating economic growth and job creation for the people of the United States and of Taiwan; and

Whereas successive Congresses have publicly reaffirmed United States commitments to Taiwan under the Taiwan Relations Act and Six Assurances, including most recently on December 31, 2018, with the enactment into law of the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–409), which states that—

(1) it is United States policy ''to support the close economic, political, and security relationship between Taiwan and the United States''; and

(2) the President should—

(A) ''conduct regular transfers of defense articles to Taiwan that are tailored to meet the existing and likely future threats from the People's Republic of China, including supporting the efforts of Taiwan to develop and integrate asymmetric capabilities, as appropriate, including mobile, survivable, and cost-effective capabilities, into its military forces''; and

(B) ''encourage the travel of high-level United States officials to Taiwan, in accordance with the Taiwan Travel Act'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress—

(1) reaffirms that the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances are, and will remain, cornerstones of United States relations with Taiwan;

(2) encourages United States officials at all levels to travel to meet with their counterparts in Taiwan, and for high-level Taiwan officials to enter the United States and meet with United States officials, in accordance with the Taiwan Travel Act;

(3) reiterates that the President should conduct regular transfers of defense articles to Taiwan consistent with Taiwan's national security requirements in accordance with existing law, including the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–409);

(4) calls upon the Secretary of State to actively engage internationally in support of Taiwan's meaningful participation in international organizations engaged in addressing transnational threats and challenges such as those related to health, aviation security, and crime and terrorism;

(5) recognizes Taiwan's partnership in combating global terrorism, including as a full partner in the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS, and in addressing other global challenges through the Global Cooperation and Training Framework and similar initiatives;

(6) urges the President to explore opportunities to expand and deepen bilateral economic and trade relations with Taiwan;

(7) underscores the importance of the close people-to-people ties cultivated through initiatives such as the Fulbright Program, which has supported thousands of scholar and grantee exchanges between the United States and Taiwan for 60 years;

(8) welcomes the inclusion of Taiwan into the United States visa waiver program and U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Global Entry Program to make it easier for those traveling from Taiwan to visit the United States; and

(9) acknowledges the important work done by the American Institute in Taiwan and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in support of United States-Taiwan interests.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 4, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 4, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary, and Susan Combs, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary, both of the Department of the Interior, and Aimee Kathryn Jorjani, of Wisconsin, to be Chairman of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 4, 2019, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 2:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Daniel P. Collins, and Kenneth Kiyul Lee, both of California, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, James Wesley Hendrix, and Mark T. Pittman, both to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas, Sean D. Jordan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Ronald D. Vitiello, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security, Virgil Madden, of Indiana, to be a Commissioner of the United States Parole Commission, and Nick Edward Proffitt, of Virginia, to be United States Marshal for the Eastern District of Virginia, Department of Justice.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during

the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 3, 2019, at 2.45 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AVIATION, OPERATIONS, SAFETY, AND SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Aviation, Operations, Safety, and Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, April 4, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUPPORTING THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND RECOGNIZING ITS 70 YEARS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 5, S. Res. 123.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 123) supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 70 years of accomplishments.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing none, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 123) was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

(The resolution is printed in the RECORD of March 27, 2019, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

COMMEMORATING THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF RABBI ISAAC MAYER WISE AND THE 130TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CENTRAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN RABBIS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 145, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 145) commemorating the bicentennial of the birth of Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise and the 130th anniversary of the founding of the Central Conference of American Rabbis.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 145) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF THE INSTITUTE OF INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 146, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 146) recognizing the centennial of the Institute of International Education.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 146) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2019

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 4 p.m., Monday, April 8, 2019, and 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 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.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 8, 2019, AT 4 P.M.

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 6:39 p.m., adjourned until Monday, April 8, 2019, at 4 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

FRANK WILLIAM VOLK, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA, VICE JOHN T. COPENHAVER, JR., RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

SCOTT SOLES, OF TEXAS, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, VICE JON M. HOLLADAY.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

MICHELLE BOWMAN, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM FOR A TERM OF FOURTEEN YEARS FROM FEBRUARY 1, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

ALLISON HERREN LEE, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2022, VICE KARA MARLENE STEIN, TERM EXPIRED.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

MICHAEL J.K. KRATSIOS, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY, VICE PATRICIA K. FALCONE, RESIGNED.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ALMA L. GOLDEN, OF TEXAS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE ARIEL PABLOS–MENDEZ.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

RICHARD B. NORLAND, OF IOWA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO LIBYA.

THE JUDICIARY

STEVEN D. GRIMBERG, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE RICHARD W. STORY, RETIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

RANDALL P. HUFF, OF WYOMING, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF WYOMING FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE JOSEPH CAMPBELL MOORE, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS SENIOR MILITARY ACQUISITION ADVISOR IN THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 1725(A):

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER B. ATHEARN

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

THEODORE W. KLEISNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT W. HUGHES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

LARRY R. JORDAN, JR.

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 7064:

To be major

KONTRINA S. PARK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MARCUS L. JORDAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT M. HUDSON
TERRY W. PARTIN
JAMES D. SIZEMORE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN E. CALLIHAN II
MICHAEL A. HOFFMAN
JOHN A. MEYER
JEFFREY F. RYAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

BOGUSLAW A. AUGUSTYN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JAMES R. ACHENBACH
DERRIL J. ALBERT
ALLAN D. BARALL
JEREMY BARAN
LOUISA R. BARGERON
RYAN W. BARNES
FRANK A. BART
ERIK S. V. BENSON
JULIE M. BIRCH
ROBERT G. BLAIR III
JIMMY W. BOAN
DEREK R. BOLZ
GARY H. BOUTELLE
KACEY C. BRASHEAR
PATRICIA L. BREWER
DANIEL M. BROWN
JOHN F. BRUNETT
WILLIAM D. BUNDY
DUANE A. BURK
CHRISTINA L. BURTON
ANTHONY C. BUSILLO III
CHRISTOPHER J. BUZARD
MATTHEW M. CAIN
MARK D. CAMPBELL
ARCHER R. CARR
ABIGAIL A. CATHELINEAUD
JOHN A. CHAVEZ
BRAD A. CLAWSON
BRIAN A. COPE
MICHAEL J. CREEDON
ANGEL R. DAVILALOPEZ
DAVID J. DAVIS
MARK P. DEDRICK
ANDREW S. DEJESSE
CECILIA A. DIAZ
ROBERT J. DINAN
ROSA A. DRAKE
OBUN J. DUFFY
REX A. EISERER
GREGORY H. FAIRBANK
DAVID M. FARABAUGH
SUZANNE M. FIELD
GAIL A. FISHER
PHILLIP A. FLEMING
WALTER L. FLINN
MARTIN R. FLYNN
JEFFREY W. FOREST
DAVID M. FOSTER
KAREN D. R. FRICKE
JAMES H. GORMLY
JASON A. GRIDER
JOHN C. HAAS, JR.
THOMAS J. HARZEWSKI
NANCY L. HENDERSON
LEE A. HERRING
JAY A. HINES
PHILLIP L. HIRSCH
PATRICK E. HUGHES
MILTON V. HUMPHREY
GREGORY P. HUTCHINS
MICHAEL A. JACOBSON
GEOFFREY J. JERAM
MARK L. JOHNSTON, JR.
HEIDI A. JONES
CHARLES C. JORDAN
LAWRENCE J. KAPP
OK K. KIM
CHAD E. KIRCHNER
ADRIAN I. KOBRYN
REGINALD J. KORNEGAY
ERIC C. KOTOUC
GERALD J. KRIEGER
MICHAEL R. LAFONTAINE
RODERICK F. LAUGHMAN
HARRY M. LAWSON
MATTHEW J. LAWSON
RICHARD R. LEACH
SCOTT A. LEIDIGH
JOHN W. LEWIS
ANTHONY M. LEYVA
CHRISTOPHER G. LIBERTINI
RUSSELL J. LOFQUIST
PAUL V. LOHMANN
GEORGE N. MAY
JAMES F. MAZZEI
CARLUS U. MCCONNELL
WILLIAM S. MCDANIEL
EDWARD A. MCGOLDRICK
JOHN M. MCGOWAN
KEVIN O. MCKENZIE
CLINTON MEAD
MICHAEL C. MELANCON
CARLOS J. MELENDEZ
ROBERT W. METCALFE
JOSEPH S. MILLER
CHRISTOPHER MINOR
CHARLES S. MOLINETS
TRACY G. MONTEITH
MICHAEL A. NAPOLITANO
DAVID S. NASH
CHRISTOPHER J. NIEWIND
DAVID A. OKIMOTO
RODERICK J. PAGE
JAMES E. PATRICK
STEPHEN M. PAZAK
MATTHEW W. PETERSON
JEAN P. PLAMONDON
RONNIE H. PRESTON, JR.
MOHAMMED Z. RAHMAN
ANDREW L. RAMOS
BRIAN J. REGAN
DIANE M. RICHBURG
MATT F. RIESENBERG
CHRISTOPHER B. RILEY
DEAN B. ROBERTS
DEVON D. ROBERTS
JANET E. ROSS
STEPHEN B. RUBRIGHT
THERESA J. RUSIN
NICHOLAS M. SANCHEZ
RUDOLPH P. SANTACROCE
WESLEY B. SARGENT
GREGORY M. SAWMELLE
MATTHEW T. SCILLIA
JOHN A. SHULLI
CHRISTOPHER S. SIMCOX
BETH A. SISSON
DARRIN L. SMITH
EDDIE J. SMITH
GREGORY M. SMITH
MICHAEL D. SMITH
MICHAEL J. SMITH
TRAVIS A. SMITH
JONATHAN D. SOLTZ
DARREN A. SPAULDING
THERON C. SPURGEON
GEORGE M. STATHAM III
BENJAMIN L. STEVENS
BRYAN L. STOVER
FRANCIS C. SUYAK
ELIZABETH K. SWEET
MICHAEL L. TANG
HENRY L. TENNANT, JR.
JOSEPH C. THAMES, JR.
KATHERINE J. TOWNSEND
JOHN H. TUCKWILLER
SIEGFRIED J. ULLRICH
ANDREW B. ULMER
CHRISTOPHER M. UPCHURCH
TIMOTHY J. VERSPRILLE
STEPHEN D. VILE, JR.
GERARD D. WALSH
ALLISON E. WATKINS
KEITH B. WEBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KEITH A. ARCHIBALD
JASON M. ARNDT
BETTINA K. AVENT
JERRY A. BROWN
ANTHONY M. CALLANDRILLO
JOHN G. CASEY
DANIEL L. CEDERMAN
MARCUS A. CHEATHAM
JOHN J. COIRO
BETTY S. CUMMISKEY
VERNON R. DAVIS
ERIC R. FRIEBIS
LEAF S. HALES
SHAWN T. HUBBELL
DAVID M. JENKINS
ELAINE J. JOHNSON
VALERIA G. JOHNSON
BRET D. JONES
DOUGLAS R. KISSELL
MARITZA LAGARES
STEVEN E. LAMPKINS
JAMES M. LEWIS
ANDREW T. LOVE
THOMAS MANION
JABAR M. MARKS
MARY P. MARTINEZ
RHONDA R. MCCULLEY
DANIEL C. MCTIGUE
MATTHEW N. METZEL
CASEY J. MINER
WILLIAM G. MORRIS
CHARLES N. MOULTON
JEFFREY C. MOZINGO
GARY L. OLIVER
JOSEPH R. PARNELL
AARON P. RADTKE
KIP R. REITZ
JOSEPH C. RICKER
JOHN A. SALO
NICHOLAS J. SCHAPPER
TERRANCE L. SCHOOLER
DARRELL S. SCHUSTER
THOMAS L. SHARRATT
TROY N. SHEARER
TY S. SHORT
MICKIE J. SKAGGS
TRENT A. SMITH
JOSEPH L. THOMAS
MARK A. WATERS
FRANK L. WITSBERGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY B. ALEXANDER
MICHAEL J. BANKS
DAVID C. BARKUS
AARON H. BAUGHER
JOSEPH A. BAULDRY
HUNTER L. BELCHER
JASON P. BENSON
ANDREW M. BISHOP
BRIAN L. BLANKENSHIP
ALVIN P. BOLTON
JOHN B. BOWLIN
RODNEY W. BOWMAN
SEAN A. BRADY
DONALD R. BRAUGHT
SHILOH P. BRIGGS
MARK E. BRODERICK
TIMOTHY A. BROOKS
JEFFERY P. BURKE
SCOTT L. BUSH
KENDRICK L. CAGER
MIRIAM D. CARLISLEWESTFALL
BRYAN M. CARR
MAXIME C. CASTELEYN
ERICA M. CHRISTIE
SHAWN C. CODY
JOSEPH A. COOKE, JR.
BRETT A. COOPER
GREGORY S. COOPER
JUNE S. COPELAND
VIRGINIA C. CORDERY
KEVIN P. CRAWFORD
JAMEY L. CREEK
DAVID E. CRENSHAW
PAUL F. CRIGLER
ROBERT S. CROCKEM, JR.
JAMES C. CROWLEY
HENRY J. CUDNEY
JAMES T. CULVER
MICHAEL B. DAAKE
ROBERT C. DAVIS
BRIAN K. DEAN
MARC D. DEFREYN
SCOTT J. DESORMEAUX
MICHAEL G. DYKES
ANDREW R. DZIENGELESKI
MICHAEL W. ECKER
CARL E. ENGSTROM
JEFFREY A. ERICKSON
MICHAEL D. EVANS
EVAN C. EWACHIW
JAMES A. FALEAFINE
BRIAN S. FALLON
GREGORY T. FARR
TOD M. FENNER
ROBERT B. FISK
DEAN J. FIX
ANTHONY D. FORD
RENEE M. FORD
DOUGLAS J. FORTIER
CRAIG A. FOURNIER
ARTHUR J. GARFFER, JR.
RANDALL K. GATES
FRANCIS E. GERMANESE
DAVID L. GIBBONS III
DANIEL E. GILBERT
THOMAS W. GOLDEN
LINDA S. GRAY
LOUIS D. GRAY
MARVIN R. GREEN III
BRYANT L. HAAS
JOHN C. HALL
DAVID S. HAMILTON
CHARLES A. HANCOCK
MICHAEL D. HANSON
LANCE D. HARGRAVE
MICHAEL S. HATFIELD
CRAIG S. HEATHSCOTT
BILLIE W. HEISER II
BRIAN P. HENNESSEY
JAVID D. HERAVI
MICHAEL K. HERRINGTON
MICHAEL W. HICKS
JAMES R. HIGGINBOTHAM
ARVID R. HILL
DEREK J. HOLLAND
SCOTT E. HOUSE
TURON M. HUMPHREY
SARAH E. HURLEY
JOHN M. INSETTA
BARRY C. JACKSON
JOSE B. JAQUES
CHARLES K. JAWORSKI, JR.
PETER J. JERZAK
JEFFARY L. JIANNONI
BARRY L. JOHNSON
CHRISTOPHER M. JOHNSON
ROBERT C. JORGENSEN, JR.
MARK E. KALIN
DENNIS E. KEENER
AARON P. KEIRN
JARED D. LAKE
DAVID R. LAYDON
BOBBY J. LEE, JR.
NATALIE L. LEWELLEN
HEATH M. LEWIS
PATRICK L. LEWIS
DANIEL J. LONG
WILLIAM B. LONG
JOHN G. LOWE
MATTHEW A. LUTZ
REECE J. LUTZ
CHRIS M. MABIS
JASON P. MAHFOUZ
JUSTIN L. MANN
MICHAEL J. MANUCY, JR.

TIMOTHY R. MAPLES
MICHAEL P. MARCINIAK
GREGORY MARCUSON
WILLARD B. MARLOW
CHARLES B. MARTIN, JR.
ROBERT M. MARTINEZ
MICHAEL D. MCCOY
ERIC D. MCELWAIN
GARY S. MCLEOD
SARAH M. MCLEVY
JAMES L. MCNAIR III
ROBERT H. MEDINA
CARL C. MEREDITH
TIMOTHY M. METCALF
CHRISTOPHER S. MOENSTER
DAVID A. MOORE
ANTHONY MOSCATO
JASON P. NELSON
ROBERT D. NESBIT, JR.
RODNEY D. NEWTON
ERIC W. NORRIS
JAMES M. PALEMBAS, JR.
ROBERT J. PAYNE
WILLY F. PEGUES IV
JUSTIN D. PERRYMAN
NATHANIEL W. PETERS
THOMAS C. PETERSON
SALLY F. PETTY
IRA J. PHILLIPS, JR.
JOHN E. PITT
DAVID C. POLKINGHORN
MATTHEW N. PORTER
PAMELA L. PRINCE
JOSHUA B. QUANTZ
JAMES C. RAE, JR.
KENNETH J. RATLIFF
DARREN REAM
CASEY D. REED
RANDY N. REMIKER
EDMUND M. RIELY
RAYMOND J. RIPBERGER
FELIX A. RODRIGUEZ, JR.
GREGORY W. ROGERS
CARLOS R. ROQUE
STEPHAN J. RUPPELLEE
ARON T. SACCHETTI
CHRISTOPHER J. SAMULSKI
DEMIAN W. SANMIGUEL
CLEMENT V. SAWIN
SEAN W. SAWYER
STEPHEN E. SAWYER
MICHAEL T. SCATES
LORI R. SCHANHALS
JOHN A. SCHOTT
AARON R. SCHUH
JAMES D. SEWARD
WILLIAM M. SHARP
FRED B. SHIRAH, JR.
JOSHUA M. SIMER
JOHN D. SIVLEY
NATHANIEL R. SKELLY
JAMES S. SLAVEN
STEPHEN G. SMITH
TIFFANY M. SNEED
RAGNAR P. SORENSEN
WILLIAM G. START
JONATHAN S. STEINBACH
TOMMIE D. STEVENS
ERIC M. STILLER
CHAD E. STONE
JEFFREY D. STOWELL
JOHN W. STRAIN II
SHANE P. STRICKLAND
TIMOTHY A. STROHMAN
STEPHEN M. STROUD
CRAIG A. SWANK
PAUL W. TAPPEN
DEXTER T. THORNTON
KENDRICK D. TRAYLOR
PHILLIP G. TREVINO
DANA L. TUCKER
TODD J. VERRILL
WALTER E. VONHOVEN
ROBERT S. WALKER
PAUL A. WATERS
BRIAN E. WATSON
RAY P. WATSON
MATTHEW E. WEAR
DAVID E. WEST, JR.
JONATHAN C. WILLIAMS
JASON L. WISEHART
KENNETH P. WISNIEWSKI III
MATTHEW S. WOODRUFF
ROBERT J. YENCHA
WING Y. YU

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

GUY W. JENSEN
DAVID L. RHOINEY
VENITA M. SIMPSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

MARISSA A. MAYOR

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 captain

ADAM C. HANCOCK

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

JOHN J. EASTMAN

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 4, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

ROY KALMAN ALTMAN, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY

MARK ANTHONY CALABRIA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on April 4, 2019 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

RONALD D. VITIELLO, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE SARAH R. SALDANA, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 16, 2019.