



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 19, 2018

No. 122

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by the Reverend Dr. Richard Gibbons of First Presbyterian Church, from Greenville, SC.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us join our hearts and minds together as we pray.

Let us pray.

Gracious God and loving Heavenly Father, as we prayerfully seek Your presence, enable us amidst complex challenges to be refreshed and renewed by the transforming nature of Your extravagant love. Impart to us a profound sense of gratitude, thankful that in Your sovereign purposes, we are a people shaped by adversity, dedicated to equality, while fully dependent on You, for "In God we trust."

Father, grant to us a renewed sense of Your calling, sustained by the enduring values we hold to be self-evident. Equip us, by Your Spirit, to be defined by consensus through compassion, expertise enlightened by experience, leadership resistant to polarization and expediency, yet intentional in unity, honesty, transparency, and integrity, as together we seek to be "one nation under God."

We bring our prayers to You in and through the Name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 19, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable CINDY HYDE-SMITH, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

NOMINATION OF RYAN BOUNDS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate is continuing our productive summer. This week we have been focused on confirming more of the President's qualified nominees. After his confirmation yesterday, Andrew Oldham, of Texas, will now bring his impressive credentials and years of distinguished service to his new role on the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. Today, we are considering the nomination of Ryan Bounds to serve on the Ninth Circuit. Each of these nominees has been selected by the President and

his team for their credentials, reputations, and commitment to the rule of law. Each has been thoroughly examined by our colleagues on the Judiciary Committee.

Ryan Bounds is no exception. He has earned degrees from Stanford and Yale. He clerked for the very Ninth Circuit judge he has been nominated to succeed. For the past 14 years, he has distinguished himself as a public servant at the Department of Justice and in his current role as an Assistant U.S. Attorney for Oregon.

Along the way, he has earned the respect and recognition of legal professionals from across the country and the political spectrum. Forty-six of his colleagues in the District of Oregon describe his "admirable work ethic," "keen judgment," and "masterful writing" as "skills that colleagues and opponents alike seek to emulate."

In a letter to our Senate colleagues from Oregon, criminal defense attorneys who have litigated against Mr. Bounds testified to his "fairness," "diligence," and "legal acumen."

They write:

He has shown time and time again that he is a man of his word. . . . He is an excellent lawyer and would make an outstanding judge.

A number of law professors from across the country seem to agree. They remind us about the standards to which this body is charged with holding judicial nominees—fairness, impartiality, intellectual rigor. To sum it up, in the words of one legal peer, "Ryan has all of this, and more."

So I look forward to voting to confirm this excellent nominee, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, speaking of excellent nominees, I would like to speak for a moment about President Trump's outstanding

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S5079

choice for the Supreme Court, Judge Brett Kavanaugh.

This week, even more of our colleagues have had an opportunity to meet with Judge Kavanaugh. I am sure they will agree that it is hard not to come away impressed—the academic achievement, the judicial credentials, the esteem of his peers and fellow legal professionals.

Of course, that hasn't stopped the far-left special interest groups from grasping at straws and trying to smear this nominee any way they can. They don't seem to care whether it is honest or not. They don't seem to care whether it is accurate or not.

The latest made-up controversy is an attempt this week to make hay out of comments Judge Kavanaugh made about the long ago expired independent counsel statute. But, once again, there is no "there" there, whatsoever.

Here are the facts. Judge Kavanaugh's apparent concerns about the independent counsel law appear in line with mainstream views that have been widely held on both sides of the political aisle—views that were, in fact, strongly held by many of my Democratic colleagues, at least until there was an opportunity to try to make political hay.

Congress chose to let the statute expire back in 1999, based in large part on constitutional concerns.

Let me say that again. The Congress, in 1999, on a bipartisan basis, decided to let the independent counsel statute expire.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, the assistant Democratic leader in the Senate right now, explained this well when he was fighting any attempt to renew the statute. Here is what he said in 1999 about the independent counsel: "Unchecked, unbridled, unrestrained, and unaccountable."

My friend from Illinois punctuated his enthusiasm for the demise of the independent counsel law by saying: "I would like to say to Judge Starr and all of the other counsels, your days are numbered."

I agreed with him about the independent counsel statute. A number of us, in both parties, saw it the very same way. So we happily allowed the law to expire.

This has nothing to do with special counsels. That is different from the independent counsel. The day the independent counsel statute expired, the day we actually finished with the impeachment trial of President Clinton in the Senate, Senator Chris Dodd from Connecticut and I went upstairs and had a press conference, stating that we agreed that the independent counsel statute ought to be allowed to expire, and it did. That has nothing to do with any special counsels or any tools that are currently in place for elected officials to be held accountable. This has nothing to do with any investigations that are in the headlines today.

What Judge Kavanaugh was talking about is a law that has not existed for

two decades and which the Supreme Court upheld with only a single dissenting vote. One of the dissenters in the case that upheld the independent counsel statute was Justice Scalia.

The irony or hypocrisy is that our Democratic colleagues are now criticizing Judge Kavanaugh because he may hold the same views on this subject that they did, at least until Judge Kavanaugh was nominated. It is a view that was shared and acted upon by Members of this body on both sides of the aisle, as I have explained.

So it is another day, another off-base attack.

Here is how Newsweek dismissed this tempest in a teapot: "Law experts told Newsweek that Kavanaugh's view on independent counsels has nothing to do with special counsels or Mueller's probe and, in fact, the two types of federal investigations are completely different."

Yet again, the far-left special interest groups that are desperate to deny Judge Kavanaugh fair treatment are hoping the media will buy their latest made-up charge.

Do you remember the outrage when it was learned that Judge Kavanaugh enjoys baseball? My goodness—shocking.

Well, I am proud the President has chosen a nominee who is as strong as Judge Kavanaugh. We should put aside these unfair attacks and misrepresentations and give his nomination the fair treatment it deserves.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a final matter, this week I discussed a number of converging reports that highlight the strength of this economy for middle-class families and job creators.

U.S. retail sales just increased for the fifth consecutive month. Earlier this year, consumer confidence hit its highest level since 2000. More than a million new jobs have already been created in 2018. There are more job openings than job seekers for the first time in 15 years. Over 95 percent of U.S. manufacturers are reporting confidence in their companies' outlook—an all-time high.

Just this morning, there was this announcement from the Department of Labor: In the second week of July, new claims for unemployment benefits fell to their lowest level—listen to this—since 1969.

All of these favorable trends are interrelated. Jay Powell, Chairman of the Federal Reserve, testified before our colleagues on the Banking Committee this week that "robust job gains, rising after-tax incomes, and optimism among households have lifted consumer spending this month."

To put it even more simply, American employers are doing better. So American workers are doing better. So American families are doing better. So American businesses are doing better.

This is how a vibrant, growing economy works. This is what happens when Washington, DC, swallows up less of the American people's money in taxes, when it imposes fewer heavy-handed regulations that make it hard to do business, and when it gets the bureaucracy's foot off the brake of our economy.

This is among the best—quite possibly the best—of economic moments for jobs and opportunity that Americans have seen in recent memory.

The policies of this united Republican government helped to bring it about, and they are helping to sustain it.

Earlier this week, the Wall Street Journal reported:

Tax cuts appear to be propelling robust consumer demand. Many households are experiencing less withholding from their paychecks thanks to the tax overhaul.

According to a recent survey, fewer than one in five American manufacturers now say an unfavorable climate due to things like taxes and regulations is a primary obstacle to their businesses. Back in 2013, during the Obama economy, more than two-thirds of the manufacturers said that. Two-thirds said it was a problem in 2013, and only one in five considers it a problem now.

All across the country, as job creators of all sizes have announced worker bonuses, pay raises, and business expansions, many say loud and clear that tax reform is what made it possible.

The American people voted. Republicans kept our promises. Now middle-class families are seeing the effects of the pro-growth policies they asked for in 2016, and the whole world has seen what the American people can accomplish when their government gets off their backs.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, in the 3 days since the President returned from his humiliating display of obsequiousness in Helsinki, he has offered numerous explanations for his behavior.

First, he said the media was too focused on the negative and that his summit with Putin was a great success. Then, admitting there was, in fact, a problem, he attempted to walk

back some of his comments, but even he couldn't commit to that and ad-libbed that other people could also have been responsible for interfering in the 2016 elections. A mere 24 hours later, the President was back to claiming it was not his fault and that the media was biased.

Then, astoundingly—the President not having learned his lesson—when he was asked yesterday whether Russia was still attacking our election system, the President replied “no.” This was, of course, followed by yet another implausible clarification when—surprise—his Press Secretary told reporters that was not what the President meant. Although, when you actually look at the tape, it is clear as a bell it is what the President meant. He was saying Russia was not still attacking our election system—once again, disbelieving all of the fine men and women who have reported this, who labor quietly, diligently in our intelligence agencies.

The constantly shifting, insincere, and thoroughly unconvincing explanations for the President's performance reveal that the President and his team do not understand the depth of President Trump's blunders with Putin. Frankly, any post hoc clarification cannot substitute for or repair the President's failure to confront Putin face-to-face. All of his walk backs, which then get undone, are done in the wrong place at the wrong time.

Where is this man who prides himself on being strong but is then afraid to say these things to Putin and has to wait until he is 6,000 miles away to say them? It is unbelievable.

One of the most stunning things about the summit was the President's openness to a request by President Putin to question former U.S. Ambassador to Moscow Michael McFaul and other Americans. In Helsinki, the President described the request as part of an “incredible offer.” The President's spokeswoman was asked about it yesterday. She confirmed the President and his team would discuss it.

That President Trump would even consider handing over a former U.S. Ambassador to Putin and his cronies for interrogation is bewildering. No President should have the power to gift wrap American citizens, let alone former Ambassadors, to our known adversaries. How can President Trump and his team spend even a moment considering Putin's request? How can they equate the democracy and rule of law and system of open and fair prosecution we have in this country with what Putin does? It is just amazing.

Every day, this President demeans the United States. So many Americans are saying they are ashamed to have him as their leader when he behaves like this.

Certainly, if the President were to agree to such a request, Congress must do everything in its power to block it. There can be no room for debate, no room for discussion. We must be

clear—and clear quickly. This morning, Senator MENENDEZ, Senator SCHATZ, and I plan to offer a simple resolution that states: “It is the sense of Congress that the United States should refuse to make available any current or former diplomat, civil servant, political appointee, law enforcement official, or member of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin.” This body must agree on the importance of protecting our Ambassadors. We should pass it today, not wait, not show any equivocation.

This incredible offer, as President Trump so casually and incorrectly called it, raises other serious questions. What else has President Trump agreed to behind closed doors? What else has he discussed with President Putin? President Trump and President Putin met for nearly 2 hours behind closed doors. No one else was present but a translator, and hardly anyone knows what was said.

Has Secretary Pompeo been briefed on that private, behind-closed-doors meeting? Nobody knows. He hasn't said so. Does our military know if President Trump made commitments about our nuclear arsenal? Nobody knows. Defense Secretary Mattis hasn't said whether he has been briefed. Do we know if President Trump made commitments about the security of Israel or Syria or North Korea or about any of the other issues the President said he discussed with Putin?

It is utterly amazing that no one knows what was said. This is a democracy. If our President makes agreements with one of our leading—if not our leading—adversaries, his Cabinet has to know about it and so do the American people. These questions and more need a full and complete accounting before Congress, in an open setting, as soon as possible.

That is why I have called on the Republican leadership to demand that Secretary of State Pompeo, Ambassador Huntsman, and, crucially, the translator who was present at the closed-door session be made to testify before the Senate. They should come immediately—now. What are our Republican friends waiting for?

The events of this week raise serious questions about the President's ability to responsibly and safely conduct this Nation's foreign policy, about his ability and willingness to defend the United States and her citizens, about his very ability to govern in so many areas.

Confronted with these grave questions, I believe the Senate must act to show our country's resolve to punish Putin for his interference and never allow such a thing to happen again and to ensure the President is doing what is necessary to stand up for American interests.

So I have proposed—and many of my colleagues on this side of the aisle have proposed—a bunch of things we can do right now to take action in the wake of

President Trump's indefensible summit with President Putin. Democrats are not in the majority. We don't control the floor. We need our Republican colleagues, who control the Senate floor, to join us on these measures. The lack of action—action, not just words—by our Republican colleagues is stunning and deeply disappointing not just to Democrats but to all of the American people.

Since Monday, sadly, we haven't seen movement from our colleagues in the majority, just more slow-walking. I understand my friends, Senators Coons and Flake, are working on introducing a resolution to support the consensus of our intelligence agencies and to request congressional oversight. We are all for it. I hope it passes with the unanimous consent it deserves. My Republican friends can and must do more—actions, not just resolutions and statements of disapproval. We shouldn't need this resolution. The things asked for in this resolution should have been happening already.

The burden of patriotism and of protecting America's security is on Leader MCCONNELL's shoulders. I know he has a difficult situation. I know he has a President who can sometimes be vindictive. The bottom line is, our country's security, our country's direction, our country's honor demand it.

We need to bring Secretary of State Pompeo, Ambassador Huntsman, and the rest of President Trump's national security team from Helsinki, including the translator who was present in the one-on-one meeting with Putin, right here before the Congress, in open session, so we all will know what happened.

We need to pass legislation to protect Special Counsel Mueller. There is bipartisan legislation already that was passed out of the Judiciary Committee under Senator GRASSLEY's leadership and support. It is on the floor. What is our Republican leader waiting for?

We need to see the President's tax returns, which has been the common practice of all Presidents in recent memory, but it is needed far more now because one of the most logical explanations of the President's obsequious and almost inexplicable actions toward President Putin is that Putin has something on him. Maybe it would be revealed in the tax returns, and if there is nothing there, the President should have no problem with releasing them.

We need to implement sanctions against Russia, not weaken them. We need to demand that Putin hand over the 12 Russians who have been indicted for election interference. We also need to harden our election infrastructure so that what happened in 2016 never happens again.

These are all commonsense measures, and most of them have bipartisan support already. They will accomplish for America what the President has been unwilling or unable to do. If my Republican colleagues refuse to pursue any—if not all—of these items, they are de

facto consenting to the President's capitulation in Helsinki. They cannot stand by. The American people will not allow it.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, finally, on healthcare, ever since Republicans have been handed the keys to both Houses of Congress and the White House after the 2016 election, they have engaged in a protracted campaign of sabotage against our healthcare system. Premiums are going up, coverage is going down, and it is all falling in the laps of our Republican colleagues in the House and Senate.

President Trump and congressional Republicans proposed legislation that would have gutted Medicaid and allowed insurers to charge more and deny coverage just because a person had gotten sick. The legislation would have excluded critical benefits and imposed lifetime or annual limits on care.

Under cover of night, the Republicans dismantled the healthcare law's coverage requirement without putting anything in its place.

The Trump administration canceled the Federal program that helped low-income customers afford insurance and expanded the availability of junk insurance plans that sucker Americans in with low premiums but that hardly cover anything. When people have these plans, they ask: Why did I even buy insurance? They were duped.

Now, worse yet, the administration has directed the Justice Department to stop defending the constitutionality of protections for Americans with preexisting medical conditions—turning its back on the most popular and humane advancement in our healthcare system over the last decade.

I would say to my Republican friends: Go to your constituents. Ask if people have someone who is sick in their families. You will get a lot of hands. Then ask them if they should be excluded from gaining health insurance to help that sick member and see how many support these ideas.

If they try to do this in the dark of night, it is not going to work. In August, we Democrats are going to be talking about this over and over again. Believe me—this will probably be the most important factor in the 2018 election as the American people will rebel from the taking away of healthcare.

Imagine going back to the days when a mother with a child who has cancer can no longer find affordable healthcare for her daughter. When hard-working Americans who fall on hard times are made to suffer by being denied healthcare coverage precisely because they need it, how wrong, how backward, how immoral. That is where President Trump wants to take us, and that is where all of our Republican colleagues seem to be following.

Later this morning—actually, right now—a group of Democrats is announcing how we plan to fight back against

this lawsuit and preserve the protections for up to 130 million nonelderly Americans who have preexisting conditions. The elderly, fortunately, are protected since we still have Medicare, despite some efforts by some on the other side to cut it back.

As millions of Americans watch their healthcare costs go up, as they read the news about the latest Republican effort to undo healthcare protections, they fear for the future and wonder who in Washington will be fighting for them. In November, they will have the chance to vote for a party that will check the President's dangerous healthcare sabotage, that will work to bring down costs and improve quality, that will never undermine the protections of Americans with preexisting conditions.

I look forward to the response to my colleagues' announcement.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Arkansas.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to express my support for the 20,000 men and women of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. They work hard every day to keep drugs off our streets, to stop human trafficking, to protect our communities from gang violence, and, yes, to enforce our immigration laws. Theirs can be a thankless job, but they do it with courage, dedication, and professionalism. So I, for one, want to say thank you.

I wish to point out the overwhelming support that House Republicans showed for ICE yesterday, which stands in stark contrast to the contemptible display put on by House Democrats. On a simple resolution merely expressing support for the men and women of ICE, only 18 Democrats voted yes, 8 skipped the vote, 34 voted no, and 133 Democrats voted present, which is the same thing as no. That is a pretty sad state of affairs. Thirty-four Democrats condemned the men and women of ICE, and 141 Democrats don't even have the courage of their conviction—they don't

even have the guts to vote yes or no—because we all know that Democrats, in their heart of hearts, want to abolish ICE. The way they tell it, ICE is a rogue agency driven by hatred and spite to tear apart communities.

Congressman POCAN of Wisconsin said that ICE is "ripping at the moral fabric of our nation."

Congresswoman JAYAPAL of Washington said that "ICE is out of control."

Congressman BLUMENAUER of Oregon calls ICE "toxic."

The senior Senator from Massachusetts said that we should replace ICE "with something that reflects our values," which I suppose means that the 20,000 men and women of ICE don't measure up to the professor's definition of our values. I have to ask, isn't the rule of law one of those values? Because ICE's job is simply to enforce the law and to protect our citizens from crime.

In the last year alone, ICE arrested more than 125,000 illegal aliens with criminal records. Those illegal aliens were responsible for more than 80,000 DUIs, 76,000 dangerous drug offenses, 48,000 assaults, 11,000 weapon offenses, 5,000 sexual assaults, 2,000 kidnappings, and 1,800 homicides. Yes, that is right, almost 2,000 souls would still be on this Earth but for those illegal alien criminals. ICE's investigative arm seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics last year. These men and women are on the frontlines of the war on drugs and the opioid crisis in particular. Do the Democrats really believe we should put all these efforts on hold?

This call to abolish ICE is so irresponsible that even some Democrats—those not running for President or beholden to the radical left—are speaking out against this.

Jeh Johnson, President Obama's former Secretary of Homeland Security, said that it "is not a serious policy proposal" and "would compromise public safety." He pointed out that even those who opposed the Vietnam war wouldn't have demanded that we abolish the Department of Defense.

Eric Holder, President Obama's former Attorney General, said, "I don't think that substantively or politically that makes a great deal of sense," calling it "a gift to Republicans."

Sarah Saldana, who ran ICE under President Obama, has called it "nonsensical."

Perhaps the most insightful comment came from former Senator Joe Lieberman of Connecticut. He said, "This makes no sense unless you no longer want any rules on immigration or customs to be enforced." And that, I would contend, is the whole point.

Those who want to abolish ICE just want open borders. The very bill House Democrats have introduced to abolish ICE doesn't even say which Federal agency should assume its critical law enforcement duties. They leave it up to a commission. The reason, I submit, is that they don't really care. Their obsession with open borders is so great

that they are willing to risk public safety to achieve it. These irresponsible politicians should know better. They aren't worthy to lead the brave, hard-working men and women of ICE. These officers are just trying to do their jobs and to keep us safe. On behalf of a grateful nation, I conclude by again extending them my deepest thanks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Arkansas in commending those who are involved in law enforcement, risking their lives for the safety of this Nation at all levels—Federal, State, and local. They put their badges on every single day and risk their lives for us, and that is a fact.

Within the Department of Homeland Security, there are men and women who are conscientiously trying to keep America safe. I commend them as well. I believe they are doing their job as they understand it, and they are risking their lives many times to achieve it, not only to stop the illegal flow of drugs into our country but to deter crime and to ferret out criminals where possible. They risk their lives to achieve that goal.

I have not joined in a call for the abolition of ICE, but I will not join in a call for the adoration of ICE because of one specific issue. The zero tolerance policy of the Trump administration resulted in our agents of the Department of Homeland Security forcibly separating children from their parents—forcibly separating up to 3,000 children from their parents.

I saw some of those kids separated by that agency. They were toddlers and infants. Some were being held by the care workers whom I happened to visit in Chicago. They were little babies taken from their mothers—toddlers, children 5 and 6 years old, separated by this agency under the President's zero tolerance policy. There were up to 3,000 of them, according to the administration's own estimates.

Had that happened before? Only rarely, but it became the policy of this administration until there was such an uproar in the United States and around the world that President Trump reversed his position on zero tolerance.

Reversing the position did not return the children to their parents. It took Federal courts to do that—one in particular, in San Diego, where the judge called the representatives of ICE, Health and Human Services, and all the other agencies involved in these children being removed forcibly from their parents and gave them deadlines to return the children to their parents. It was then that we discovered something about this agency. It was then that we discovered that they didn't keep a record of the parents and kids.

If you place an order online to Amazon or some other source and the next day you want to check on the status of your order, you use your tracking

number, and they will tell you where your package is. There was no tracking number when it came to these kids. If you decide that you are going to order a pizza and it seems to take a little too long and you call the pizza parlor, they can generally tell you where the delivery person is. The same thing is true in so many other areas.

Why, then, did this agency, which my colleagues are now coming to the floor claiming such great praise for, ignore the obvious? This agency, the Department of Homeland Security, ended up setting free 3,000 children into care facilities around the United States of America and didn't keep records of the parents.

We asked them several weeks ago, downstairs—all of the agencies, including ICE, referred to by the Senator from Arkansas: OK, let's get down to basics. How many kids are we talking about?

They wouldn't give us a number.

How many kids are under the age of 5? Those are the ones whom you have a deadline to reunite under the Federal court order in San Diego.

They couldn't give us a number.

Then, how many parents can you identify who actually had their kids taken away?

ICE said: We can identify 10.

Ten parents, 3,000 kids—I am not making this up. This is exactly what they said.

They said: We have 10 parents in custody. Those are the ones we can identify.

Two weeks passed, and we had another briefing this week. The numbers are now more complete. There are some 2,500 kids separated from their parents, spread around the United States.

What happened to the parents who lost their children?

The explanation from ICE was that they abandoned their kids and left.

Does that sound reasonable? Does that sound honest? You take the child away from the arms of a parent and then the parent says: I am leaving the country.

That might have happened in some cases, for reasons I don't know, but it is an outrageous suggestion. What it reflects is incompetency. How in the world can you take a child away from a parent, forcibly take them away, and not keep an adequate record for their reunification? How can you do that? Common sense and common decency suggests that you would do it.

I am not going to join in any resolution applauding that action by any Federal agency—the Department of Homeland Security, ICE, or other agencies. To me, it is a stain on the reputation of this Nation, one that we need to quickly resolve by reuniting these children with their families as quickly as possible.

You see, it isn't just a question of a holiday for these kids. Pediatricians have come forward from the American Academy of Pediatrics and have said

that what we have done is institutional abuse of children.

This separation is not just another day in the life of this 2-year-old, 5-year-old, or 8-year-old. This separation is something that is causing trauma within their own minds.

Have you read the stories about the reunifications, where some of the parents come back, finally get their children, and the children will not even come to the parents? They don't quite understand what just happened to them. They think the parent might have just decided to give them up.

There they were alone and by themselves at that tender age. Can you imagine that for your children or your grandchildren? I can't.

We did it as part of the official government policy of the Trump administration under zero tolerance.

When some of us come to the floor to question the actions, the conduct, the management of ICE, we have good reason to do it. I hope for the people within that agency who are doing their jobs conscientiously that we can at least be honest in saying that this policy is one which doesn't deserve praise and doesn't deserve our adoration on the floor of the Senate or the House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

S. RES. 582

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a matter of extraordinary importance to the future of American democracy and, in fact, democracies all over the world. At the Helsinki summit on Monday, President Trump embarrassed our country, undermined American values, and openly sided with Russia's authoritarian leader, Vladimir Putin, against the U.S. intelligence community's unanimous assessment that Russia interfered in the 2016 Presidential election.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN is right when he said: It was—

[It was] one of the most disgraceful performances by an American president in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump's naivete, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. But it is clear that the summit in Helsinki was a tragic mistake.

That is not BERNIE SANDERS talking. That is former Republican Presidential candidate Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

On Tuesday, after a strong international backlash, Trump, in a bizarre statement, claimed he misspoke and, of course, blamed the media for reporting what he said, even then he could not help but suggest that the electoral interference "could be other people also" and not just Russia.

In an interview last night, Trump changed his answer yet again and acknowledged, in the meekest way possible, that, yes, Russia meddled in our election, and, as the leader of Russia, Vladimir Putin is responsible.

This is a step forward, but it is not remotely sufficient. Who knows what tweet the President will release tomorrow? He seems to come up with a new response every few hours.

Today, we face an unprecedented situation of a President who, for whatever reason, refuses to acknowledge the full scope of the threat to American democracy. Either he really doesn't understand what is happening—and that is possible—or he is under Russian influence because of compromising information that they may have on him or because he is ultimately more sympathetic to Russia's authoritarian oligarchic form of government than he is to American democracy.

Whatever the reason, Congress must act now. Democrats must act and Republicans must act if we are serious about preserving American democracy. We must demand—and I know this is a radical idea—that the President of the United States represent the interests of the American people and not Russia.

Let us be as clear as we can be. Russia has been interfering not only in U.S. elections but in the elections of other democracies—the United Kingdom, France, Germany.

I yield to the Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I want to thank my friend, the Senator from Vermont, for this outstanding resolution. It is a resolution. I don't see who can object to it. We ask for five things in this resolution: that our government accept the assessment of our own Intelligence Committees about Russia's interference; that we move aggressively to protect our election systems; that the sanctions that this body passed 98 to 2 finally be implemented by the Trump administration; that there be no interference in Mr. Mueller's investigation; and that there must be cooperation.

Who in America would object to that? Maybe a small group of hard-right ideologues, but no one else.

Who in this body will object to it? This is an outstanding resolution.

I know my friend from Vermont would agree with me. We need action in addition to resolutions, but this is an excellent start. I urge all of my colleagues to support this fullheartedly. Our country is at risk.

The Senator from Vermont is sounding a clarion call and saying in a bipartisan way that we should strengthen our country, not weaken it, as the President has done over the last week. I hope this will get unanimous support from every Member of this body—whether they be Democrat, Independent, or Republican; whether they be liberal, moderate, or conservative. If you love America, if you care about our security, support this resolution.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank the Democratic leader for his strong efforts on this enormously important issue. I want to reiterate that this really is not a Democratic resolution. If there is any resolution that should be bipartisan, this is it. My Republican colleagues believe in democracy. I know that. We believe in democracy. Together, we and the American people must make it clear that we will not allow Russia or

any other country on Earth to undermine our democracy.

Let's be very clear that Russia has not just been interfering in U.S. elections but in elections of other democracies around the world—the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, to name just a few countries.

Russia's goal is to advance its own interests by weakening the transatlantic alliance of democracies that arose after World War II, while also inflaming internal divisions in our country and in other countries. We should also be clear that this interference is directed from the very highest levels of the Russian Government. Last week, Special Counsel Mueller announced a set of indictments of 12 members of Russia's military intelligence service, the GRU. There can be no doubt that given the nature of the Russian Government, Vladimir Putin was directly involved in this effort.

But our concern is not only what has already happened; more importantly, it is what could happen in the future. What happened in 2016 was an outrage, but we have to make sure it does not happen in 2018 and future elections.

Last week, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, a former Republican U.S. Senator, raised the alarm on growing cyber attacks and threats against the United States in a range of areas—a range of areas, not just elections—including Federal, State, and local government agencies, the military, business, and academia, saying that the situation is at a “critical point.” Coats said Russia is “the most aggressive foreign actor, no question, and they continue their efforts to undermine our democracy.” Coats compared the warning signs to those the United States faced ahead of the September 11 terrorist attacks. This is a clear and present threat to our democratic system and those of our allies.

Ultimately, of course we want a peaceful relationship with Russia. We do not want a return to the Cold War, and we surely do not seek any type of military conflict. But at the same time, we must be very clear that we oppose what Putin is doing, both in terms of his foreign policy and his domestic policy.

On foreign policy, we will not accept Russia interfering in the elections of democratic countries, stoking political tensions by promoting hatred and suspicion of immigrants and minorities, and trying to undermine longstanding alliances between democratic allies.

In 2014, in violation of international law, Russia invaded neighboring Ukraine and annexed the Crimea region.

Russia has assassinated political opponents abroad, most recently through the use of poison in Salisbury, England. The British Government concluded in that attack that it was most likely carried out by Russia's military intelligence service.

Domestically, Putin has undermined democracy in Russia, crushing free

speech, jailing political opponents, harassing and assassinating journalists who criticize him, and increasing persecution of ethnic and religious minorities.

On Monday in Helsinki, President Trump had an opportunity to speak out on all of these things and more, to confront Putin about these destabilizing and inhumane policies. He chose not to.

Well, here is the main point: If for whatever reason the President of the United States is not going to do what is right, Congress must do it. Democrats must do it. Republicans must do it.

The Congress must make it clear—and this is the resolution I am introducing and asking for unanimous consent—the Congress must make it clear that we accept the assessment of our intelligence community with regard to Russian election interfering in our country and in other democracies. Does anybody doubt the truth of that?

The Congress must move aggressively to protect our election system from interference by Russia or any foreign power. Does anybody deny the importance of that?

The Congress must demand that the sanctions against Russia, as the Democratic leader mentioned, which passed with 98 votes, be fully implemented—98 votes on that issue.

The Congress must make it clear that we will not accept any interference with the ongoing investigation of Special Counsel Mueller, such as the offer of preemptive pardons or the firing of Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, and that the President must cooperate with this investigation. Time and again, I have heard Republicans, including leaders, make it clear that there should not be an interference in that investigation. There is nothing new here on that point.

Finally—nothing new here, either—the Congress must make it clear to President Trump that his job is to protect the values that millions of Americans struggled, fought, and died to defend: justice, democracy, and equality; that he is the President of the United States and his job is to protect the interests of the American people, not Russia.

Tweets, comments, and press conferences—and I know many of my Republican colleagues have been involved in those activities. They are fine. They are constructive. But we need more from Republican Senators now. It is time for the Senate to rein in the President's dangerous behavior.

If their leadership—Senator McConnell—will not allow votes on this extraordinarily important matter, then my Republican colleagues must join with Democrats to make it happen, or all of their fine-sounding words of concern will become meaningless.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 582

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in legislative session, the

Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 582, submitted earlier today. I further ask 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, Trump derangement syndrome has officially come to the Senate. The hatred for the President is so intense that partisans would rather risk war than give diplomacy a chance. Does anybody remember that Ronald Reagan sat down with Gorbachev and that we lessened the nuclear tensions? We need to still have those openings.

Nobody is excusing Russia's meddling in our elections. Absolutely we should protect the integrity of our elections. But simply bringing the hatred of the President to the Senate floor in order to say "We are done with diplomacy. We are going to add more and more sanctions"—you know what. I would rather that we still have open channels of discussion with the Russians. At the height of the Cold War, Kennedy had a direct line to Khrushchev, and it may have prevented the end of the world.

Should we be so crazy about partisanship that we now say "We don't want to talk to the Russians. We are not going to have relations with the Russians"? We should stand firm and say "Stay the hell out of our elections," but we should not stick our head in the ground and say we are not going to talk to them.

I would like to see the Russians leave Ukraine. I think we could do it through diplomacy. We are not going to have it if we don't talk to them.

I would like to see the Russians help more with North Korea, with denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. We are not going to have it if we just simply heap more sanctions on and say that we are not going to talk to the Russians and that anybody who talks to the Russians is committing treason.

For goodness' sake, we have the former head of the CIA, John Brennan, gallivanting across TV—now being paid for his opinion—to call the President treasonous. This has to stop. This is crazy hatred of the President. Crazy partisanship is driving this.

For goodness' sake, we don't excuse Russia's behavior in our election, but we don't have to have war. We can still have engagement. We have engaged Russia throughout 70 years, while also acknowledging the imperfections of their system, the parts of their system we vehemently disagree with—the lack of freedom, the lack of human rights. Yet we had open channels of negotiation, open channels of communication.

I could not object more strongly to this.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky just told us that he wants dialogue with Russia, he wants diplomacy with Russia, and that he thinks it is important that we communicate with Russia. I agree. Who disagrees with that? There is not one word in this resolution that suggests that the United States of America should not aggressively engage in diplomacy with Russia to ease the tensions that exist between the two countries. What the Senator said is totally irrelevant to what is in this resolution.

What this resolution says is that we are going to tell Russia: Stop interfering in our elections.

What this resolution is about is telling Russia to stop interfering with the elections in democratic countries all over the world.

What this resolution is about is saying that we should implement the sanctions overwhelmingly voted for by Congress.

What this resolution is about is that we will not accept interference with the ongoing investigation of Special Counsel Robert Mueller.

What this resolution says is that the President must cooperate with the investigation of Mr. Mueller.

That is what this resolution is about. It has nothing to do with ending diplomacy with Russia at all. That is inaccurate.

I would hope that, if not today, in the very near future, Republicans will join Democrats and do the right thing in our effort to preserve American democracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 583

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, we are here to put forward a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its adoption. This is the Flake-Coons resolution, which Senator COONS will speak on and I will take it from there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor with my colleague Senator FLAKE from Arizona to send a strong, clear, and, importantly, a bipartisan message to the American people that we stand with the men and women of the Department of Justice and the men and women of the U.S. intelligence community.

We support the ongoing investigation into Russian interference in our elections, and we must act—and act unequivocally—to hold Russia accountable for its actions.

Just 3 days after the U.S. intelligence community issued a detailed and staggering finding that led to an indictment against 12 Russian military intelligence officers for interfering in our 2016 election, President Trump stood shoulder to shoulder with President Putin and failed to challenge Putin's claim that his government played no role in the effort to undermine our democracy.

In fact, when asked, at the time, whether he believed Putin's denial or

the U.S. intelligence community, President Trump said: "I have confidence in both parties."

He has subsequently walked back those comments, but I think it is important that the Senate be on the record as saying that our intelligence community is clear, our law enforcement community is clear, and today the Senate should be clear.

So today Senator FLAKE and I are putting forward a resolution that, in its language, commends the Department of Justice for its ongoing investigation into Russia's interference in our last election—the one that led to last week's 11-count indictment, offering the most thorough and detailed accounting to date of Russia's complex effort to sow doubt and create chaos in the months leading up to our last election.

The resolution also reaffirms the intelligence community's assessment of Russian interference and asserts that Russia must be held to account for its actions. This can be accomplished in part by immediately and responsibly implementing sanctions provided for in the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, or CAATSA, which this body passed 98 to 2 this summer.

Finally, following the President's summit with Putin in Helsinki, today's resolution calls for prompt hearings and the release of notes to better understand what the two leaders discussed and may have agreed to during their one-on-one meeting, which ran for over 2 hours.

I am encouraged by hearings that have already been scheduled, but I think it is important that it be clear that our Senate seeks a role in engagement and oversight.

Congress and the American people deserve to know what promises or concessions may have been made to President Putin, and thorough hearings with senior officials, including Secretary Pompeo, are critical.

This resolution is a first step—a good first step—but we need to be clear-eyed. President Putin of Russia will not stop until we stop him. We know we face continued threats to our elections in 2018 and beyond. Just last week, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats, our former colleague here in the Senate, cautioned that the warning lights are blinking red again on cyber attacks against our Nation. He said:

These actions are persistent, they are pervasive, and they are meant to undermine America's Democracy. Attacks on our country's digital infrastructure [are] made principally by Russia.

He said:

Russia is the most aggressive foreign actor and the worst offender.

So we know that we continue to face hostile threats. FBI Director Chris Wray said just yesterday: "Russia is still working to sow division in the United States and continues to engage in malign actions against our country."

So we need to join arms and look forward to protecting our next election. Today's resolution is an important first step, but I think we should work together to take up and pass the DETER Act, introduced by Senators RUBIO and VAN HOLLEN, to deter Russia from interfering in our next election.

I think we should take up and consider the Lankford-Klobuchar Secure Elections Act to strengthen election cyber security.

Of course, I would like to see my Special Counsel Independence and Integrity Act taken up as well. We can build on \$380 million invested in election security, grants provided by this Congress to the States back in March to help bolster their election systems against threats.

It is important to remember that Putin and Putin's Russia are attacking other democratic processes throughout Europe. As Americans, as Senators, we need to stand up and fight for our democracy and the rule of law.

I had a memorable conversation with the Ukrainian leader last year, who said to me: If you don't defend your own elections, your own democracy, how can the rest of us count on you to defend ours?

This resolution makes clear that, on a bipartisan basis, we intend to defend our democracy. Russia's attacks on our last elections where attacks on every American—Republicans and Democrats. The threat is great, it is pressing, and it demands that we act.

Today's resolution is a first step and an important one, and I call on my colleagues to join us in supporting it. If there is any Senator who disagrees with this very basic resolution, I look forward to hearing their reasons.

Let me close by thanking my colleague and friend Senator FLAKE, from Arizona, for having taken the initiative and the lead in introducing this important resolution. We may not agree on everything, but we agree on this important principle: We should stand up and be counted in defense of our democracy.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS, for helping to get together and working on this resolution and for working with his colleagues.

I hope that we can pass it today. There may be an objection to moving forward. If there is, we will bring it back again and again. This needs to be passed. The Senate needs to speak here.

Mr. President, in his dystopian novel "1984," George Orwell wrote:

The party told you to reject the evidence with your eyes and ears. It was their most final, essential command.

Well, what we saw on air this week in Helsinki was truly an Orwellian moment. What we saw earlier this week in Helsinki is what happens when you wage war on objective reality for nearly 2 solid years, calling real things fake

and fake things real, as if conditioning others to embrace the same confusion. Ultimately, you are rendered unable to tell the difference between the two and are at critical times seemingly rendered incapable of thinking clearly—your mind a hash of conspiracy theory and fragments of old talking points deployed in response to a question no one even asked. Ultimately, you fail to summon reality in the face of a despot in defense of your country.

It wasn't a hard question. An American President was invited by a reporter to denounce the Russian attacks on our elections and, in doing so, to defend the country that he was elected to lead. This should have been not much of a test at all for any American President. Yet it was, and our President failed that test.

The findings of our intelligence community regarding the Russian aggression are not matters of opinion, no matter how powerful and strong Putin's denial. To reject these findings and to reject the excruciatingly specific indictment against the 12 named Russian operatives in deference to the word of a KGB apparatchik is an act of will on the part of the President.

That choice now leaves us contemplating a dark mystery: Why did he do that? What would compel our President to do such a thing?

Those are questions that urgently beg for an answer, and it is our job to find that answer. But what isn't a mystery is that, by choosing to reject objective reality in Helsinki, the President let down the free world by giving aid and comfort to an enemy of democracy. In so doing, he dimmed the light of freedom ever so slightly in our own country. Such is the power that we vest in the Presidency. Such are the consequences when a President does not use that power well.

I can add no further to the extraordinary and thoroughly justified response of my fellow Americans from across the political spectrum to the events in Helsinki, ranging from heartbreak to horror. But I will say that if ever there was a moment to think of not just your party but for the country, this is it. This is not a moment for spin, deflection, justification, circling the wagons, forgetting, moving on to the next news cycle, or for more of Orwell's doublespeak. No, when the American Government offers an onslaught on unreality, it puts the whole world at risk.

That is the lesson of Helsinki. That is the dose of reality that hit hard. We have indulged myths and fabrications and pretended that it wasn't so bad, and our indulgence got us the capitulation in Helsinki.

We in the Senate who have been elected to represent our constituents cannot be enablers of falsehoods. This bipartisan resolution from the Senator from Delaware and me, which we have here today, commends the Department of Justice for its thorough investigation that has led to the indictment of

12 Russian operatives who on behalf of the Russian Government interfered in the 2016 election. It acknowledges that such efforts by the Russian Government to undermine our elections, as confirmed by our own Director of National Intelligence, continue.

Specifically, the Flake-Coons resolution rejects the denial of election interference by Russian President Vladimir Putin, something that our President failed to do when given the opportunity in a public forum in Helsinki on Monday.

This resolution calls for the full and immediate implementation of mandatory sanctions, passed by a vote of 98 to 2, to deter and punish election interference by the Russian Government.

If there are waivers that are needed—and there are some needed for the Indian Government, for example, for weapons they purchased from the Russian Government or for hardware—there is a waiver process already in law for that, and I would support that.

Finally, the resolution calls on the relevant committees of the Senate to exercise oversight, including prompt hearings and obtaining relevant notes and information to understand what commitments were made by the President in the summit and the impact it will have on our foreign policy going forward.

The Russian Ambassador last night said that "important verbal agreements were made." We need to know the details of those agreements.

Empirical, objective truth has taken a beating for the last 18 months. I said from this pulpit in January that "the dissemination of untruths has the effect of eroding trust in our vital institutions and conditioning the public to no longer trust them."

As we saw in Helsinki on Monday, entertaining the untruths of a dictator has the same effect. Passing this resolution will let our constituents, the administration, our allies, and our adversaries know that here in the Senate we do not entertain the deceit of dictators.

The truth is that Russia interfered in our elections in 2016, and these efforts continue. Accepting that truth is the first step in preparing us to confront this malign activity. Let's pass this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 583, submitted earlier today. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table with no intervening action or debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me first thank the Senator from Arizona and

the Senator from Delaware for expressing all of our concern about Russian interference in the 2016 election. It is absolutely clear they did, and the President has said as much on a number of occasions.

Now, I agree, in Helsinki he was less than clear about that, but he came back and said that he misspoke and reaffirmed his earlier position that, yes, the Russian Government had attempted to interfere in the election, although nobody disputes the fact that they were unsuccessful in changing a single vote or affecting the outcome. Ironically, the very same investigation which has made clear that the Russians did attempt to disrupt the election has also made clear there is no evidence of collusion that anybody has uncovered to date.

My concern with this resolution is that it is purely a symbolic act, and what we need to do is not just offer symbolic resolutions on the floor. We need to do the hard work Senators have to do through regular order. In other words, our committees that have jurisdiction over these issues ought to be permitted to call the witnesses and ask the hard questions and develop the record before we go on record as to a resolution like this.

I would point out that the indictments that were referred to, apparently, according to published reports, Rod Rosenstein, the Deputy Attorney General, asked the President before Helsinki if he should withhold the announcement of those indictments or go ahead and release them before the summit. The President said: No, go ahead.

Anybody who read the 29 pages of the indictment, issued at the request of Robert Mueller by a grand jury in the District of Columbia, knows there is chapter and verse of how Russians attempted to interfere with the election. It is a good and important read. The President knew that before he went to Helsinki. That gives me some confidence that he did, indeed, misspeak, especially in light of his subsequent affirmations of Russian interference in the election.

I happen to be privileged to sit on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. We have been conducting a bipartisan investigation of the Russian matter for the entire time the President has been in office for the last year and a half. We already issued some preliminary reports. The way to do our work is through bipartisan committee work—have the witnesses come and testify, ask them hard questions, and render our judgment.

I know Secretary Pompeo is coming before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee sometime next week. He ought to be asked hard questions. I am confident he will respond to those questions. That is how we get the information we need.

Let me just say that I think we should consider sanctions—not some sort of sense-of-the-Senate resolutions that have no sting or no impact, cer-

tainly no deterrent effect on what we all want, which is to discourage Russian involvement in our 2018 elections. That is why the majority leader today asked the chairman of the Banking and Foreign Relations Committee to hold hearings and recommend additional measures that could respond to or deter Russian malign behavior. We ought to do our work through our committees of jurisdiction.

When we rush to judgment and do resolutions like this, we can inadvertently make mistakes. Let me point out one that is in this resolution. There is a reference to Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, which passed the Senate 98 to 2, to deter and punish election interference by the Russian Federation. There is a provision in the current conference committee on the Defense authorization that would issue a waiver of that act to our partner India. If we want to encourage countries like India to come partner with the United States of America—the world's largest democracy and the world's oldest democracy—then we ought encourage that movement toward us and away from the Russian Federation. I worry there is no reference in here to the waiver provision in the Defense authorization conference committee that India has asked for and that Secretary Mattis has requested Congress grant.

All I am asking for is a little bit of caution in the rush to issue a resolution. No. 1, I don't think we acknowledge the full picture, but we also don't commit our work to the committees that have jurisdiction over these matters to do it carefully, thoughtfully, and in a bipartisan way so we come up to the best solution to the problem.

I think this is the wrong way to go about it. I think our committees ought to continue to do their work—Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Banking Committee. We ought to come up with the right kind of bipartisan answer, which I think could well include sanctions against the Russian Federation to deter them from meddling in our 2018 elections and beyond. I am confident they will continue until we stop them from doing so.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Objection is heard.

The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Madam President, I think it is regrettable this was objected to. We will bring it back. The majority leader said this is just a symbolic vote. It is. Symbolism is important.

Obviously, we have underlying sanctions we ought to fully implement. If there are waivers needed, there is already a waiver process in the NDAA authorization. I support those waivers with regard to India. This does not affect that. This says, in a symbolic way, that we in the Senate don't buy Vladimir Putin's rejection or his denial of election interference.

That was put in question this week, whether our government believes that or not. We in the Senate should stand and say: We don't believe it. We know the intelligence is right. We stand behind our intelligence community. We need to say that in the Senate.

Yes, it is symbolic and symbolism is important. Our agencies of government need to know that we stand behind them. That is what this is about.

I hope we will pass this. I note, regretfully, that there has been an objection to it, but we will bring it back. I believe this should pass, and I believe it ultimately will pass.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding Senate rule XXII, postcloture time on the Bounds nomination expire at 1:45 p.m. today; further, that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. RES. 584

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that following disposition of the Bounds nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to the immediate consideration of a Schumer resolution that is at the desk; further, that the Senate immediately vote on the resolution; that if agreed to, the motion 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 PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

S. RES. 583

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I join my colleague from Arizona in briefly remarking on my regret that our resolution was not adopted today.

It does call for the full implementation of mandatory sanctions as discussed at some length. It does not call for the reckless implementation of mandatory sanctions.

There is a significant range of sanctions already provided for in this law, adopted 98 to 2 by this body, that have not yet been adopted. I recognize that this resolution, standing strong behind the Department of Justice, the intelligence community, and its ongoing investigation is, as was referenced, a symbolic act, but there are moments when symbolism and standing together are important.

I look forward to continuing to work closely with my colleague and friend from Arizona to ensure that this resolution is adopted, that the American people and the men and women of our Federal law enforcement agencies and our intelligence community understand that this body strongly supports them and their work and sees clearly the ongoing and continuing threat to

our democracy posed by President Putin and Putin's Russia.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, before I talk about the resolution Senators MENENDEZ, SCHATZ, and I have authored that will be voted on at 1:45 p.m., I would like to say a few words about the work the Senators from Delaware and Arizona did and my severe disappointment that there was objection from the Republican leadership.

The bottom line is very simple. President Trump has put our country in a foreign policy crisis. President Trump has weakened the security of this country. A resolution is the minimum we can do. We should be acting.

The idea that we cannot even pass a resolution in this body because of the objection on the other side, when this was done in a bipartisan, careful way by the Senators from Arizona and Delaware, shows something very bad. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so cowered by a President that they cannot stand up for national security. They cannot stand up to Vladimir Putin, just as the President seems not to be able to.

I have one more point. From what I am told, one of the major objections from the other side was that Congress wished the contemporaneous notes from that secret 2-hour meeting be made available. That is key.

What are they hiding? What are they afraid of? The American people have a right to know what went on in that meeting, particularly when President Putin gets up and talks about some agreements that it seems not even our high-ranking officials in the State and Defense Departments and intelligence agencies know about. This is amazing.

We have come to a really low moment in this body when a bipartisan resolution that is rather modest and limited—I had talked to the Senator from Delaware. He knows I wanted much more in this resolution, but in an effort to get something done, we limited it.

In my view—the view of most Americans—the notes should be made available. The translator should be made available. The translator wasn't specifically referred to in this resolution, but when they talked about relevant people coming, my view—and I believe the view of the Senator from Delaware—was that would include the translator. I am not sure if it was the view of the Senator from Arizona. It doesn't matter. We are not even passing this resolution.

I have to say, this was a moment for bipartisanship. This was a moment for America pulling together. This was a moment, when the President doesn't served the country well, that Americans of all parties, all ideologies come together and fill that void and undo the misdeeds that occurred in Helsinki.

Unfortunately, because of weakness, fear—my guess is, if you looked inside

the hearts and minds of every Member on the other side, all but maybe one or two would feel this is the right resolution, but they are afraid. Fear will not get us anywhere. Letting a bully push us around, meaning President Putin, as he pushed President Trump around, will not serve this country well. It is a sad moment that this resolution was rejected.

S. RES. 584

Madam President, before I yield to my good friend, the hard-working and very able ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I want to talk about our resolution which we are going to vote on. Lord knows what would happen if we couldn't have even gotten a vote on that.

The idea that an American ambassador, who served us so well, should be brought before Putin and his minions to be questioned, when there is no charge against him, no issue against him—it is not like the 12 Russians who are indicted for trying to interfere with our elections. It is not even an analogy. There is not an evenness. President Trump amazingly called this an "incredible offer." Our President is saying that one of our Ambassadors being hauled before an authoritarian regime that twists the truth, that lies at will, that even seems to kill people they want to with poison in other countries is an incredible offer?

Well, this resolution is a fine resolution. It will pass. It doesn't undo what just happened. It doesn't make up for the fact that our colleagues are afraid to take real action, even a resolution that posits action in terms of the major misdeeds at Helsinki. At the very least, we are protecting the integrity of the men and women who serve us, because if today it is the Ambassador, tomorrow it could be somebody in the military or somebody in the intelligence agencies or elsewhere.

This resolution is very clear. What it says is, when President Trump called Putin's offer an "incredible offer," he was incredibly wrong. No President can put one of our fine servants at risk who has worked hard, in this case, for the diplomatic corps. This resolution is a bare minimum of what we should be doing here. I am glad it will be on the floor, and I suspect it will pass—hopefully, unanimously.

I yield to my colleague from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I am very pleased to join with the distinguished Democratic leader in co-authoring this resolution.

S. RES. 583

Madam President, before I speak to it, I do want to speak to the Flake-Coons resolution.

Certainly, I would have supported it; although, I believe it is the minimum of what this body should be expressing after what we saw in Helsinki. This is a moment for bipartisanship and for patriotism because what I saw in Hel-

sinki speaks to the opposite of standing up to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States.

In the majority whip's objection to the resolution coming to a vote, I find it interesting that, among other things, he was talking about our having more sanctions against Russia, which I will speak to shortly. We are in the midst of developing a new, strong package of sanctions as it relates to Russia. So I embrace and welcome him to that effort if he seeks to actually see real sanctions against Russia.

We have sanctions. There are sanctions that passed by 98 to 2 in this institution and that passed overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives, which forced the President to sign it as a result of there having been overwhelming votes. These were sanctions that were largely mandatory but have not been fulfilled. So we could start off by having a robust engagement of the existing sanctions.

I am not quite sure how we start being tough on Russia. One of the elements of those sanctions was to go after Russia's sales of defense weapons. Yet here we are, and we are already looking for waivers. There is a difference between a country that, maybe, has a long history of buying Russian military equipment, but the S-400—a new anti-defense system—is a new version. That is not a legacy issue. I am not sure how we are going to tell one country it can buy the S-400 but tell another country it can't. It doesn't work. That is how sanctions begin to crumble at the end of the day. Yet I welcome the response that we should be having new sanctions.

S. RES. 584

Madam President, as it relates to this resolution, it is outrageous that the White House would not instantaneously and firmly dismiss a proposition that Russian prosecutors question a former U.S. Ambassador. Again and again, we have seen President Trump take Vladimir Putin's word. It is unconscionable that this White House would give anything other than a full-throated defense of America's Foreign Service, like Ambassador Mike McFaul, who has served our country with honor and distinction.

The reason Putin doesn't like Mike McFaul is that as our U.S. Ambassador, he stood up for democracy and human rights in Russia; he stood up to the Russian regime; and he promoted American values and ideals. He spoke truth to power inside Russia. That is why Putin wants him. Congress shouldn't have to tell America's President to stand up for America's public servants and its diplomatic corps, but apparently we have to.

President Trump has repeatedly dismissed Russia's attack in 2016 and shrugs off the threat it poses today, despite all of our intelligence agencies and the Director of National Intelligence, just days ago, saying there are red blinking lights about Russia's continual engagement and interference in

the elections that will take place 110 days from now.

This week, he has continuously and directly contradicted his own national security advisers and, instead, has embraced the line of Putin and Russian intelligence. Now, I know they have been trying to clean it up. Yet he has said it so many times and in the same way he said it in Helsinki. That is what he really believes. Now for him to say something that is different—wrong time, wrong continent, not too much. He has spouted talking points that have sounded like they have come straight from the Kremlin. He has shown a willingness to accede to Putin's requests to interrogate Americans, a willingness to accept Putin's denials about Russian interference, a willingness to attack NATO allies like Montenegro, and a willingness to be a supplicant to Putin's views.

The President keeps claiming he has been tough on Russia. No. It is Congress that has been tough on Russia by its passing CAATSA, the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, with broad and deep bipartisan support. Yet the White House hasn't taken it seriously. It has ignored a series of mandates in the law. The clear tone and intent that came from the Helsinki summit was one of accommodation, not of pressure.

I don't see any other way forward, other than through further congressional action, to forcefully call out and address the administration's willful paralysis to Putin's abhorrent behavior. To date, our efforts have been transformative, but just as the administration has been prepared to find ways that allow Putin to circumvent the law and to avoid implementing mandatory provisions of CAATSA, we must be equally prepared to adjust and adapt by closing those loopholes.

That is why I will soon introduce comprehensive legislation to increase pressure to actually implement the law and increase pressure on Russia for its aggression against the United States and our allies. Among the considerations we have for this new legislation are to increase sanctions on Russia's energy sector, to increase sanctions on its cyber sector, to increase pressure on Russia's oligarchs and those who are closest to Putin, and to look at Russia's sovereign debt as a target.

We cannot wait to see whether Russia will attack us in the 2018 election. We know it is in the midst of making that a reality, and we need to ramp up the pressure. We can't afford to wait.

Based on this President's behavior, we also need to protect our institutions here at home. That is why we want to include protections for the Office of Special Counsel. The President has done more to target Bob Mueller than he has to go after Vladimir Putin, and this must stop. This effort must be bipartisan, which is why I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues who truly want to see us fight back on Russia and nearly all of whom

voted to increase sanctions on Russia last year and place more authority for sanctions alleviation in the hands of Congress. They were right to support such measures in July of 2017, and God knows it would now be right to step up and defend America's interests.

It is time to show the American people that we can be patriots, not just partisans. It is time to show the world that we can put our country over party. It is time that we defend America's democratic institutions against Russia's continued aggression. I look forward to the resolution and its vote, and I urge everyone to join us in approving it.

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

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, we will vote today on the confirmation of Ryan Bounds to the Ninth Circuit. He has been nominated to fill the vacancy left by Judge O'Scannlain. Mr. Bounds once served as a law clerk to Ninth Circuit Judge O'Scannlain.

Mr. Bounds is highly qualified to serve on the Ninth Circuit. A native of Oregon, he attended Stanford University and Yale Law School. He has dedicated his career to public service and has served in government for the past 14 years. The last 8 years were as an assistant U.S. attorney in Oregon.

I have listened to my colleagues on the other side voice their opposition to Mr. Bounds. Interestingly, none of them cite anything Mr. Bounds has done in his legal career as a reason for opposing his nomination. Instead, they focus on two things. First, they say we shouldn't confirm Mr. Bounds because his home State Senators didn't return their blue slips. Second, they say some of Mr. Bounds' college writings were insensitive. So I am going to start with point No. 1 on which they base their opposition to him.

As I have explained so many times on the floor of the U.S. Senate and in the Senate Judiciary Committee—and I don't know how many times to the multitudes of journalists who are on the Hill—my blue-slip policy is the same as all but 2 of my 18 predecessors who were chairmen of the Judiciary Committee over the 100-year history of blue slips. Like Chairmen Ted Kennedy, Joe Biden, and ORRIN HATCH, I will hold hearings for circuit court nominees who have negative or unreported blue slips if the White House has consulted with the home State Senators, and I will not allow Senators to abuse the blue-slip courtesy for political or ideological reasons.

In the case of Mr. Bounds, the White House sought the Oregon Senators' input, seriously considered the one

candidate suggested by the Oregon Senators, and waited several months for the Senators from Oregon to establish their judicial selection committee, which is quite a tradition in that State. The selection committee itself even recommended Mr. Bounds. Yet the Oregon Senators still didn't return their blue slips.

They say it was because Mr. Bounds didn't disclose some of his college writings to the selection committee. There is a very good reason he didn't—the selection committee never asked for his college writings. In fact, Senator WYDEN's staff instructed Mr. Bounds not to disclose them. Moreover, the Oregon Senators refused to ever meet with Mr. Bounds during this whole process.

It has been misleadingly said this will be the first time in modern history we will have confirmed a judge without there having been at least one positive blue slip from the two State Senators. My Democratic colleagues have only themselves to blame. The way the blue slip used to be enforced was through the 60-vote filibuster, and that was done away with in November 2013, led by the then-Democratic majority and Senator Reid.

For example, Chairman HATCH held hearings for five nominees in 2003 and 2004, despite there being the lack of a positive blue slip from either home State Senator. These nominees were voted out of committee. Then Senate Democrats blocked these nominees on the floor by using the 60-vote filibuster. But my Democratic colleagues abolished that filibuster, as I said, in 2013 for the reason that they needed the votes and the freedom to pack the DC Circuit with liberal judges who would uphold Obama's regulatory schemes.

Leading this effort was none other than Senator MERKLEY of Oregon, who argued that 41 Senators shouldn't be able to block a Senate majority from confirming judges. Now they have a different point of view. Now he argues that he alone should have the right to block Mr. Bounds from even getting a hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

In November of 2013, I told my Democratic colleagues that they would regret abolishing the filibuster just to stack the DC Circuit Court of Appeals with their friends. Now, obviously, today, as they consider the Bounds nomination, they know they made a mistake.

Turning to the only other criticism my colleagues have made about Mr. Bounds, which is in regard to his college writings, I don't believe that misguided statements made in a college newspaper 25 years ago should disqualify Mr. Bounds. I hope we don't live in a world where controversial things that we write in college end our careers forever. This is especially true with our kids and grandkids now in the era of social media.

For example, a few years ago, just when the same thing came up on Justice Wright going to the Minnesota

District Court, I voted and supported her despite very controversial writings she had in law school. We shouldn't assume that views expressed years ago during college and law school represent the nominee today.

Mr. Bounds testified that he regretted much of what he wrote in those op-eds.

We received numerous letters in support of Mr. Bounds' nomination from people who have known him personally throughout his life. We received a letter from some of his classmates at Stanford. And before I quote, it is kind of like—these sound like they were his friends in the dormitories. I never was a dormitory student, but I imagine you really get acquainted with people there. This is what they had to say about Mr. Bounds:

We have become aware of a handful of controversial op-eds and articles Ryan wrote for *The Stanford Review* during that time. None of us believes that these writings reflect Ryan's character, either then or now. All of us remember our dorm-mate fondly.

We are a diverse bunch. Yet Ryan never failed to treat all of us with courtesy, respect, and civility, regardless of our respective genders, sexual orientations, skin colors, religions, ethnicity, or any other characteristics.

There is not, and never has been, a racist, sexist, homophobic, or bigoted bone in Ryan Bounds's body.

Mr. Bounds has also been a community leader, promoting diversity and equality. As a member of the Multnomah Bar Association's Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Committee, Mr. Bounds spearheaded programs to expose underprivileged young people to the legal profession. He mentored young scholarship recipients and helped those same people navigate law school admissions and law school. He expanded low-cost CLE offerings and organized anti-harassment and anti-discrimination training.

Mr. Bounds is imminently qualified to serve on the Ninth Circuit. His college writings do not represent who he is today. His professional accomplishments and exemplary public service speak much more loudly to his character and integrity.

I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Mr. Bounds' confirmation today.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Madam President, I would like to say one thing about another nomination issue. I understand that so far, no Senate Democrat has met with Judge Kavanaugh. They are apparently awaiting their marching orders from the minority leader. Well, the American people elected each one of those Democratic Senators to represent them, not the minority leader. And when Senate Democrats have largely already made up their minds to vote against Judge Kavanaugh and none of them have even met with him, their demand for a paper chase beyond relevant material sounds more and more like a demand for a taxpayer-funded fishing expedition.

REMEMBERING GOVERNOR BOB RAY

Now, Madam President, I would like to address my colleagues in the U.S. Senate on the life and death of Governor Bob Ray, a wonderful Governor for the State of Iowa over a long period of time. I wish to honor him in this way.

I wish to pay tribute to my good friend and an exceptional Iowan whose life and legacy will be remembered in my home State for generations to come. As the people of Iowa mourn the loss of our 38th Governor, I would like to share about a few ways that Robert D. Ray made Iowa a better place to grow. Looking back at his lifetime of service, it seems nearly impossible that one person could wear so many hats and reach the highest rungs of distinguished service in both his private life and in the public sector.

After graduating from high school in 1946, Bob enlisted in the U.S. Army to serve his country that way. He returned from service and earned undergraduate and law degrees at Drake University in Des Moines, IA. He married the love of his life, Billie, and together they raised three daughters.

In addition to serving 14 years as our State's chief executive from 1969 to 1983, Governor Ray also served as our State party chairman at the age of 35, chairman of the National Governors Association, interim mayor of Des Moines, 11th president of Drake University, U.S. delegate to the United Nations Conference on Refugees, and CEO and board member to a number of non-profit and for-profit corporations.

Reading such an outstanding resume, one might come to the conclusion that this Iowan must have an outsized ego to match. To that, I can personally affirm that Bob Ray was a humble leader driven by a servant's heart. He brought honesty, dignity, and integrity to the campaign trail and, in turn, to State government.

His policy achievements as our 38th Governor made government work better for the people by reorganizing State government, such as the creation of the department of transportation, and modernizing the National Guard. Those are just a few of the reorganizations. But through doing this, he strengthened rock-solid Iowa values in education, conservation, good government, and fiscal stewardship. It was Governor Ray who signed Iowa's—we call it the bottle bill. You get a redemption for a can you return instead of throwing it in the dump. He signed it into law to keep our roadways clean and our State looking beautiful.

Arguably, the lasting measure of his governorship is defined by moral leadership, and particularly as evidenced after the fall of Saigon in 1975.

As a result of the ending of the Vietnam war, Governor Ray's actions transcended the riverbanks of America's heartland to reach thousands of refugees across the world. Those refugees were fleeing communism in Southeast Asia. Governor Ray persuaded Presi-

dent Ford to allow Iowa to welcome the Tai Dam to Iowa, allowing this close-knit ethnic group to stay intact and to resettle in Iowa.

In 1978, we had another wave of Southeast Asians who were desperate to escape communism in South Vietnam. They became known as the boat people who put their lives in peril for the pearl of freedom that we offer in America. Bob Ray put his political life on the line to open Iowa's homes and hearts to rescue them from suffering and death. In so doing, he saved the lives of thousands of people, including generations of new Iowans yet to be born.

Yet again, Governor Ray responded in 1979 to another humanitarian crisis going on in Southeast Asia by launching the Iowa SHARES Program. The acronym "SHARES" stands for Iowa "Sends Help to Aid Refugees and End Starvation." That very first year, the program raised more than \$600,000 in less than 1 month—small donations to send food and medicine to starving people on the Cambodian border. Volunteer nurses and doctors from Iowa also went to save these people, who suffered under the harsh Khmer Rouge regime of Pol Pot.

When one of those members of the boat people first learned of Governor Ray's passing, she was moved to tears. Now a wife and mother of five children, she prayed for Governor Ray, in fact referring to him as "Saint Bob Ray." She attributed his courage and generosity to saving thousands of people just like her.

At his funeral, Senator ERNST and I saw a whole part of the church filled with these Southeast Asians who very much wanted to express their appreciation for Governor Ray's leadership by being there at that funeral.

In 2005, Governor Ray received Iowa's highest civilian honor, the Iowan Award. It is a well-deserved honor for this legendary man of honor. He is a statesman, a humanitarian hero, and, of course, to those who loved him the most, he was a husband, dad, and grandpa.

Years after Governor Ray left the Governor's mansion, called Terrace Hill, he launched the Robert D. and Billie Ray Center at Drake University. That center's mission is dedicated to improving civility and developing ethical leaders at home and throughout the world. And for all of us, we know that in a society less civil now than it has been throughout most of the history of our country, that center is going to serve a very needed purpose. For those who know the story of Bob Ray, his ray of light connected with the center will inspire generations of leaders for years to come.

Barbara and I join our fellow Iowans in extending our condolences to Billie and the entire Ray family. We will miss this extraordinary Iowan. Our State benefited in countless ways because he shared his gift so generously to make Iowa an even better place to grow for generations to come.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that three eulogies that highlight Governor Ray's life as a Governor, political humanitarian, and a man with strong family values be printed in the RECORD.

These eulogies are from David Oman, who served as chief of staff to Governor Ray; Ken Quinn, a former U.S. Ambassador to Cambodia who worked on the refugee resettlement as a member of the Ray administration and today serves as president of the World Food Prize Foundation in Des Moines; and the third is from Scott Raecker, who serves as director of the Robert D. and Billie Ray Center at Drake University. I hope my colleagues will read these eulogies because there is no way that anything I say today can do justice to what they said in their separate eulogies.

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

ROBERT D. RAY EULOGY

DAVID OMAN

One more time, for the last time, Bob Ray has done what he did so often in life—bring people together, in this church, at the Capitol last evening, on social media, and in conversations.

Lessons from his life have been learned and re-learned this week, none better than the simple reminder that a keen mind, warm heart, and a bias for action—by one person—can cause great change, and uncork goodwill among so many.

Gov. Ray's life ended without regrets and remorse. Embracing his example, we're better able to live our lives with renewal and resolve.

Yesterday, a motorcade brought the Ray family past many touchpoints in Bob's and Billie's lives—Terrace Hill, Drake University, and Theodore Roosevelt High School.

President Roosevelt, in 1910, a year after leaving the White House, spoke in Paris about leadership, and making a difference.

He said, 'above all stands character, a man's force and courage, his good faith and sense of honor . . . self-restraint, common sense, the power of individual responsibility, and acting in conjunction with others.'

TR didn't know it, but he previewed the life of Robert D. Ray, or as we called him, RDR.

Another President Roosevelt, Franklin, died at the end of World War II. FDR and RDR had something in common—a very real human touch. During FDR's funeral, an aging African American man wept inconsolably on a Pennsylvania Ave. sidewalk.

A reporter approached timidly and asked, 'Did you know the President?' The man said, 'No . . . but he knew me.'

Good leaders, good people, know, in a broad sense—and in the moment—what other people feel and need.

Bob Ray had that quality. He knew Iowans, or as he liked to say 'our Iowans.'

People who had a two-minute phone call or 20 minute meeting, or just a handshake at the Fair, felt they mattered and were the most important person to Gov. Ray at the time . . . and they were.

Sometimes, Bob Ray wasn't aware of his impact.

Two years ago, at Wesley Acres, Gov. Ray wasn't in room 146, nor physical therapy or the lunch room. A nurse and I couldn't find him. It turned out he was in P.T.; he told us we'd been lost.

Then the nurse said to me 'Gov. Ray changed my life . . .' I asked her to tell me more.

It seems her late teen life was not good in 1969; she doubted herself. Then she listened to Gov. Ray's first Inaugural Address on the radio. She added, 'He talked about the future. He said the future was going to be better and brighter. I felt he was talking about me and my life. He gave me hope. My life turned out alright, and now, I get to help him.'

Gov. Ray spoke with thousands of Iowans through four of his campaigns in seven years, ending the two-year term era. Iowans quickly got to know his openness and decency . . . civility and sincerity . . . humanity and humor.

And who didn't love his smile?

That genuine persona stood in stark contrast to the erosion of trust in a Washington awash in Watergate. In '74, Bob Ray stood against the tide. He won 59% of the vote when nine other GOP governors were swept away. He acquired more momentum, if not a mandate.

Governor Ray knew how to campaign. He knew how to govern. And, he knew the difference.

The late Lt. Gov. Arthur Neu said, 'Ray would take his time making decisions, but when his mind was made up, he was a tough as nails.'

The other evening, I wrote down Ray policy initiatives and stopped at 30. Some were ahead of their time, some were copied by other states. They covered tax policy, streamlined government, education, conservation, human services, human rights, public safety, agriculture and transportation.

I can't list them all today. As they say about baseball stats . . . 'you can look 'em up.'

The Gov. would at times borrow or co-opt good ideas from Democrats. They didn't know whether to laugh or cry, but he always gave them credit.

Gov. Ray looked beyond the next year or cycle. He paired with Gov. Culver's father, Sen. Culver, to set up the Iowa 2000 project. In his first term, Gov. Vilsack cloned it with Iowa 2010.

In 1978, Gov. Ray came up with a new theme 'progress with stability' as part of a larger effort throughout his administration to better connect Iowa's cities and towns with rural Iowa.

In small towns he would nudge with nuance 'stability with progress.' Bob Ray communicated deftly. He was transparent with and respected the press. He helped define modern Iowa and did define the modern Iowa governorship.

With Billie Ray and three active daughters, the five defined the modern Iowa First Family.

We thank you for supporting him, and for your sacrifice.

A governor's work is never easy. Gov. Ray's four successors, all with us today, have said privately and publicly, over time and this week, how much they respected him and his leadership.

Bill Clinton was the 32 year-old Gov.-elect of Arkansas when he met Bob Ray, then 50, at the NGA 'new governors school' in November '78.

The two hit it off. It was Ray 'charisma' and Clinton 'charisma on steroids.'

Clinton credited Ray with mentoring him on how to be a good governor. When he would come to Des Moines as President in the 90s; he would often ask about Bob Ray and word would get back to us. Wednesday, President Clinton tweeted a heartfelt remembrance of his mentor and friend.

Ray met one Pope . . . but worked with seven Presidents. There is apparently no public record of what Richard Nixon thought of him. The tape recorders must have been turned off.

President Ford said, 'I relied heavily on Bob's good advice.'

President Reagan: 'The success you experienced was the product of good ideas, hard work, a whole lot of follow through—just what you'd expect to find in Iowa.'

President George H. W. Bush said this well, 'He never turned his back on the Party, but somehow transcended Party and made public service better.'

Like Bush 41 and Jimmy Carter with their post-Presidencies, Bob Ray also defined the role of 'former' governor.

His ongoing service as CEO, mayor, and Drake president was exemplary. Ray backed countless charities and good works. Once I told him 'you've supported about everything except 'Iowans for Term Limits.'

To close, in the years ahead, governors and perhaps Presidents like Ronald Reagan was, will be in Room 9 of the Capitol. Gov. Branstad fittingly designated it the 'Robert D. Ray Conference Room.'

Governors have made many important decisions in that room, including Ray's to relocate and welcome legal political refugees to Iowa.

Future governors will see a large, wonderful oil painting of Gov. Ray. That portrait is behind me. It returns to the Governor's Office today.

Next year, or 2028, or 2046 (Iowa's Bicentennial year) or any year, governors will sit in the Ray Conference Room—coping with complicated, controversial, even morality laden decisions.

Our Iowans and future Iowans can hope those governors pause, in deliberative, decisive moments, look up at the portrait, and think . . .

What would Robert D. Ray do?
How would he lead?

EULOGY FOR GOVERNOR ROBERT D. RAY

AMBASSADOR KENNETH M. QUINN

One of the first refugees Governor Ray rescued and resettled in Iowa was a young man who was trapped in one of the most treacherous and threatening environments on earth—Washington, D.C. That person he rescued was me.

He brought me and my wife Le Son and our children home to Iowa where we became part of Governor Ray's extended family. For 4 years, I worked closely with the Governor on many of his humanitarian endeavors.

A few weeks ago, I was with Governor and Mrs. Ray recalling many of these experiences—and a flood of memories came back about when we were together, including:

—In the winter of 1975, at the celebration for the Tai Dam refugees from Laos, whom he had rescued and resettled together in Iowa in order to preserve their culture, language and kinship. The Tai Dam had written to every Governor in America, but Robert Ray was the only Governor to answer their plea. He convinced President Ford to permit all of the Tai Dam to come to Iowa. They have been here ever since.

—Or, on a cold January night in 1979, while he and I watched the video of a boat filled with Vietnamese 'boat people' refugees, who had escaped from Communist oppression only to be pushed back out to sea by local officials fearful of being inundated because no country in the world, including the United States, was accepting any more refugees from Indochina. We watched in horror as their boat broke up in the waves, with the refugees drowning before our eyes.

This so impacted Governor Ray that he wrote late that very night to the President, saying that Iowa would double the number of refugees it had resettled if only the President would reopen America's doors.

His letter and lobbying in Washington worked! America's doors were reopened.

—Six months later, in June 1979 we were together in Geneva, Switzerland, at the UN conference on the Boat People, where Vice President Walter Mondale announced that America would accept 168,000 new refugees each year. This led to over 1,000,000 refugees from Indochina eventually being resettled in the United States.

The assembled diplomatic delegations gave a spontaneous standing ovation to America's humanitarian leadership, a leadership that began when Robert D. Ray became the first governing official anywhere in the world to say he would accept the Boat People refugees.

—A few months later in October 1979, I was with Governor Ray at Living History Farm in Des Moines, as Pope John Paul II appeared before 350,000 people. Among those bringing the gifts to the Pope to celebrate Mass were Vietnamese Catholic refugees in their colorful native dress.

—Two weeks later the Governor and Mrs. Ray and I were at a place called Sa Kaew in Thailand where 30,000 victims of the Cambodian genocide were lying strewn across a field. Emaciated, starving and beset with disease, they were dying at the rate of 50–100 a day, with their bodies being bulldozed into mass graves.

—This scene of incredible human suffering led Governor Ray to create Iowa SHARES. Iowa Sends Help to Aid Refugees and End Starvation. With contributions by Iowans across the state, we rushed food and medicine that arrived on Christmas Day, to feed people who had been eating insects to survive. This was followed by volunteer Iowa doctors and nurses. Together this saved thousands of lives.

—On that same trip, we were in Nong Khai in Thailand, where the Tai Dam, Lao and Hmong refugees were waiting uncertain about their fate. These refugees said they wanted to show us their “symbol of hope.” They took us across a muddy field to a thatched hut. Beckoning us to look inside, they said “there is our symbol.” Tacked on the wall was the Iowa Department of Transportation highway map. Governor Robert Ray had made the shape of our state a symbol of hope for people languishing in a refugee camp 12,000 miles from Iowa.

—There was one other event where neither the Governor nor I were present but which has great meaning for today. In 2004, the Catholic Bishop of Des Moines visited a very ill Pope John Paul II. When the Bishop reminded the Pontiff of his visit to Living History Farms, the Pope heard “Iowa”—in a halting voice the frail Pope said—“Iowa . . . Farms . . . Refugees.” The man who put the words Iowa and Refugees on the lips of a dying Pope, and who made the shape of Iowa a symbol of hope around the world, was Governor Robert D. Ray.

The common thread in all of these experiences was that Governor Ray was driven by moral impulses planted deep inside him by his parents, the educational institutions he attended, and his religion, and nurtured by his wife Billie and his children.

When confronted by scenes of human suffering, Robert Ray responded, not as a political candidate doing an electoral calculation, but as a Christian following a moral imperative from the parable of the Good Samaritan.

—Robert D. Ray saw that his obligation was to his fellow human beings who were suffering and dying, even if the color of their skin, the language they spoke, and the religion they followed were all different from his own;

—Or, even if they were thousands and thousands of miles away on the other side of our planet, or adrift in the ocean.

Through his actions, Governor Robert Ray answered the eternal question—“Am I my brother's keeper?”

Even though the impact of Robert Ray's leadership would often occur far from Iowa; The one story that most poignantly captures Robert Ray's humanitarian legacy and his place in the pantheon of Iowa's greatest heroes took place about 10 years ago, not in the Governor's office or far from Iowa, but in a supermarket in West Des Moines.

As Governor Ray described it to me, he and Mrs. Ray were shopping for groceries, pushing their cart down the aisle, when, as can happen, they almost bumped into a cart being pushed by another shopper—in this case, an Asian man.

When he saw it was Governor Ray, the man stopped; walked over to the Governor and extending his hand, said “you saved my life. I just want to say thank you.”

Today thousands of Tai Dam, Lao, Hmong, Cambodians and Vietnamese who live in Iowa just want to say thank you. In a very real sense, Governor Robert Ray saved them all.

And all of us, whom he made so proud to say we are Iowans—we just want to say thank you.

Governor Ray uplifted my life. He uplifted all of our lives. And his legacy will uplift countless, thousands and thousands of others far into the future.

GOVERNOR ROBERT D. RAY—FAMILY EULOGY J. SCOTT RAECKER

On behalf of Mrs. Ray and the entire Ray family I want to express their sincere appreciation for the outpouring of love, support and prayers at this time. They have asked for me to share that following the service there will be a reception at The Robert D. and Billie Ray Center on the Drake campus—which is walking distance from the church.

So here we are Mrs. Ray, back at First Christian Church where your lifelong love story with Governor Ray started 73 years ago. You met through this church and church camp where you were elected King and Queen. You became high school sweethearts—you the smart looking girl with the car and Governor Ray the shy school-boy athlete.

Together we've looked at the pictures of the two of you in those early years—you and Governor Ray had a youthful twinkle in your eyes and a shining smile that said—“I'm in love”—and that's one thing that did not change over all these years.

Recently you told me that in the last several months it was just nice to sit and hold hands and tell each other “I love you”—and as I observed these moments, I saw that same twinkle and shining smile in both of you—and, oh my heavens, it still radiated—I'm so in love.

You also shared that you never had a fight—and I believe you. However, with all due respect, it has come to my attention through an un-named grandchild that there were a few disagreements—mostly over ice cream at McDonalds, and they were resolved with another Diet Coke and a loving grandpa slipping a dollar under the table to a very happy granddaughter.

In your understated way you told me he was a “special person”—which he was—and together you were spectacular . . . you were always his beloved Billie Lee—and you most certainly were his beloved soul mate.

Mrs. Ray, here is the message for the rest of us today—if there is an aspect of Governor Ray's life that should inspire us, and we should seek to emulate, it should be this—his excellence as a man devoted to his family—and that passion was rooted deeply in his faith, his love for you and his desire to serve others in love.

It's no secret that Governor Ray's favorite titles in life were husband, father and grand-

father—and he took them seriously—and with good humor.

It has been said that you can tell what kind of parent you are by how your grandchildren turn out—and how your children care for you as you age. And by all measures Mrs. Ray—you and the Governor were an extreme success.

Randi, Lu Ann and Vicki, he loved you girls—unconditionally. And, a gift he gave you . . . is that you all know that fact.

Whether singing out to you as his “Miss America” or, telling you at a time you needed to hear it the most, that “you are always beautiful in my eyes”—he loved you in actions that reflected his words.

And even when some boundaries needed to be set (you know what I'm talking about), that was also done in love, sometimes frustratingly so for you as he always wanted to talk things out and think through the best resolutions and consequences.

He was your hero, he was patient and calm, and even in the darkest moments he looked for the positive. He was inclusive as reflected best in his love for you son-in-laws.

And one of the things I have heard, and seen from you as daughters, and the grandchildren as well, is this—his admonition to “Do more, speak less—and if you have to speak, think before you speak.”

Now for you grandchildren, Robert, Jeffrey, Billie Ray, John, Michael, Emma, Leah and Sadie—he absolutely adored and cherished you—he was so proud of each of you. He talked more about you than anything else. And, he loved taking pictures of you.

I've watched you grow up directly, or through his stories, and see so many traits of him in each of you. In fact, you shared with me the traits you possess that you saw in your grandpa. And here they are, listen closely . . .

Empathy, kindness, humor, humility, honesty, sense of justice, respect, compassion, considerate, loyal, self-confident, attention to detail, positive, caring, adventurous spirit, modest, selfless, charisma, perseverance, appreciation for other cultures, a good and sometimes slow decision-maker, a genuine and good hearted person, never mad, peace-seeking and relationship centered.

And of course, love of ice cream and chocolate chip cookies.

You also shared that one of the qualities you admired most about him was that he was always “more interested in your opinion than telling you his opinion.” A good lesson for all of us.

And I loved this trait you shared—he adored my grandma—and so do I.

Think of this list for a minute—these are the traits that emanate from you—that is what a lasting legacy looks like. And each of you grandchildren will continue to make your lives, and the world, a better place because of these traits.

And, for the rest of us, these are qualities we also saw in your grandpa that continue to shape our lives.

When you unpack the list and look deeply into the character qualities you share with your grandpa—there is something that resonates clearly—and for your grandpa it was developed in this church early in his life.

They are called “fruits of the Spirit”—they are found in Galatians 5 and they define your grandfather's life—they are “love, joy, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control.”

Of these fruits of Governor Ray's spirit, love was first and foremost—and the fruits of his spirit were these words . . . in action.

Mrs. Ray, Randi, Lu Ann, Vicki, grandchildren, and the entire family—Governor Ray's family legacy lives on in you and is a lesson for all of us.

His faith driven love served us all—and while most directly to you the family—he

also served those of us who were blessed to call him a friend.

Governor Ray loved quotes and we shared many over the years. One that I gave him that he liked was from Richard Bach who said:

"The bond that links your true family is not one of blood, but of respect and joy in each other's life. Rarely do members of one family grow up under the same roof."

I thought of this quote as I spoke with Tai Dam refugee and family friend, Som Baccam, this week when she referred to Governor Ray as her 'savior'—and he literally was.

Savior is a strong and powerful word, and when I reflect on times Governor Ray used that word in our discussions about faith—he talked about how his Savior demonstrated unconditional love—sacrificial love—service love—so that we could love others and know our eternal home.

Governor Ray has left our earthly home and created a void in our lives . . . and that hurts, however, I would challenge us to think that the real void would be if we had never had his presence in our lives.

Governor Ray set the standard for how to treat people . . . and we can all be better people if we look to Governor Ray as a model.

For me, and I hope for each of you, I want to be a better person each day because of Governor Ray and his presence in my life. I've felt that way since the day I met him . . . and I will for the rest of my life.

The inspiration of Governor Ray's life is that we shine our light in the lives of others when we demonstrate love—and we must remember to shine that light first and foremost with our family and friends.

I challenge us all to honor his legacy by aspiring to be better people—by shining our light in our homes, with our family—and with our friends.

Letting our light shine may be his most important lesson.

One more time—Governor Ray leading the way.

REMEMBERING EUGENE SUKUP

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I wish to recognize a friend, an agricultural innovator, an inventor with I think about 80 patents. His name is Eugene Sukup.

If you travel around the Midwest, you will see there are grain operations on a lot of family farms. If you go to Haiti, as a result of the catastrophe down there a few years ago, you will see how smaller buildings that we would call grain storage facilities in Iowa serve as homes for homeless people. That resulted from that catastrophe.

Eugene Sukup is a quintessential bootstrap American success story. After settling in Iowa during the Dust Bowl and serving his Nation as a sergeant in the National Guard, Eugene made his living as a farmer, earning the title of "Franklin County Outstanding Farmer" in his younger years, in 1962.

While working on his farm, like a lot of farmers, he tried to think of easier ways to do things. He observed that pockets of grain—particularly corn—housed in storage bins could overheat and, as a result, spoil. Understanding the depth and breadth of the problem for farmers across the country, he was determined to find a solution, and he did. Through trial and error, along

with gritty determination and ingenuity, Eugene came up with something he entitled the "Stirway Stirring Machine." The innovative technology automated the process of stirring stored grain and corn and became an instant success among his fellow farmers. Eugene patented his invention and founded the Sukup Manufacturing Company in 1963.

Through my years holding annual meetings in each of Iowa's 99 counties, Sukup Manufacturing from time to time has hosted the meetings I have in Franklin County. After a tour of the factory, I always enjoyed Eugene's allowing his employees to have an open Q&A session with me so that I could hear what is on the minds of my constituents, because these constituents can't afford to leave their jobs and come to the courthouse to ask me questions. I try to go to people like them to make the process of a representative government work, and the best way to do that is face-to-face with your constituents.

Getting back to Sukup Manufacturing, by words and deeds, it is very clear that Sukup Manufacturing is a great place to work and a devoted contributor to the local community and global philanthropy. Fifty-five years later, the Sukup Manufacturing Company—which was the idea of a small family farmer—holds over 80 patents and sells its products in more than 85 countries. It remains the largest family-owned, full-line grain system manufacturer, employing more than 700 employees in the community of Sheffield, IA, and if I had to guess its population, I would say it is around 1,500.

Eugene's pioneering invention contributed to the success of tens of thousands of farming operations, allowing farmers to safely store their grain on their farms to capture the best market price. We have Sukup grain bins on my own family farm near Waterloo, IA; more specifically, the little village in New Hartford, IA. His ingenuity is a perfect example of the opportunity America's economic system gives people with ideas and drive.

Eugene's legacy spans Iowa's landscape from the Mississippi River to the Missouri River and reaches beyond the borders of our State and the borders of the United States. Sukup Manufacturing stepped up to reconfigure grain bins into housing units, as I previously said, for hurricane-ravaged Haiti. The units withstand 140-mile-per-hour winds, providing a safe habitat for residents.

In 2006, Eugene was inducted into Iowa's Inventors Hall of Fame and received the Outstanding Innovation Award by the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers. He was inducted into Iowa's Business Hall of Fame in 2011 and was named a Legend in Manufacturing by Elevate Advanced Manufacturing in 2015.

Through Eugene and its leaders, the Sukup family business has been a constant voice for job creation and oppor-

tunity. His contribution to manufacturing, agriculture, and the entire rural community and our economy will be an asset to farmers and the agriculture community for generations to come. It is amazing to think of what can happen in rural and small towns throughout our country thanks to the successful enterprise that Eugene Sukup represents.

Throughout our decades-long friendship, I have admired his relentless work ethic and unwavering commitment to community and family. His civil, political, and community leadership sets a very high bar for the rest of us in America.

Eugene was an American inventor, innovator, and a great friend. He will be greatly missed. May God bless him and his beloved family.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise in strong opposition to the nomination of Ryan Bounds to be a judge on the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Bounds, who, if confirmed, would serve on a Ninth Circuit seat in the State of Oregon, has received zero blue slips. He is opposed by both Senators from the State in which he would sit if confirmed.

Never before in the 100-year history of blue slips has a nominee been confirmed over the opposition of both home-State Senators. The Republican majority is setting a precedent here, and all of our home States are at risk of being impacted by this.

By moving this nominee without blue slips, Republicans are diminishing the voice that home-State constituents have through their Senators in the process of selecting judges in their States.

Let me make it clear to my Republican colleagues: If you vote to confirm Ryan Bounds, you are consenting to a precedent that is likely to affect your state someday. Consider your vote carefully.

It is hard to understand why my Republican colleagues would abandon the blue slip for the sake of this particular nominee. Mr. Bounds has written and published articles that should disqualify him from consideration for a Federal judgeship.

Consider how the Multnomah Bar Association in Oregon—a bar association that Mr. Bounds has belonged to for 12 years—described Mr. Bounds' articles in a statement after the writings were revealed.

The association said Bounds' writings "express insensitive, intolerant, and disdainful views toward racial and ethnic minorities, campus sexual assault victims, and the LGBTQ community."

The statement went on to say that the bar association "strongly disavows the views expressed in those articles as racist, misogynistic, homophobic and disparaging of survivors of sexual assault and abuse."

Mr. Bounds' writings, which he published in college, included his discussions about the "more strident racial factions of the student body."

His writings mocked LGBTQ students for being sensitive when a group of drunk athletes vandalized a statue celebrating gay pride.

He mocked Latino students for being overly sensitive when they complained about the termination of a Latino administrator.

Then he wrote this, in an article about sexual assault on campus: "There is really nothing inherently wrong with the University failing to punish an alleged rapist—regardless his guilt—in the absence of adequate certainty; there is nothing that the University can do to objectively ensure that the rapist does not strike again. Only the legal system can do that, and if it lacks the certainty to do so, it is not necessarily up to the University to stick it to the suspect, anyway, just in case. Expelling students is probably not going to contribute a great deal toward a rape victim's recovery; there is no moral imperative to risk egregious error in doing so."

Not only did Mr. Bounds publish these writings, but he chose not to share his writings with Oregon's judicial selection committee even though the committee had asked him to disclose any potentially controversial materials.

Mr. Bounds said he didn't think he needed to disclose any information to the committee that preceded his time at law school.

As Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY pointed out in a letter to Chairman GRASSLEY, Mr. Bounds did share with the Oregon committee information about his high school days. He just conveniently left out his intolerant publications from college.

As Senators WYDEN and MERKLEY said in their letter, "Mr. Bounds' failure to disclose these writings, and the nature of these writings themselves, demonstrate a substantial lack of judgment that is unsuitable for a nominee for a lifetime appointment."

This is not a close call. The Senate should not be moving forward with Mr. Bounds' nomination on process or substance.

Republicans are failing to be responsible stewards of nominations. The fact that Senate Republicans are moving forward with this nomination is a troubling sign for how Republicans will handle the Supreme Court vacancy.

All too often, Senate Republicans are failing to serve as a meaningful check and balance on President Trump when it comes to nominations.

Last week, 50 Senate Republicans voted to confirm an unqualified lawyer who had represented a suspicious Russian bank as the head of the Justice Department's Criminal Division.

This week Republicans already voted to confirm Andrew Oldham, a 39-year-old circuit court nominee who refused to say whether he thought Brown v. Board of Education was correctly decided and who has described the Supreme Court as "the most dangerous branch."

Now, Senate Republicans are looking to confirm Mr. Bounds, who has shown terrible judgment with his published writings and with his failure to be forthcoming about them.

Senators have a constitutional obligation to scrutinize these nominees and to vote no if the nominees lack the experience, temperament, or judgment to be a fair and impartial judge. The Senate should not be a rubberstamp, but under President Trump, all too often, it has been.

I know Senate Republicans like to say it is unfair to nominees if we hold them accountable for their records. My Republican colleagues have been coming to the floor, day after day, complaining about what they see as unfair scrutiny of the Kavanaugh Supreme Court nomination.

Do they have amnesia? I would remind them that no Supreme Court nominee in history has ever been treated worse than Merrick Garland was treated by Senate Republicans in 2016. Senator MCCONNELL wouldn't even allow Judge Garland a hearing or the courtesy of a meeting.

The treatment of Merrick Garland was unprecedented, and it was disrespectful. His record and reputation were torn apart by Republicans who never gave him a chance to respond in an open hearing. Even Judge Bork got a hearing and a vote.

I hope my Republican colleagues are not going to simply rubberstamp President Trump's nominees. So many of these nominees are extreme. We need to review their full records and consider them carefully before voting to confirm them for life.

I have carefully considered Mr. Bounds' nomination, and I will vote no. I urge my colleagues in both parties to join me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

CUBA

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to give tribute to the spirit of the Cuban people—the people of my forefathers, who still live under a corrupt and violent Communist regime—and to honor the memory of Oswaldo Paya. Oswaldo was a champion for freedom. He died 6 years ago this Sunday, on July 22, 2012, in a car crash that is widely believed to have been orchestrated by the Castro regime.

The plight of the brave people of Cuba has been marked by terrible suffering under both the Castro regime and the brutal dictatorship of Fulgencio Batista before it. The Castros and their revolutionary terrorist lackeys, like Che Guevara, are responsible for the suffering and murder of countless innocent Cubans. It is because of these oppressors that my family fled their beloved home in Cuba for a better life in the United States.

My father, born and raised in Cuba, fought in the revolution, initially believing that the principles of freedom were what the revolution was all about. He fought against Batista, a

cruel dictator, and he was imprisoned and tortured by Batista's thugs.

Then my aunt, his younger sister, my tia Sonia—who was there after the revolution succeeded, who discovered along with the rest of the world that Fidel Castro was a Communist, who saw the torture and the murder—my aunt fought in the counterrevolution against Fidel Castro, and she, too, like her brother, was imprisoned and tortured, except this time by Castro's thugs.

Both my father and my aunt were kids. They were kids who believed they were fighting for freedom, and they discovered they went from one tyrant to an even worse tyrant, a Communist dictator who would line up dissidents and shoot them.

The betrayal, the brutality, and the violence experienced by my father and by my aunt were all too typical of the millions of Cubans who have suffered under the Castro regime of the last six decades. Fidel may be dead, Raul may be retired, but the evil of the Castros persists. It still molds the Cuban regime's fundamental opposition to truth, to freedom, and to human rights.

But the malice and menace of communism cannot break down the will of the Cuban people. Instead, it has strengthened their resolve. It has further united them to fight for freedom and build a better future for their country, to establish a free Cuba—a Cuba not streaked by the ashes of dissident literature or littered with the corpses of defenseless teenagers; a Cuba built on human decency and individual liberty, where citizens are heard, not murdered, and speech is protected, not silenced. It is the Cuba envisioned by Oswaldo Paya Sardinias, his Christian Liberation Movement, and their fellow activists who continue to stand against the Castro regime. It is the Cuba of the young bloggers who expose the regime's crimes and corruption at the risk of arrest, deportation, torture, or worse.

With time, the oppressions of the Castro regime gave rise to remarkable leaders like Oswaldo Paya, whose life's work was the peaceful overthrow of communism and whose legacy we honor today. Oswaldo dedicated his life to promoting democratic freedoms and human rights in Cuba. His memory continues to inspire dissidents in Cuba and in other countries under tyrannical rule, countries like Venezuela, where Nicolas Maduro routinely imprisons and murders those who dare speak out against him, or Nicaragua, where the corrupt Ortega regime desperately clings to power by persecuting journalists and violently putting down protesters.

Last year, I introduced legislation to commemorate Oswaldo's legacy by naming the street in front of the Embassy of Cuba, located right here in Washington, as "Oswaldo Paya Way." It would send a powerful statement that here in the United States of America, we stand with freedom fighters

like Oswaldo Paya who are working to bring hope and liberty to oppressed nations, who are working to make a better Cuba, free of the horrors of Communist rule.

I have never been to my father's homeland. I have never been to Cuba. My father has not returned to Cuba in over 60 years. I look forward to one day visiting Cuba, hopefully with my dad, with my tia Sonia, my cousin Bibi, with my whole family, my two girls, and seeing a free Cuba—where people can live according to their beliefs without fear of imprisonment, violence, or oppression, but today is not that day.

There are many, like Oswaldo, who have fought for this vision for a free Cuba, who are no longer with us, but their struggle will endure, and their spirits will shine a light through the darkest nights. We will never forget them, nor cease fighting to bring about the free Cuba they died for. Today, and on July 22, and each day thereafter, they will be remembered, "Viva Cuba libre."

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, soon, the Senate will vote on the Ryan Bounds nomination, and I want to make sure each Member of the Senate is aware of two important issues as they prepare to cast their votes on the Bounds nomination to serve on the Ninth Circuit.

First, Mr. Bounds flagrantly misrepresented his background to our bipartisan Oregon judicial selection committee. This is the committee that was tasked with vetting his nomination—a process I have worked on with Republicans for literally two decades. I was pleased to work with our former colleague Senator Smith on this. I worked with the late Mark Hatfield on this. Now it is a pleasure to work with Senator MERKLEY, and the bipartisan efforts we have had produced this selection, a process. Mr. Bounds misrepresented—in my view, really lied—as he covered up disturbing, intolerant writings from his past.

Among many hateful matters he wrote about, he defended homophobic vandals who damaged a gay pride monument. He argued against efforts to protect the survivors of sexual assault on college campuses because, he wrote, he didn't think that would guarantee absolute safety.

As I indicated earlier, what outraged me, and shocked me, was his comparison of organizations that promote multiculturalism and tolerance in America to Nazi rallies. I am the child of Jewish parents who fled Nazi terror in Germany. Not all of our family got out. My great Uncle Max was among the last to be gassed at Auschwitz. For Mr. Bounds to compare groups that lift up minorities in America to Nazis is an extraordinary and dark stain on his character. For him to have concealed these writings from Oregon's bipartisan selection committee is disqualifying.

He never acknowledged these writings until they were uncovered and then posed a threat to his nomination. To this day, he has not fully recanted the abhorrent views that are reflected in that content. Five of the seven members of the bipartisan judicial selection committee, including the Chair, said recently they would not have included Mr. Bounds among their recommended candidates had they known about the writings as he was vetted.

Our bipartisan committee forwarded Mr. Bounds' name, along with others, as part of this process, and they said if Mr. Bounds had been straight with them, he would have told them about these offensive writings, but he misled them by keeping that secret.

The second issue, this is the first time in the 101-year history of what is called the blue-slip process where a nomination moved forward without a blue slip from either home State Senator. Senator MERKLEY and I withheld our blue slips specifically because of what I described, these lies about omission. We didn't consent to a hearing, a debate on the floor, but Chairman GRASSLEY and Majority Leader MCCONNELL barreled right ahead.

Leader MCCONNELL even told the New York Times that blue slips ought to be viewed as nothing more than an indication of how Senators might vote on a given nominee. That was not the tune Republicans were singing in 2009. Democrats then occupied the Oval Office, held the gavel of the Judiciary Committee, and every Member—every Member—of this body who sat on that side of the Chamber in the Republican conference sent a letter to President Obama and then-Chairman LEAHY saying that the nomination's process was "needlessly acrimonious." They wanted to return to an era of bipartisanship. Then, they said:

We hope your Administration will consult with us as it considers possible nominations to the federal courts from our states. Regretfully, if we are not consulted on, and approve of, a nomination from our states, the Republican Conference will be unable to support moving forward to that nominee.

In 2009, while in the minority, everyone who sat on that side of the Chamber rushed to defend blue slips as a statement of senatorial courtesy and collegiality. What a difference a few years makes.

What is happening now cheapens the advice and consent role of the Senate, something delegated to us by the Founding Fathers. The White House wants the Senate to act as a rubberstamp on whatever nominees are sent our way. The majority seems perfectly willing to go along with that.

My colleagues on the other side need to be aware of the new reality—this new reality where the blue slips don't matter—they are creating. This is going to be the end of the blue-slip process as it has worked in the Senate to promote good government on both sides of the aisle. This breach of a cen-

tury of bipartisan protocol is going to further drive the judiciary to the partisan extremes.

As we consider this nomination in a few minutes, this means lights-out—lights-out—for this important bipartisan tradition. The nominee we will be voting on concealed disturbing, intolerant writings from his past, misleading the bipartisan committee that reviewed his candidacy. Moving his nomination forward, in the face of that information and without the blue slips from Senator MERKLEY and myself, destroys more than a century of bipartisan tradition and certainly expands the power of the executive branch of the President.

What we learned earlier this week is it would take only one U.S. Senator on the other side—of all the people sitting over there, it would take only one to stop this abomination of a process. I hope one of my colleagues will be swayed by the horrendous writings Mr. Bounds lied to conceal.

This has been a sad moment for the Senate and a rejection of the kind of bipartisanship this body ought to bring to judicial nominations, the kind of bipartisanship I have been honored to be part of in Oregon for two decades. I urge my colleagues to vote no on the Bounds nomination.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The Senator from Michigan.

FAST-GROWING STARTUP COMPANIES

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, when you think about fast-growing startup companies, you might think about Silicon Valley, Boston, or Boulder. Though all these cities certainly have very vibrant ecosystems, innovative startups and small businesses are launching and growing across the United States, including in my home State of Michigan.

In every State, there are hard-working entrepreneurs who have established job-creating startups. These dynamic companies act as business leaders, innovators, and job creators within our communities.

This is why I am working with Senators WARREN, TILLIS, and SCOTT to commemorate Startup Week Across America and celebrate the ingenuity and entrepreneurship in our States and across the country. I kicked off this annual event in 2013 while serving in the House of Representatives. In the years since, I have had the privilege of visiting startups in Grand Rapids, Detroit, and Traverse City.

I have met with business founders who code apps for Fortune 500 companies, design and produce high-end jeans and other denim products, and grow and deliver farm-fresh products.

This Monday I visited Ferris Wheel, a new coworking space in Flint, MI, a community of hard-working Michiganders who are focused on their future.

The people of Flint are committed to building a stronger, healthier, more prosperous community, and they are

committed to doing it together. You can see this in their schools and their churches and nonprofits, and you can see this in their startups and small businesses.

One of the best parts about starting a business in Flint is 100K Ideas, a non-profit staffed by university students committed to helping entrepreneurs start their companies. This group is named in honor of the 100,000 residents of Flint and inspired by the thought that if they could pull one idea from every local resident, they could change the world.

This week, I had the chance to learn about a few of these new ideas. I met Kiara Tyler, the founder of Kalm Clothing. She moved the furniture out of her apartment to make room for inventory and stocked boxes of overalls and track suits where her couch used to be, while using her car as the company's headquarters. Now Kiara has done over \$100,000 worth of business. She is selling her clothing online, and she has space for her office and inventory at Ferris Wheel. Flint is her home, and she is excited to stay and to build her business in Michigan.

I learned about Article One Eyewear, a company that has taken on office space next door to her. They sell handcrafted eyeglasses and donate a portion of their proceeds to combat vitamin A deficiency and to fight blindness in developing nations.

I also met with SkyPoint Ventures, a true homegrown Michigan story. While they are a for-profit investment fund, they have also committed to social benefit projects and making Flint a better place to live and to do business. In addition to investing in companies like Article One, SkyPoint renovated the Ferris Building to create the Ferris Wheel coworking space and commit to the growing community of startups in the city of Flint.

Successful business growth comes down to matching talent to capital, and the United States does this better than any other country in the world. I am proud to say that I had a chance to see this happening firsthand in Flint and across the State of Michigan.

Michigan, in fact, has one of the fastest growing venture capital communities in the entire Nation, a critical asset that will help us become the startup capital of the Midwest. We have world-class colleges and universities, more engineers per capita than any other part of the country, and the infrastructure to export not just nationally but global as well.

I know that if we keep pulling together as a community and harness 100,000 ideas and beyond, Flint's future is bright. I know that Michigan's small businesses and startups will help to lead the way to new innovations that will revolutionize our economy.

I am committed to ensuring that our growing startup communities will be a fixture of creativity, innovation, and job creation for decades to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, today I rise to voice my support for the brave men and women of America's Immigration and Customs Enforcement, also known as ICE. Unfortunately, a resolution that would have shown this body's unanimous support for these courageous individuals was blocked.

While the Border Patrol has the important mission of maintaining security at our borders, ICE agents have the critical mission of enforcing immigration laws inside the United States. These two work hand in hand. Our Nation cannot have border security without enforcing our laws inside communities, and we cannot have secure communities without enforcing our laws at our borders.

The critical mission of ICE goes far beyond just immigration enforcement. These folks are on the frontlines of our homeland security.

Here is just a short list of the types of activities ICE is involved in: one, investigating and combating drug smuggling, pretty important; stopping human trafficking; preventing gang-related crimes; and working with other law enforcement entities to stop criminal and terrorist networks from operating.

Iowa, along with the rest of the country, has been gripped by an opioid crisis that puts our people and our safety at risk. Additionally, we continue to have a very grave methamphetamine issue that threatens the core of many of our already struggling rural communities.

We need ICE to help stop the flow of these drugs into Iowa's communities, our schools, our workplaces, and to our children and our families. In 2017 alone, ICE enforcement and removal operations seized nearly 1 million pounds of narcotics—1 million pounds of narcotics seized by ICE. Abolishing ICE would turn the flow of illegal drugs across the border from a stream into a monsoon.

I also implore anyone challenging the need for ICE to look at the horrendous toll of human trafficking: young and innocent women and men, boys and girls used as human pawns, smuggled across the border with hopes of a better life, forced into prostitution or worse—raped, beaten, subjected to sexual diseases and stripped of all innocence and dignity.

Sadly, human trafficking is a major issue in Iowa. In 2016, for instance, Des Moines was identified as one of the country's top 100 human trafficking locations. That information came to us from our good friends at Polaris, which is an anti-trafficking organization.

Human traffickers often exploit our immigration laws to transport their victims, and our ICE agents are the ones who help to stop them and to stop their illicit activities.

Every day, 24/7, 365 days a year, ICE agents are on the frontlines. They are

working to dismantle human trafficking networks and protect our most vulnerable.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider their objections and to support not only the resolution but to support those officers and personnel who carry out the vital mission of Immigration and Customs Enforcement in order to ensure the safety and security of all Americans.

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

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

TRUMP-PUTIN SUMMIT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss what is on so many Americans' minds today and the last couple of days—President Trump's recent trip to Europe, his meeting with Vladimir Putin, and his comments about Russia's interference in our elections.

So many Pennsylvanians—and I am sure this is true in every other State—have called or written to our office this week in complete disbelief asking: What is next? Where do we go from here?

These are good questions. They are critically important questions.

This President's views on Russia's past actions and the way forward have seemed to change every day this week.

Rather than focus on the news cycle following the Helsinki summit, I want to take a minute to review where things stood before—before—the President went to Europe.

Relations between the United States and Russia have been deteriorating for some time. We know that. The Russian Federation is clearly and unequivocally our adversary. Vladimir Putin envisions a world more closely resembling the Cold War era, certainly, than compared to today's realities, and he works toward a resurgence of Russian power and influence every day.

Just take a few examples. Russia attacked, annexed, and continues to illegally occupy Crimea. Russian-backed forces continue to violate cease-fire agreements in Ukraine and destabilize other parts of that country, preventing the Ukrainian people from fulfilling their dream of a secure and prosperous nation.

Russia is backing and enabling the murderous Assad regime in Syria. The conflict has emboldened terrorist groups, had dramatic humanitarian impacts, and has threatened the region's stability. As many as a half million people have been killed, and half the country has been displaced.

Just imagine if half of our population, say 150 million people, were displaced from their homes, sometimes to another part of the country and sometimes to a completely different country. That is the reality in Syria since

2011, and Russia has prolonged and exacerbated the Syrian people's suffering for its own power projection.

No. 4, Russia is also developing a stronger relationship with the Iranian regime and is reportedly considering arms sales and boosting their economic relationship. This threatens not only our national security interests in the Middle East but also those security interests of our staunchest ally, Israel.

Finally, Russia continues to have a substantial nuclear arsenal. It has violated the INF Treaty, and according to the Defense Department, is developing low-yield, nonstrategic nuclear weapons that could threaten our allies and partners.

Russia uses any number of tools, from manipulation of the energy supply to arms sales, to loans and aid to promote its brand of corrupt authoritarian governance around the world. It also employs nefarious means like hacking, espionage, and sowing false information to meddle in the most fundamental parts of our great democracy—our elections and, of course, those of other countries.

I don't think it is wrong for a United States President to meet with a hostile foreign leader. That is part of the job.

What is dead wrong is to sit across from a hostile foreign leader, one on one, with no notes, no staff, and to fail completely—completely—at your core mission, your job, which is protecting the national security interests of the American people.

To many people, it might seem odd to be focused on who was or wasn't in the room or whether any notes were taken, but without them, there is absolutely no accountability for what was said. We hear that the Russian military—let me say that again—the Russian military is ready to start implementing the agreements reached between President Trump and Vladimir Putin in that room.

We have to ask the President of the United States, what agreements? What did you agree to in that room? What did the leader of our Nation agree to that the Russian military is so eager to start implementing?

Further, there seems to have been some discussion between President Trump and Vladimir Putin about the Russian Government's interest in interrogating U.S. citizens, like former Ambassador to Russia Michael McFaul. Yesterday, we heard the White House say the President was giving that absurd proposal serious consideration. Of course Putin wants to question Ambassador McFaul. He is an expert on Russia who served our country honorably as Ambassador and as a public servant. He stood up to Russian aggression and promoted U.S. national security interests, especially when they contradicted Moscow's agenda.

The idea that we would entertain handing over an American citizen to an authoritarian Russian Government with no rule of law and no history of treating people fairly—and, of course,

with a history of interrogating and torturing political opponents—that is not only insulting to our values, it is dangerous and it is wrong. That is not America. No official in our government—of any branch of government—should support that. If the administration tries it, the Congress should take every effort to stop them from doing that.

The Russian threat is serious and persistent. It isn't solved by one meeting and a press conference. It will take sustained commitment from the national security professionals across our government, and it will take real vision and leadership from the President and his Cabinet. I do not object to meeting with an adversary, nor does anyone. That is part of the job of being President. Instead, what I am concerned about, what a lot of Americans are concerned about, is this President's conduct during and after that meeting, especially his unwillingness to say without reservation or caveat that Russia was responsible for hacking our elections in 2016 and continues to meddle in our democratic process. This isn't a political judgment; it is the judgment of our intelligence and law enforcement experts, and it led to the indictment of 12 Russian military intelligence hackers this past Friday.

Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats reaffirmed this judgment just this week, saying:

The role of the Intelligence Community is to provide the best information and fact-based assessments possible for the President and policymakers. We have been clear in our assessments of Russian meddling in the 2016 election and their ongoing, pervasive efforts to undermine our democracy, and we will continue to provide unvarnished and objective intelligence in support of our national security.

So said the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats.

Why can't the President say this and say it repeatedly, that he agrees with their assessment and is working to stop Russia from doing it again?

My constituents, like so many Americans, were right to ask: Where do we go from here? There is no playbook for this scenario.

I believe we must act in a bipartisan fashion to make clear to Russia that the U.S. Congress will not stand for continued interference in our elections and will work to counter them on other fronts.

First, we should enact new legislation to levy sanctions on Russian entities responsible for this malicious behavior and demand the administration fully implement legislation that was passed with an overwhelming bipartisan majority last year. No. 2, we must pass legislation to protect the special counsel and to shine a bright light on the dark money in politics. No. 3, we must fully fund State and municipal efforts to shore up our electoral systems. No. 4, we must speak out in support of our alliances. Many of our closest international partners are right on the frontlines of Russia's desta-

bilizing actions. Finally, we should insist that the administration answer the questions so many of us have about what happened in that room in Helsinki and what they plan to do to counter Russia and protect our national security interests.

We are in uncharted waters in terms of the actions of the President. His actions the last 2 weeks have made us less safe. I will say it again—less safe. He must take decisive action to guarantee our security by confronting malign Russian aggression against the United States and our NATO allies and partners. At the same time, Congress, both parties, both Houses, must act to protect our security and make it clear to the President that this branch of government will continue to discharge its constitutional duties.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I would like to acknowledge that the Senator from Pennsylvania has made a number of good points on the subject of Russia and the way we need to go with Russia.

People have asked me about what I think about Mr. Putin and whether he is trustworthy, and I tell them no. The way that I know he is misleading the public on the issues of meddling is because his lips are moving. He is not just telling the truth. Any time he talks about it, it just flies in the face of Federal investigations, oversight hearings, and classified briefings we have been involved in. I think it is an example of where Members of Congress have really come together on an issue.

KEEPING FAMILIES TOGETHER AND ENFORCE THE LAW ACT

Mr. President, now I would like to talk about another issue that I would like Members of Congress to come together on, and it is called the Keeping Families Together and Enforce the Law Act.

You have heard a lot of reports recently about children being separated from their families at the border, and the administration has taken a position, in part prompted by lawsuits, and we can debate whether the administration should fix this problem through an Executive order, but how about this.

Why doesn't Congress act to provide long-term certainty through an act of Congress to make absolutely certain that children who cross the border with their families can be kept with their families while we are trying to determine in a court whether that family has a legitimate claim to asylum?

It sounds fairly simple. In fact, it is pretty simple. I met with Senators FEINSTEIN, Senator DURBIN, and Senator CRUZ. We sat down, and we discussed a way to actually get this into law. We all agreed it needs to be very narrowly focused.

The problem with immigration around here and the immigration subject is it gets really big and really complex really quickly. What happens with

big and complex on Capitol Hill is nothing gets done.

So the bill we propose is very simple. Fix the issues in the law, clarify the process so we can actually make absolutely certain that minor children can stay with their parents while their asylum claims are being considered.

We have had agreement on virtually everything. We have agreed that families should be kept together. We have agreed that we need more judges so we can reduce the backlog. We agreed we need more attorneys to participate in the process—basically a 2-to-1 ratio between a new judge and new attorneys to support the legal process. We agreed on minimum standards for housing so we make sure we are keeping these families in a place that we think are appropriate.

Some people may come to the floor and say we are going to stand up tent cities and subject people to harsh conditions. We don't want to do that. As a matter of fact, we feel so strongly about it that we are putting forth specific requirements for housing. So we are addressing the judge constraint, we are addressing the lawyer constraint, we are addressing specific standards for keeping families together.

We can actually pass this in a heartbeat. We can do it on the Senate floor, and we can do it through what is called unanimous consent. Allow somebody to come down here, put a bill forward, and get it passed. Give those children and parents certainty.

The fact is, some of them are going to apply for asylum and will not have a legitimate case. Others will, but we have proposed a bill that will prevent any sort of lengthy detention. As a matter of fact, if this bill gets passed, the average case with a family would be prioritized. If you have an asylum request and you are with children, we want to keep you together and get it at the front of the docket so you can get certainty fairly quickly—over 40 to 60 days, but we have a constraint we have to get past. It has to do with a court ruling called the Flores case, where if we don't narrowly tailor the language to say, if a child—if a minor comes across the border with their parents, then they will be allowed to be kept with their parents in appropriate housing until such time as their asylum request has been heard before a court of law. It is not getting rid of Flores. You have some people here saying we want to completely eliminate the case. That is not the case.

We don't want children coming across the border who don't have parents with them to be retained in perpetuity or indefinite detention, as it is referred to down there. That is what Flores does. So if a child comes across the border, and they don't have a parent with them, then after 20 days, they have to be placed somewhere other than detention. That is a good policy.

If you have a situation where Flores stands the way that it is, then the law specifically requires the child to be

separated from the parents. This gives the parents the choice. If they want the children with them while they are going through the legal process, then they can have that. If they choose to have the child placed with a family member or a guardian, then they can have that too.

One of the things that I think we have to talk more about is the danger of just randomly placing children with a parent or guardian who comes across the border. We have several cases where in our system there is no way we would place the child with some of the people they are coming across the border with. They have been convicted for a variety of things: child neglect, child abuse, drug trafficking. All sorts of things that would have an American citizen's child removed from their family are the same sort of standards we want for a child coming across the border. Of course, we want to make sure the parent who says they are their parent or guardian really is.

So in this body, there are few opportunities where you can narrowly tailor a policy to a point to where only the most partisan or unreasonable person wouldn't support it. This is one of them. We can get this bill passed, sent to the President's desk, and provide certainty—a compassionate, appropriate method for dealing with what are now hundreds of thousands of people who have come across the border—to children with their parents. Treat them fairly, treat them justly, and have them processed in what I believe is the greatest judicial system that has ever existed.

It is on us to solve this problem. Anybody who comes down here and says, well, no, I have to talk about DACA, which is something I support, a path to citizenship or I want to talk about border security, which I also support—yes, let's talk about that, but let's not hold these children and these families hostage for other immigration matters. This body should have the backbone to deal with the political challenges that may come from their own party and do the right thing—the next time.

This time, let's solve the separation of children from their parents. Let's stop playing the political games that make for great fodder, but they are not compassionate, they are not a part of the solution. I hope we have enough Members to become a part of the solution. Next week, we will be talking more about this and possibly through unanimous consent.

I want somebody to come down to this floor and explain to me why it is a bad idea. I want them to explain it to the American people, but, out of respect for the Senate, we will not offer a unanimous consent request today, but you can be pretty sure we will next week.

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. (Mr. PERDUE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the Bounds nomination be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. For the information of all Senators, the nomination will be withdrawn.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 584 as under the previous order and that I then be permitted to speak briefly about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE AGAINST THE MAKING AVAILABLE OF CURRENT AND FORMER DIPLOMATS, OFFICIALS, AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR QUESTIONING BY THE GOVERNMENT OF VLADIMIR PUTIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session to consider the following resolution, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 584) expressing the sense of the Senate against the making available of current and former diplomats, officials, and members of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am hopeful that we will come together on this resolution, which I introduced with the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Hawaii, that it is neither the policy nor the practice of the United States to submit our citizens, let alone our Ambassadors, to the interrogation of a foreign adversary.

Let this resolution be a warning to the administration that Congress will not allow this to happen. I call on President Trump to say once and for

all—not through his spokespeople—that the lopsided, disgraceful trade he called an incredible offer is now off the table. There should be no equivocation on the matter.

One more point. I am so disappointed in the failure of the resolutions earlier today. We had a real chance for bipartisanship. The resolutions were modest and mild, and they were just resolutions, but we couldn't even come to agreement on those. Our Republican colleagues, given the crisis we have in foreign policy, have to step up to the plate and join us not just in resolutions but in bipartisan action that is so important.

I was told that one of the reasons the resolution was objected to was because we couldn't—they didn't even want us to get the notes, let alone hear from the translator of this 2-hour, mysterious meeting where nobody seems to know what happened. The American people should know what happened. The Senate should know what happened. Our leaders in the State Department and Defense Department should know what happened. Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to be too afraid to let us bring that up. That is so wrong for the security of America.

I am hopeful—there are bipartisan efforts going on today—that we cannot do what we did earlier and block the resolution by the Senator from Vermont and the bipartisan resolution from the Senators from Arizona and Delaware but move together in real action to undo the damage—try to undo the damage that the President has done to this country this week.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY).

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

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 162 Leg.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Cardin	Daines
Baldwin	Carper	Donnelly
Barrasso	Casey	Duckworth
Bennet	Cassidy	Durbin
Blumenthal	Collins	Enzi
Blunt	Coons	Ernst
Booker	Corker	Feinstein
Boozman	Cornyn	Fischer
Brown	Cortez Masto	Flake
Burr	Cotton	Gardner
Cantwell	Crapo	Gillibrand
Capito	Cruz	Graham

Grassley	Manchin	Sasse
Harris	Markey	Schatz
Hassan	McCaskill	Schumer
Hatch	McConnell	Scott
Heinrich	Menendez	Shaheen
Heitkamp	Merkley	Smith
Heller	Moran	Stabenow
Hirono	Murkowski	Sullivan
Hoeven	Murphy	Tester
Hyde-Smith	Murray	Thune
Inhofe	Nelson	Tillis
Isakson	Paul	Toomey
Johnson	Perdue	Udall
Jones	Peters	Van Hollen
Kaine	Portman	Warner
Kennedy	Reed	Warren
King	Risch	Whitehouse
Klobuchar	Roberts	Wicker
Lankford	Rounds	Wyden
Leahy	Rubio	Young
Lee	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Shelby

The resolution (S. Res. 584) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am proud of the advancements we have made in healthcare in this country—advancements that have been made, including those in the Affordable Care Act.

At lunch today we had an opportunity to see one of the faces of the progress that we have made. Elena Hung brought her daughter to our caucus lunch today, and we had a chance to see how a young girl has been able to literally survive as a result of the coverage provided under our healthcare system.

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we have found that more and more Americans have not only been able to get health insurance but they have been able to get quality health insurance that covers their essential health benefits and provides them protection against discriminatory insurance company practices. We are clearly moving to where healthcare is a right, not a privilege.

I say that fully aware that President Trump's policies have reversed some of this progress and that he is trying to reverse even more of this progress. The President's policies have sabotaged the individual marketplace. As a result, we have seen significant premium increases caused by actions taken by the Trump administration in eliminating the individual responsibility, not providing the cost-sharing, and making it difficult for reinsurance to take place.

All those add to the instability within the individual marketplace, turning it into more of a high-risk pool, increasing premiums, and causing a lot of insurance companies to wonder whether they should be in that market at all.

Recently, the Trump administration went one step further—and I would hope all Americans would be very much outraged—and that is the protection against preexisting conditions that were included in insurance policies prior to the adoption of the Affordable Care Act.

With regard to preexisting conditions, most of us have some form of preexisting condition. You may have high blood pressure, high cholesterol, asthma, heart condition, or diabetes. You may have had cancer, or you may have had behavioral health issues. All of those are preexisting conditions.

According to a recent study by Health and Human Services, there are as many as 133 million Americans, nonelderly, who would qualify for preexisting conditions and would be subject to discriminatory actions by private insurance companies if the protections under the Affordable Care Act were to vanish.

In my own State of Maryland, that number is about 2.5 million Americans, nonelderly, that could be subject to discriminatory practices by insurance companies—320,000 of whom are children.

In June 2018, President Trump's administration broke a longstanding tradition and practice in this country and announced that it would not defend the court challenge to the Affordable Care Act. In the case of Texas v. United States, not only did the Trump administration say that they would not intervene to protect the constitutionality of the act passed by Congress but that they would submit a brief to the Court recommending that protections such as the preexisting conditions protections that we have under existing law should be held invalid.

Well, the Trump administration is going to the courts asking them to allow insurance companies to once again discriminate against people in this country based upon preexisting conditions. That is why we have insurance, to protect you for what you need.

This is now in the courts, and we will see what will happen with Texas v. United States in that court, but it could very well end up in the Supreme Court of the United States. It is very clear that as we evaluate our judicial appointments, we need to understand the importance of the decisions they will be called upon to make.

We had a circuit court appointment this afternoon that we were supposed to vote on, and it has been withdrawn. I am pleased about that because that individual would not have been sensitive to the rights of the people of our country.

Now we have a nominee for the Supreme Court of the United States, Judge Brett Kavanaugh. It is critically

important that we understand that the Supreme Court of the United States may very well be considering the case of *Texas v. United States* and may very well be considering whether preexisting condition restrictions that currently exist in law are valid or not.

I think what we should be doing in our evaluation of President Trump's nominee is to determine whether that person will be an independent voice on the Supreme Court of the United States, representing the people of this country, protecting their constitutional rights against the abuses of power, whether that power comes from the White House or Capitol Hill or corporate America.

There are so many areas that we should be concerned about. Today, I am going to talk about healthcare.

Yes, it is very possible that this particular nominee, if confirmed, could be a deciding vote on preexisting condition restrictions. Judge Kavanaugh dealt with the Affordable Care Act in 2011 on the DC Circuit, where there was a challenge to the constitutionality of the Affordable Care Act. The Court did not hold it invalid, but Judge Kavanaugh was in the dissent on that opinion, raising concerns to us as to whether he will side with consumers or special interests as it relates to protecting consumers and policyholders in this country against the abusive practices of health insurance companies.

We also, of course, have the concern over women's healthcare issues and whether women's right of choice will be protected—*Roe v. Wade*. Judge Kavanaugh has raised questions as to whether he will follow precedent. *Roe v. Wade* is well established, but I have little comfort as to whether Judge Kavanaugh, in fact, will follow that precedent. These are issues that, as we start the vetting process with our interviews and our committee hearings, we really need to drill down on and understand where Judge Kavanaugh is on these issues.

Then I will bring up the high cost of prescription drugs. One of the basic protections I would hope our Court would do is to protect consumers against powerful special interests. We have to make sure, as we vet Judge Kavanaugh, whether he will side with the people of this country or with the powerful special interests.

Now, we have a greater role than just vetting the next Supreme Court nominee. There are things that we can do to protect our healthcare system. I am talking to many of my colleagues, and many have said, on both sides of the aisle, that we want to protect against the preexisting condition restrictions in insurance policies. So why don't we take action? Let's make sure that we protect the Affordable Care Act as it relates to denying insurance companies the ability to deny coverage based upon preexisting conditions.

We could also intervene in the lawsuit that is pending to tell the Court that we meant what we said: Insurance

companies cannot impose preexisting restrictions on coverage.

Yes, we should deal with the high cost of prescription drugs. There are things that we can do. We have had suggestions on both sides of the aisle. The President talked about this during his campaign, but he has done little to deal with the cost of prescription drugs.

One of the basic things that can be done—economics 101—is to use the collective purchasing power of the government and the larger market share to bring down costs. Why are we paying two to three times what consumers in industrialized nations in the world are paying for the same drugs? Let's organize our markets so that our consumers can get a better price. We can pass legislation to make that a reality.

Then, yes, we should take the necessary time in the process of considering President Trump's nominations to the courts, particularly for the Supreme Court of the United States. To make sure that we recognize that the balance of the Court is at stake, let's make sure that we use as our barometer whether Judge Kavanaugh will represent your constitutional rights over the powerful, over the abuses of any President, Congress, or corporate America. We don't want to be a rubberstamp for President Trump, particularly in these times, when we have the sensitive Mueller investigation going on, when we have the President taking so much power.

We saw what he is doing with the borders and what he is doing in so many ways, violating the basic values of this country. We want to make sure there is an independent court that will not be beholden to the President of the United States.

We need to protect the advancements we have made in healthcare, including protections against preexisting conditions, women's right to choice, and continue with the work on the high costs of healthcare.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

STOP ENABLING SEX TRAFFICKERS ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I wish to report back to my colleagues here in the Senate and to the American people about the results of legislation which we passed here in the Senate and the House and which was signed into law by the President. We don't do that often enough, and we tend to pass legislation and don't do the oversight to figure out whether it is working.

In this case, this was legislation we passed back in April on a bipartisan

basis called the Stop Enabling Sex Traffickers Act. This legislation allows the victims of sex trafficking to get the justice they deserve by being able to sue websites that knowingly trafficked them online and have some accountability for these horrible crimes that are committed online. It also allows prosecutors at the State and local level to prosecute these cases.

We drafted the legislation because after looking at this for several years, we realized that there was a rise in trafficking of underage girls, women, and sometimes underage boys and that this was increasing primarily because of the dark side of the internet. We are hearing a lot about what is going on on the internet these days in terms of meddling in our elections and so on. With all the positives, there is also a darker side. We realized this was happening increasingly, and it was a ruthlessly, efficient way to sell people online.

We looked at it and found there was a Federal law put in place—with good intentions, I believe—a couple of decades ago to try to ensure freedom of the internet, which, of course, all of us support, but it provided an effective immunity to these websites even if they were knowingly selling people online. So we wrote legislation to get at that, spent about a year trying to get that through the process, and eventually got it to a vote and got it passed.

The law that provided the immunity was part of the Communications Decency Act. Again, it was meant to encourage freedom of the internet but was taken too far, particularly in how it was interpreted by the courts. The internet was something we had to address because without that, we would see this increase in drug trafficking and sex trafficking.

So what happened? After passing the law, there was a pretty dramatic change.

On Monday, I was in Cincinnati, OH, my hometown, at a place called the CHANGE Court. The CHANGE Court is a place where women who are trafficked and incarcerated for prostitution are able to go through a 2-year program to help them get clean and, if they are willing to go through this program, to walk away with a clean record, understanding that sex trafficking is not a crime and that they are in effect victims of trafficking.

It is very inspiring to go there. I talked to about a dozen women who are currently in the program and some women who had graduated from the program. The stories are unbelievable—women getting their lives back together; getting back to work and getting back to their families; in almost every case, getting back to their children—in almost every case, these are moms; having the self-respect and dignity that comes with work; getting back with their families; and getting their lives back on track. It is a much better alternative than the system of throwing people into jail who are, in effect, victims of trafficking and not

dealing with their issues, whether it is the trauma or the drug addiction. In almost every case, there was a drug addiction issue. Almost all of them were opiate addicts or recovering addicts. One was addicted to alcohol. This is common.

In talking to these women, almost every one of them said the same thing, which was that, yes, they had been trafficked online, and they were very interested in this legislation. They had been through it, and they wanted to save future women and girls from having to go down this dark path.

We passed the legislation and assessed the legislation meant to help on this issue, and I was able to tell these women at the CHANGE Court what the results were. They are pretty dramatic.

On Monday of this week, I also met with the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, or NCMEC. This is the leading anti-trafficking group in the country. They work day and night trying to stop online sex traffickers. They keep track of the statistics and data. They particularly focus on rescuing kids from being exploited.

According to NCMEC, the results from SESTA being signed into law has been swift and significant. NCMEC said:

Since the enactment of SESTA and the government's seizure of Backpage, there has been a major disruption in the online marketplace. The robust marketplace for sex trafficking, including the sale of children for rape and sexual abuse, that took a decade to build, fragmented over the course of just a few days.

They also said:

Many sites or portions of sites where NCMEC knew children previously have been sold for sex have voluntarily shut down.

Their bottom line:

This means it is much harder to purchase a child . . . online.

This means it is much harder to purchase a child online. That is great news, and that is exactly what we intended this legislation to do—to save these kids, women, and sometimes boys from being subjected to this horrific crime.

Another analysis was shared with me recently, and you can find this online. This analysis found that since our legislation passed, online ads selling women and children have been reduced by between 60 and 80 percent, depending on the State. That is a dramatic change, having the effect of saving literally thousands of children.

I am hopeful we will continue to be vigilant about this issue because when you push something down in one place, it often pops up somewhere else. But we have done an effective job of dealing with a very real problem. Backpage.com, which we talked about, was the industry leader. They have now been shut down. The CEO of the company has pled guilty to numerous money laundering and trafficking-related charges.

Because prosecutors can now do their work and go after these online traf-

fickers and because victims of this crime can finally have their day in court, websites that knowingly facilitate sex trafficking are being shut down and being held liable for their actions.

This never would have been possible without the work of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. The staff and investigators spent 2 years working on this issue, investigating it. We had to come all the way to the floor of this Chamber in order to enforce our subpoenas to get the information that we were able to unveil, which no one else had been able to find, and that showed clearly that they knew what they remember doing. They knew they were selling underage kids online. I chair that subcommittee. It is bipartisan. I am very proud of those investigators. They do good work, and they deserve to be applauded, given the results we are now seeing.

It is not just Backpage; a lot of other, classified websites have also shut down their personal ads or sex-related operations.

OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. PORTMAN. We have made good progress on the issue of sex trafficking, but it is so related to the issue of opioid abuse. Specifically, as I said, these often go hand in hand. Often, traffickers find people who are addicted. They are vulnerable, they crave the drug, and the trafficker can provide it. But in my home State of Ohio, I have met with survivors, and many times we have found that they find vulnerable people who are not addicted but then make them addicted so they become dependent on the trafficker.

This is an issue that relates to so many things, doesn't it? It relates to our workplace because people who are addicted to opioids are not coming into the workforce. One reason we have such high levels of unemployment—people are outside the workforce altogether, not showing up on the unemployment numbers because they aren't even looking for work. The labor force participation rate, as economists call it, is so low right now largely, in my view, because of this opioid issue. Our courts are jammed, our jails are jammed, and our hospitals and emergency rooms are jammed. We have to do more to get at this issue for so many reasons.

The driving force in my home State of Ohio and around the country now is this synthetic form of heroin or opioids called fentanyl. It is 50 times more powerful than heroin. There are other drugs—carfentanil is an example—that are even more powerful. These synthetic forms of opioids are causing most of the deaths now in my State of Ohio and around the country.

The Centers for Disease Control, CDC, recently issued a report that showed this increase in overdose deaths involving fentanyl. The report analyzed overdose deaths in 10 States hit

hardest by the epidemic, including Ohio. They found that fentanyl overdose deaths in those States nearly doubled from the last 6 months of 2016 to the first 6 months of 2017. Of course, 2017 is the last year for which they have good records. It is unbelievable.

This synthetic form of heroin is the new scourge of the opioid epidemic, and it is being spread into every other drug too. When I do roundtables back home, as I do regularly, I hear about it being spread into crystal meth, cocaine, and heroin, of course.

Twice in roundtable discussions I have had with community leaders, I have heard—once from a police chief and once from a sheriff—very similar stories about a young man who wakes up from an overdose after being saved through Narcan, which is a miracle drug that reverses the effects of an overdose. When the young man comes to, he says: I was just smoking pot. How did I overdose?

In both cases, based on the forensics and the information they were able to get from the labs, they found out that of course it wasn't just marijuana; it was marijuana laced with fentanyl. No street drug is safe. They can all kill you.

As I have met with these first responders, community leaders, and those in recovery across Ohio—I just did recently with a group called PreventionFIRST—I have heard what is often brought up by those on the frontlines; that is, that we would be making so much more progress right now on this war against opioids—we have been successful here in this Congress in passing more money for prevention, treatment, and recovery, and those funds are starting to be used back home, and I see it; I see the results, and there are some really exciting things going on—but for the fentanyl. In other words, just as we were finally making progress on prescription drugs and, then, on heroin, now this fentanyl comes in and is creating even more problems. It is so inexpensive, and it is so pervasive.

Recently, in Ohio, there were two busts where they were able to apprehend people who were selling fentanyl and find this cache of fentanyl they had. In both cases, it was a massive amount combined. Just these two busts alone, there was enough fentanyl to kill half the people in my State of Ohio. That is how bad it is.

Just last week, there was an autopsy that revealed that the death of an Ohio police chief from Kirkersville, in the Columbus area, who was caused by fentanyl. The report said: "acute intoxication by fentanyl." It was an accidental overdose.

I have told the story before of the police officer who brushed a couple of flakes off his shirt after a bust. He didn't know it was fentanyl. The flakes were the drug. It got into his skin through his fingers, and he dropped to the ground unconscious and had an overdose. It took several doses of Narcan to save his life.

Our first responders are in much more danger with fentanyl than they have ever been, even with heroin, prescription drugs, and other opioids. Addiction has taken too many lives in Ohio. Again, fentanyl is the deadliest drug in this epidemic.

There was a recent estimation by a group called the Ohio Alliance for Innovation in Population Health, which suggested that opioids are responsible for more than 500,000 years of life expectancy lost in Ohio between 2010 and 2016. Think about that: 500,000 years of lost life due to opioids in Ohio, just in the 6 years between 2010 and 2016.

Often, these are lives of young people who had great promise ahead of them and had become involved in this opioid epidemic, and the addiction takes over, and it is more important than anything. It is more important than their family, more important than their friends, more important than their jobs, more important than their faith, and more important than taking care of themselves. They end up, sadly, losing their lives and all that opportunity and all the purpose God had for them in their lives.

We need to turn the tide in this opioid epidemic. We can't do it, in my view, unless we get at this issue of fentanyl because that is the new scourge. We need to look at how it is coming, why it is coming, and why it is so cheap.

Here is what is very interesting, and it might be surprising to some people. It is not coming across the border from Mexico, or if it is, it is very little of it. That is where the heroin is coming from, 90 percent of it. It is more pure than ever, more dangerous than ever. The deadly fentanyl is mostly coming through the mail system. It is being mailed into the United States of America, mostly from overseas, mostly from China.

There are some evil scientists somewhere in China making this fentanyl and then shipping it into your community. It is the No. 1 killer right now. By the way, opioid overdose and death is the No. 1 cause of death in my home State of Ohio. Nationally, it is now the No. 1 cause of death of people under 50 years old. It surpassed car accidents. It is an epidemic. How could that be? What can we do about it?

There is something we can do about it. We have to be sure that the post office helps law enforcement to find these packages as they are coming in and get these packages out of circulation so they don't come into our communities and poison our families, our children, and our neighbors. We have legislation to do that. It is called the STOP Act.

One-third of the Members of this Senate have now cosponsored that legislation. We have now had it reported out of the Finance Committee of the Senate. We need to get it to the floor and get it to a vote. It is very simple. It is legislation that AMY KLOBUCHAR, a Democrat of Minnesota, on that side of

the aisle, and I have come up with that says the post office should have to do what any other carrier would have to do—FedEx, UPS, DHL. Under law, they have to tell law enforcement in advance what packages are coming in, where it is coming from, what is in it, and where it is going. You have to provide that electronically so you can use big data to sift through the millions of packages that come in and to be able to find ones that are suspect and then immediately use sophisticated equipment to scan and screen those and pull out of circulation the ones that have fentanyl in them.

I have been to these distribution centers for these private carrier companies. I have seen how they do it. I have seen the dangerous work the Customs and Border Protection men and women are doing, using a room that has significant ventilation. They have to have masks on and gloves. They have to be very careful about it. Thank God, they are there, because they are saving lives. If you send it through the mail system, that very rarely happens.

We did a yearlong study of this in our Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I talked about earlier. We found a number of things that were very troubling. One is just how easy it is to buy fentanyl online. The second is the fact that when these drugs come in through the post office, it is guaranteed delivery. The traffickers will say if you send it by FedEx or another private carrier—UPS, DHL, and others—it is not guaranteed. If you send it through the government agency, no problem. That is not the way it should be.

By the way, letter carriers—the mail carriers in my community and your community—want this fixed, too, because they care what comes into their communities. They care about the people whom they serve, and they want to be sure they are not delivering poison. They also are at risk, just like anybody else is who is anywhere in that train.

I talked about the law enforcement officers. Think about the other first responders who are using Narcan to revive people. They sometimes get exposed to it. We have too many stories of little kids dying from being accidentally exposed to fentanyl in a home where somebody is using it. It is dangerous stuff. We have to fix this.

The information as to where it is from, where it is going, and what is in it, when it is put into a digital format and can be analyzed quickly through incredible intelligence that our Customs and Border Protection people have, to be able to determine whether that package is suspect or not, will make a huge difference in taking this offline and keeping this poison from coming into our communities and ensuring that we can, in fact, begin to stop some of the poison but, at a minimum, it will raise the price by reducing the supply.

The post office, frankly, because of the pressure they have gotten from

Congress on this over the last few years have begun to start to look at some of this. They have begun to provide some of the electronic data. Based on testimony they provided for our subcommittee just recently, they are now receiving data on about 36 percent of international packages they transport into the country. Unfortunately, of that 36 percent, just over one-third, about 80 percent of those packages, are presented to law enforcement, and 20 percent get lost and end up going into the system, into our communities, even though we know they are suspect.

It is very inefficient right now. It is not working well. Plus, some of the data is not decipherable. We have a long way to go. Even if all 36 percent were being delivered to law enforcement, that would mean that 318 million international packages each year were coming in without any screening—318 million packages.

The STOP Act is very simple. It holds the post office to the same standard as private carriers—100 percent screenings. It requires that by 2020 they get all this data on all the international packages entering the United States.

It is a commonsense solution. It has already passed the House of Representatives recently with a broad bipartisan vote. Our committee has reported it out. We need to get it to the floor and get it voted on. If we do so, by the way, it will be signed because the administration has already issued a statement of administration policy on it, which supports the legislation. It was actually a recommendation of the President's commission on opioids. It is part of the solution.

Is it the whole solution? No, but it is a critical part to try to stop some of this new poison, fentanyl, from coming into our communities—the No. 1 killer—so that we can, through treatment and recovery and better prevention efforts and better other law enforcement efforts, truly begin to turn the tide on this opioid epidemic. It is critical that we do so for so many reasons we have talked about this afternoon.

My hope is that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will come together, at least on this issue, on the STOP Act, and say yes, we can do something to help those in our community who are suffering, those who are dying from overdoses, those families who are looking to us and saying: What can you do to help? I run into them all the time.

Today, I am heading back to Ohio, and I know this weekend I will be talking to people in Cleveland and Cincinnati, where I will be, and in Columbus, and they will be telling me about it.

This week, I was walking down the hall back to my office on Tuesday, and a young man came up to me and said: I want to talk to you about something.

I figured he was with the media and wanted to ask me a question. I asked him what he wanted.

He said: I want to tell you thank you.

He started to well up, and I knew what he was talking about. He was talking about a family member of his who had overdosed and died. He was talking about the fact that he appreciates that Congress is finally beginning to respond to this issue, as we have.

In the last year and after, we have passed legislation that is historic to deal with this issue, but there is still so much more to do. Let's make the next step getting the STOP Act enacted into law and, therefore, be able to save lives and help people to live their God-given purpose in life.

I yield back my time.

ANTI-TERRORISM CLARIFICATION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, last week, the Senate Judiciary Committee marked up and passed by voice vote S. 2946, the Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act of 2018.

I was proud to introduce this bipartisan bill and to lead it through the Judiciary Committee. I am proud to have Senators NELSON, RUBIO, WHITEHOUSE, CRUZ, BLUMENTHAL, TILLIS, COONS, CORNYN, HATCH, and KENNEDY as cosponsors.

It is not always easy to find common ground here in the Senate, but there is one issue where there is no doubt we can all agree: Those who aid or carry out terrorist attacks that kill or injure Americans should be held fully accountable.

Those who have been impacted should have a meaningful avenue to seek justice.

For over 25 years, the Anti-Terrorism Act has empowered American victims of international terrorism to bring civil lawsuits in Federal courts to vindicate their rights and obtain compensation for their injuries.

Just as important, these lawsuits disrupt and discourage the financing and material support of terrorist organizations. By cutting terrorists' financial lifelines, the ATA helps to reduce global terrorism, protecting Americans both here and abroad.

In short, the ATA puts terrorists on notice to keep their hands off Americans.

I was proud to be the lead sponsor of the ATA back in 1992, which removed the jurisdictional hurdles that, for too long, had frustrated or outright prevented American victims' ability to seek redress.

Since then, terrorists and those who financially support them have tried to blow holes in the law and stretch its exceptions beyond what Congress ever intended.

The Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act of 2018—and its additional improvements adopted in the Judiciary Committee last week—strengthens the ATA and reiterates Congress's original intent that terrorist groups and their supporters be brought to justice in U.S.

Courts, regardless of where the attacks occurred.

It is a carefully considered and deliberately crafted response to efforts to undermine the ATA. It represents Congress's considered judgment in responding to acts of international terrorism that kill or injure Americans overseas.

The bill clarifies the ATA's so-called "act of war" exception. Congress never intended that designated terrorist organizations could dodge liability for attacks that kill or injure Americans by simply claiming this exception.

Some, however, have twisted the exception to get away scot-free. The "act of war" exception should not be a liability shield for designated terrorist organizations or their supporters.

This bill makes clear that the exception doesn't apply to those designated by the U.S. Government as foreign terrorist organizations or specially designated global terrorists.

This is common sense. As one Federal judge put it, "To find that a terrorist organization can be a military force under the ATA would defeat the purpose of the Act, 'which was enacted to deter terrorist activity and hold liable those who engage in it.'"

Outside of that, the bill keeps in place the current analysis that courts conduct when determining who is and is not a military force.

Second, the bill permits victims of narco-terrorism to satisfy court-awarded ATA judgments with the assets of foreign drug kingpins. Assets blocked by the Federal Government under the Kingpin Designation Act are not currently available to victims to satisfy their judgments.

This bill fixes that.

Finally, the bill responds to recent Federal court decisions that severely undermined the ability of American victims to bring terrorists to justice. The ATA was specifically designed to provide extraterritorial jurisdiction over terrorists who attack Americans overseas. Last year, I led an amicus brief, with 22 bipartisan Senators, to the Supreme Court in *Sokolow v. Palestine Liberation Organization*, reiterating the purpose and scope of the 1992 law.

I was stunned when the Justice Department failed to stand up in that case for American victims of terrorism.

Despite broad bipartisan support in Congress for the ATA and the victims it protects, the Justice Department, in fact, actively opposed those victims and their right to seek redress against terrorists.

Inconceivably, instead of standing up for American victims of terrorism, the administration urged the Court to not even consider the *Sokolow* decision.

Congress can act where the administration chose not to. Accordingly, this bill makes crystal clear that defendants who take advantage of certain benefits from the U.S. Government following 120 days after the bill's enactment—such as foreign assistance—will

be deemed to have consented to personal jurisdiction in ATA cases.

Based on further improvements in a substitute amendment adopted by unanimous consent in the Judiciary Committee, the bill also restores jurisdiction in cases pending at the time of the bill's enactment. No defendant, after all, should be able to enjoy privileges under U.S. law, while simultaneously dodging responsibility for supporting terrorists that injure or kill Americans.

The Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act is supported by thousands of veterans and Gold Star families

It is supported by groups like AIPAC, the Anti-Defamation League, American Jewish Committee, Christians United for Israel, the Endowment for Middle East Truth, the Jewish Institute for National Security of America, the National Council of Young Israel, the Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America, the Rabbinical Council of America, and the Zionist Organization of America.

I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who have joined me on this bill and whose staffs are working tirelessly to help us move it forward.

I also want to thank Senators NELSON and BLUMENTHAL for their support.

Finally, I want to thank House Judiciary Chairman GOODLATTE and Ranking Member NADLER for introducing and moving the companion bill in the House of Representatives.

Now that the bill has been reported to the floor, I ask for all of my Senate colleagues' support and look forward to Congress sending this bill to the President's desk very soon.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ANDY HENRY

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the honor of recognizing Andy Henry of Prairie County for his impact on the Terry community while working at the Roy Rogers Saloon.

Andy has spent the last 17 years of his life in Terry. After Andy graduated high school in Terry, his mom Amelia and her husband, John, bought the Roy Rogers Saloon. Following that, he began working at the Saloon. He has been working there since his family took it over, just under 6 years.

Andy's work at the Saloon brings the community together. Whether it be a friend or an old elementary school teacher of his, folks from all over the community come together at the Saloon. He enjoys spending time with their regulars and making sure the experience at the Saloon is as pleasant as it can be.

I congratulate Andy on his role in growing and contributing to the Roy Rogers Saloon. I look forward to seeing that success continue to grow and enjoying the hometown bar soon.●

TRIBUTE TO AUSTIN EGGLE

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Austin Eggl, an intern in my Aberdeen, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Austin is a graduate of Bishop Ryan High School, in Minot, ND. Currently, he is attending Presentation College in Aberdeen, SD, where he is majoring in business. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Austin for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

REMEMBERING MARLENE MCCARTHY

• Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Rhode Island has lost a tireless champion in the fight against breast cancer, Marlene McCarthy. Marlene's dedication to this cause was well known throughout Rhode Island and across Capitol Hill.

Marlene cofounded the Rhode Island Breast Cancer Coalition in 1992 and represented Rhode Island on the National Breast Cancer Coalition's board of directors and executive committee. Under her leadership, the Rhode Island Breast Cancer Coalition established a helpline for breast cancer patients and a Breast Cancer Resource Center and provided countless support services to Rhode Islanders facing this terrible disease.

Her advocacy was not limited to Rhode Island. Marlene regularly visited me in Washington, DC, advocating for stronger Federal funding for breast cancer research and broader access to the best possible breast cancer care. At Marlene's urging, I introduced the Accelerating the End of Breast Cancer Act, legislation to set a goal of eradicating breast cancer by 2020.

The driving force behind Marlene's hard work and boundless persistence was her dream of a future free from the scourge of breast cancer for her granddaughters. It is in Marlene's memory that I pledge to continue to fight for policies that will make her dream a reality.

I offer my condolences to Marlene's family and to the breast cancer community. Marlene's legacy will live on through the family and loved ones she has left behind, the continuing work of the Rhode Island Breast Cancer Coalition, and the countless people she inspired through her advocacy and compassion. She will be missed.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Cuccia, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 6042. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to delay the reduction in Federal medical assistance percentage for Medicaid personal care services furnished without an electronic visit verification system, and for other purposes.

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

At 11:35 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1037. An act to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

At 3:20 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6147. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1037. An act to authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, July 19, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 490. An act to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam.

S. 931. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4910 Brighton Boulevard in Denver, Colorado, as the "George Sakato Post Office".

S. 2692. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4558 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Stanley Michels Post Office Building".

S. 2734. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 Victoria Street in Laredo, Texas, as the "George P. Kazen Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-5989. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, the July, 2018 monthly cumulative report on rescissions; referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on Appropriations; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and the Judiciary.

EC-5990. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Impoundment Control Act of 1974 and the Release of Certain Withheld Amounts; to the Committees on Appropriations; the Budget; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and the Judiciary.

EC-5991. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Lee K. Kevy II, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5992. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Michael H. Shields, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-5993. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the United States Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5994. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Flood Insurance Program: Removal of Monroe County Pilot Inspection Program Regulation" ((RIN1660-AA93) (Docket No. FEMA-2018-0027)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5995. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility (South Carolina: Columbia, City of, Lexington and Richland Counties, et al.)" (Docket No. FEMA-2018-0002) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-5996. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Biofuels and the Environment Second Triennial Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5997. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Use of Byproduct Material—Medical Event Definitions, Training, and Experience, and Clarifying Amendments" ((RIN3150-AI63) (NRC-2008-0175)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-5998. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Inversions and Related Transactions" ((RIN1545-BO20 and RIN1545-BO22) (TD 9834)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5999. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2018-0125 - 2018-0131); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6000. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Borrower Defense Delay-Technical Correction" (RIN1840-AD28) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-6001. A communication from the Vice Chairman and Executive Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of three recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 69th Plenary Session; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6002. A communication from the Vice Chairman and Executive Director of the Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting, a report of three recommendations adopted by the Administrative Conference of the United States at its 69th Plenary Session; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6003. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 22-397, "Fiscal Year 2019 Local Budget Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6004. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6005. A communication from the Director, Office of General Counsel and Legal Policy, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Executive Branch Financial Disclosure, Qualifies Trusts, and Certificates of Divestiture" (RIN3209-AA00) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-6006. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Visas: Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended" (RIN1400-AD17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6007. A communication from the Chief Financial Officer and the Chief Operating Officer of the National Tropical Botanical Garden, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an audit of the Garden for the period from January 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6008. A communication from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Rules Governing Trademark Interferences" (RIN0651-AD23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-6009. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Schedule for Rating Disabilities: Skin" (RIN2900-AP27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 18, 2018; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-268. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of New Jersey memorializing its opposition to and disapproval of the Department of Housing and Urban Development's proposed plan to increase the amount of rent paid by persons who receive federal rental assistance; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 90

Whereas, The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") has proposed a plan that would increase the amount of rent paid by persons who receive federal rental assistance through HUD; and

Whereas, According to estimates by the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, approximately 150,000 low-income households in New Jersey rely on federal rental assistance through HUD and about 99 percent of these households would see their rents increased under HUD's rent increase plan; and

Whereas, According to the same estimates, New Jersey households receiving federal rental assistance pay an average of \$4,620 annually in rent, which would increase by \$830 a year, or 18 percent, under HUD's rent increase plan; and

Whereas, New Jersey is experiencing an affordable housing crisis involving high and ever rising prices and a dwindling supply of affordable units, which is particularly severe in the State's urban areas, and which only would be exacerbated by HUD's rent increase plan; and

Whereas, It is altogether fitting, proper, and in the public interest, for this House to express opposition to HUD's rent increase plan, which would be detrimental to the many thousands of low-income New Jerseyans who rely on federal rental assistance and would see their rents sharply increase under the plan; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House expresses its opposition to and disapproval of the United States Depart-

ment of Housing and Urban Development's proposed plan to increase the amount of rent paid by persons who receive federal rental assistance.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Senate to the President and Vice President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and each member of Congress elected thereto from this State.

POM-269. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Michigan urging the United States Congress to continue the Meals on Wheels program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 30

Whereas, Meals on Wheels provide vital daily nutritional support to homebound low income seniors. Over 3 million seniors nationwide and 300,000 in Michigan were served by Meals on Wheels last year; and

Whereas, The federal budget proposal by President Trump would cut funding for the Meals on Wheels program. It would eliminate the Community Development Block Grant program which provides a portion of funding for local and state programs. While the elimination of the Community Development Block Grant could hurt many state Meals on Wheels programs, the most dramatic impact to the Meals on Wheels program may occur as a result of proposed cuts to the federal Department of Health and Human Services budget. Within that department, nutrition programs of the Older Americans Act provide support to Meals on Wheels chapters nationwide by covering approximately 30 percent of its costs; and

Whereas, The benefit of this food delivery program extends beyond providing low income seniors with essential daily nutrition. Studies have shown that homebound seniors who receive Meals on Wheels feel less loneliness and isolation. The daily deliveries by a Meals on Wheels volunteer also enable seniors to receive a well-being check and assistance in the event of an emergency; and

Whereas, Meals on Wheels is a cost-effective program that contributes to enabling seniors to stay in their homes, resulting in fewer nursing home admissions. Continuing this program benefits the lives of millions of senior and provides peace of mind to their families; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That we urge the Congress of the United States to continue the Meals on Wheels program; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation Adopted by the Senate, June 12, 2018.

POM-270. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress and the President of the United States to fund the Federal Aviation Administration's Drone Test Site Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 29

Whereas, The economic future of any society depends on its ability to develop new technologies and pioneer emerging economic sectors; and

Whereas, The civil and commercial use of unmanned aircraft systems, commonly referred to as drones, is one such emerging sector that is likely to shape future economies; and

Whereas, Although the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) published Part 107 of

the Federal Aviation Regulations (14 C.F.R. s.107 et seq. (2016)) in August 2016, which established the first rules and regulations for commercial drone use in the United States, the technology's commercial viability is still limited by the inability to fully integrate drones into the national airspace system; and

Whereas, Integration into the national airspace system, which would allow drones to reliably and safely share airspace with conventional manned aircraft, requires the FAA to develop a variety of industry-specific airworthiness credentials, air traffic control communication procedures, and operational regulations, especially for drones that fly beyond the line-of-sight of the operator; and

Whereas, Industry reports estimate that there will be roughly \$82 billion in economic impact, including over 100,000 advanced manufacturing jobs and \$482 million in tax revenue, created nationally within 11 years of the integration of drones into the national airspace system; and

Whereas, To support this emerging sector, Congress passed the "FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012" (49 U.S.C. s.40101) which established several research and development programs to support civil and commercial drone technological advancement and lay the groundwork for airspace integration; and

Whereas, Most importantly, the act established a Drone Test Site Program in which six geographically diverse test sites were created to provide the research findings and operational experiences needed to ensure the safe and efficient integration of drones into national airspace; and

Whereas, Through the "Mid-Atlantic Aviation Partnership," New Jersey, Virginia, and Maryland were selected to host a joint test site, with the Cape May Airport in Rio Grande, New Jersey serving as a primary research facility; and

Whereas, At this test site, leading researchers from Rutgers University, Virginia Tech University, and the University of Maryland focus on developing airworthiness certification standards, beyond visual line-of-sight flight operations, and long-distance drone communication technology, all of which are necessary for the safe and efficient operation of drones; and

Whereas, In addition to helping the United States become a global leader of civil and commercial drone technology, the Drone Test Site Program transforms New Jersey into a regional hub for this emerging economic sector; and

Whereas, Limited federal support for the program, however, now jeopardizes this bright economic future; and

Whereas, Because test sites do not receive direct federal funding, most are forced to rent their facilities for industry drone flights in order to finance research operations; and

Whereas, As a result, budgetary constraints make it difficult for test sites to conduct the extensive research that is needed to safely and efficiently integrate drones into the national airspace system; and

Whereas, Funding limitations, in turn, undercut the ability of test sites to accomplish their original objective of supporting airspace integration and delay the development of civil and commercial drone technology in the United States; and

Whereas, Congressional funding for the FAA Drone Test Site Program could rectify this problem and ensure that the United States becomes a pioneer of civil and commercial drone technology. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House respectfully urges Congress and the President of the United States to

fund the Federal Aviation Administration's Drone Test Site Program so that test sites are able to more effectively support drone integration into the national airspace system and ensure that the United States becomes a world leader in civil and commercial drone technology.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and each member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-271. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey urging the United States Congress to maintain the Northeast Gasoline Supply Reserve to ensure gasoline supply and distribution stability in the northeast region of the United States in the event of an emergency; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 76

Whereas, In 2012, Superstorm Sandy made landfall in the northeastern United States and caused heavy damage to two oil refineries and left more than 40 petroleum terminals in New York Harbor closed due to water damage and power loss; and

Whereas, As a result of this storm damage and its impact on the gasoline supply and distribution chain, some gasoline stations were left without fuel for as long as 30 days; and

Whereas, In response to Superstorm Sandy's disruption of the northeast's gasoline supply and distribution chain, the United States Department of Energy created the first federal regional refined petroleum product reserve containing gasoline called the Northeast Gasoline Supply Reserve (NGSR); and

Whereas, The NGSR holds one million barrels of gasoline in strategic locations in the New York Harbor area, the Boston, Massachusetts area, and in South Portland, Maine; and

Whereas, The NGSR creates a gasoline supply buffer large enough to allow the region to compensate for the initial impact of an event that disrupts the gasoline supply and distribution infrastructure until that infrastructure can return to full operation; and

Whereas, The federal budget proposed by the President of the United States recommends selling off the entire NGSR in the coming federal fiscal year; and

Whereas, The sale of the NGSR would leave the northeast region of the United States at risk of another gasoline shortage in the event of an emergency that causes a disruption to gasoline supply and distribution infrastructure, affecting the mobility of people, businesses, and emergency responders in the wake of a disaster; and

Whereas, It is altogether fitting and proper, and in the public interest, for this House to urge the President of the United States and Congress to maintain the NGSR for the safety and welfare of the residents and businesses located in the northeastern region of this country in the event of an emergency that disrupts the supply and distribution of gasoline; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House respectfully urges the President of the United States and Congress to maintain the Northeast Gasoline Supply Reserve to ensure gasoline supply and distribution stability in the northeast region of the United States in the event of an emergency.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted

by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Majority and Minority Leaders of the United States House of Representatives, and every member of the United States Congress elected from this State.

POM-272. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urging the United States Congress to adopt the National Park Service's recommendation to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include the additional sites along the Lewis and Clark Expedition's Eastern Legacy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 326

Whereas, The Lewis and Clark Expedition (Expedition) and the Corps of Discovery are nationally significant for their exploration of the Louisiana Territory and search for an all water route to the Pacific Ocean; and

Whereas, Under orders by President Thomas Jefferson, the expedition was responsible for mapping the territory explored, as well as documenting new species of plants and animals and engaging with the Native American tribes they encountered; and

Whereas, Although part of the route was unmapped territory, the Lewis and Clark Expedition was able to use maps provided to them by Native Americans, European explorers and fur traders; and

Whereas, Ultimately, the expedition was able to link routes and maps together to find passage from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean, a feat that had never before been accomplished; and

Whereas, In order to recognize the historic significance of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, the National Park Service previously designated a trail that runs from Wood River, Illinois, to the West Coast in Oregon and Washington; and

Whereas, Public Law 110-229, passed by the Congress of the United States in 2008, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to study additional sites associated with the preparation and return phases of the expedition, located in Pennsylvania, Virginia, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Delaware, West Virginia, Ohio, Kentucky, Tennessee, Indiana, Missouri and Illinois; and

Whereas, Those sites were to be considered for inclusion in the "Eastern Legacy" of the expedition; and

Whereas, The National Park Service evaluated 25 distinct route segments used by the Corps of Discovery for the expedition to determine if they met the criteria for national significance established by the National Trails System Act; and

Whereas, In August 2016, the National Park Service published its Draft Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail Extension Study, finding that three sections met the criteria established for inclusion in the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail; and

Whereas, Those segments include the Ohio River, from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, to Louisville, Kentucky; from Louisville, Kentucky, to the confluence with the Mississippi River; and from the Mississippi River's confluence with the Ohio River at Cairo, Illinois, to Wood River, Illinois; and

Whereas, A portion of the proposed extension of the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail includes sites along the Ohio River in this Commonwealth; and

Whereas, The inclusion of this segment along the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail is not only historically significant and appropriate, but may have a positive economic impact on those sites; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania urge the Congress of

the United States to adopt the National Park Service's recommendation to extend the Lewis and Clark National Historic Trail to include the additional sites along the Lewis and Clark Expedition's Eastern Legacy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each chamber of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM-273. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey condemning the federal government's policy of separating immigrant children from their families at the United States' border; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION NO. 175

Whereas, On April 6, 2018, the U.S. Department of Justice enacted a "zero tolerance" policy under which all unauthorized crossings at the Southwestern border of the United States will be treated as criminal offenses, instead of civil offenses; and

Whereas, These policies separate families crossing the border without authorization, since the parents are placed in criminal detention centers while the children are taken into the care of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; and

Whereas, These separations may last months, or even years, since the U.S. Department of Justice and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services have few procedures in place to ensure the reunification of separated families; and

Whereas, It has been reported that the motivation for these policies is not to maintain the safety of the children, but merely to deter persons from committing immigration violations; and

Whereas, The American Academy of Pediatrics, the American College of Physicians, and the American Psychiatric Association, together representing more than 250,000 doctors in the United States, are requesting an immediate reversal of the "zero tolerance" policy citing irreversible health complications to the children; and

Whereas, Experts find this policy is detrimental to the health of young children causing short-term developmental delays and long-term health concerns such as heart disease, cancer, and morbid obesity; and

Whereas, Parent-child separation also increases symptoms of anxiety and depression in adolescents, and young children whose parents were detained exhibit multiple behavioral changes, including anxiety, withdrawal, numbing, anger, crying, changes in eating, sleeping, toileting, and changes in development and learning; and

Whereas, This "zero tolerance" policy is medically unsound and should be considered nothing less than government-sanctioned child abuse; and

Whereas, Separating children from their parents violates one of our society's fundamental principles which is that, to the extent possible, children should not be punished for the sins of their parents; and

Whereas, These policies also run counter to the interests of the State of New Jersey, which depends upon immigrants for its cultural and economic growth; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

1. This House condemns the federal government's policy of separating immigrant children from their families and contends that the federal government's actions are sanctioned child abuse.

2. Copies of this resolution, as filed with the Secretary of State, shall be transmitted by the Clerk of the General Assembly to the President and Vice President of the United States; the Majority and Minority Leaders of

the United States Senate; the Speaker and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives; and every member of Congress elected from this State.

POM-274. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, condemning the denial of access to government officials to immigration detention facilities and shelters for children for humanitarian inspections and purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

POM-275. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to take immediate steps to reunite children separated from their parents due to immigration detentions, and to prohibit any future parent and child separations by United States immigration authorities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-276. A resolution adopted by the Mayor and City Commission of the City of Miami Beach, Florida, urging the Department of Health and Human Resources to provide and maintain adequate medical care, nutrition, housing, and educational standards in, and to permit access by elected federal representatives to, federal immigration detention centers and shelters for children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

S. 3094. A bill to restrict the department in which the Coast Guard is operating from implementing any rule requiring the use of biometric readers for biometric transportation security cards until after submission to Congress of the results of an assessment of the effectiveness of the transportation security card program (Rept. No. 115-305).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

*Charles P. Rettig, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2022.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

David James Porter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Roy Kalman Altman, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, of Puerto Rico, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed sub-

ject 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 Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. JONES):

S. 3241. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to provide for the termination by a spouse of a lessee of certain leases when the lessee dies while in military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 3242. A bill to establish an American Savings Account Fund and create a retirement savings plan available to all employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 3243. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iranian persons who engage in politically-motivated harassment, abuse, extortion, or extended detention or trial of individuals in Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 3244. A bill to amend chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for a corporate responsibility investment option under the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3245. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 3246. A bill to provide enhanced protections for taxpayers from fraud and other illegal activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3247. A bill to improve programs and activities relating to women's entrepreneurship and economic empowerment that are carried out by the United States Agency for International Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 3248. A bill to restrict the provision by international financial institutions of loans and financial and technical assistance to the Government of Turkey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 3249. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to modify the amount in controversy requirement and remove the complete diversity requirement; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 3250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit against tax for rent paid on the personal residence of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. PAUL):

S. 3251. A bill to require executive agencies to consider rental in any analysis for equipment acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 3252. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to modify requirements relating to reservation of funds for failure to enact or enforce open container laws and repeat intoxicated driver laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3253. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide authority to add additional vaccines to the list of taxable vaccines; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 3254. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish criminal penalties for unlawful payments for referrals to recovery homes and clinical treatment facilities; 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. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. JONES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. Kaine, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KING, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. Res. 581. A resolution authorizing the Senate Legal Counsel to represent the Senate in *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 582. A resolution protecting American democracy; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 583. A resolution commending the Department of Justice for its investigation into the interference by the Russian Federation in the 2016 United States presidential election, and maintaining that the Russian Federation must be held accountable for its actions; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEIN-

STEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 584. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate against the making available of current and former diplomats, officials, and members of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. Kaine):

S. Res. 585. A resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the commissioning of the USS John F. Kennedy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. NELSON):

S. Res. 586. A resolution honoring the 170th anniversary of the first women's rights convention held in the United States in Seneca Falls, New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 26

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 26, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes.

S. 266

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

S. 802

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 802, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of Lawrence Eugene "Larry" Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II.

S. 1113

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes.

S. 1730

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were

added as cosponsors of S. 1730, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1880

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1880, a bill to reform our government, reduce the grip of special interest, and return our democracy to the American people by increasing transparency and oversight of our elections and government, reforming public financing for Presidential and Congressional elections, and requiring States to conduct Congressional redistricting through independent commissions, and for other purposes.

S. 2009

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2009, a bill to require a background check for every firearm sale.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS Indianapolis, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2554

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 2554, a bill to ensure that health insurance issuers and group health plans do not prohibit pharmacy providers from providing certain information to enrollees.

S. 2568

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2568, a bill to amend section 5000A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an additional religious exemption from the individual health coverage mandate, and for other purposes.

S. 2593

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 2593, a bill to protect the administration of Federal elections against cybersecurity threats.

S. 2602

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2602, a bill to support carbon dioxide utilization and direct air capture research, to facilitate the permitting and development of carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects and carbon dioxide pipelines, and for other purposes.

S. 2780

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr.

RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2780, a bill to require a determination on designation of the Russian Federation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

S. 2843

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions to help combat the opioid crisis.

S. 2945

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2945, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to carry out a housing choice voucher mobility demonstration to encourage families receiving the voucher assistance to move to lower-poverty areas and expand access to opportunity areas.

S. 3063

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 3063, a bill to delay the reimposition of the annual fee on health insurance providers until after 2020.

S. 3128

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3128, a bill to reauthorize the National Flood Insurance Program.

S. 3172

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3172, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Park Service Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 3233

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3233, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons responsible for violence and human rights abuses in Nicaragua, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 525

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 525, a resolution designating September 2018 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 3245. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to transfer certain National Forest System land in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CORNYN. 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. 3245

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 “Lake Fannin Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COUNTRY.—The term “Country” means the Fannin County, Texas.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Lake Fannin Conveyance” and dated November 21, 2013.

(3) NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.—The term “National Forest System land” means the approximately 2,025 acres of National Forest System land generally depicted on the map.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

SEC. 3. CONVEYANCE OF LAND AND IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the requirements of this section, if the County submits to the Secretary a written request for conveyance of the National Forest System land not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall convey to the County all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the National Forest System land.

(b) MAP.—

(1) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be kept on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate office of the Forest Service.

(2) CORRECTION OF ERRORS.—The Secretary may correct minor errors in the map.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The conveyance under subsection (a) shall be—

(1) subject to valid existing rights;

(2) made without consideration;

(3) made by quitclaim deed; and

(4) subject to any other terms and conditions the Secretary determines appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

(d) USE.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), the County shall agree to manage the land conveyed under that subsection for a public purpose.

(e) COSTS.—As a condition of the conveyance under subsection (a), the County shall pay for all costs associated with the conveyance, including the costs of—

(1) the survey required under subsection (f); and

(2) any environmental analysis and resource surveys required under Federal law.

(f) SURVEY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The actual acreage and legal description of the National Forest System land to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by a survey satisfactory to the Secretary.

(2) CADASTRAL SURVEYS.—The Secretary may perform and approve any cadastral surveys required to be conducted as part of a survey under paragraph (1).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 581—AUTHORIZING THE SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE SENATE IN TEXAS V. UNITED STATES, NO. 4:18-CV-00167-O (N.D. TEX.)

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DONNELLY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. TESTER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CARPER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. JONES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. COONS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KING, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 581

Whereas Texas, Wisconsin, Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Paul LePage (Governor of Maine), Mississippi (by and through Governor Phil Bryant), Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, and West Virginia have filed suit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, arguing that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111-148; 124 Stat. 119), is unconstitutional and should be enjoined, by asserting that the Act's requirement to maintain minimum essential coverage (commonly known as the “individual responsibility provision”) in section 5000A(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, is unconstitutional following the amendment of that provision by the Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to titles II and V of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 (Public Law 115-97) (commonly known as the “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act”);

Whereas these State and individual plaintiffs also seek to strike down the entire Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act as not severable from the individual responsibility provision;

Whereas on June 7, 2018, the Department of Justice refused to defend the constitutionality of the amended individual responsibility provision, despite the well-established duty of the Department to defend Federal statutes where reasonable arguments can be made in their defense; and

Whereas the Department of Justice not only refused to defend the amended individual responsibility provision, but it affirmatively argued that this provision is unconstitutional and that the provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act guaranteeing issuance of insurance coverage regardless of health status or pre-existing conditions (commonly known as the “guaranteed issue provision”), sections 2702, 2704, and 2705(a) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300gg-1, 300gg-3, 300gg-4(a)), and prohibiting discriminatory premium rates (commonly known as the “community rating provision”), sections 2701 and 2705(b) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C.

300gg(a)(1), 300gg-4(b)) must now be struck down as not severable from the individual responsibility provision: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the Senate in *Texas v. United States*, No. 4:18-cv-00167-O (N.D. Tex.), including seeking to—

(1) intervene as a party in the matter; and
(2) defend all provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, the amendments made by that Act to other provisions of law, and any amendments to such provisions, including the provisions ensuring affordable health coverage for those with pre-existing conditions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 582—PROTECTING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

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

S. RES. 582

Whereas Senator John McCain stated, “[It] was one of the most disgraceful performances by an American president in memory. The damage inflicted by President Trump’s naiveté, egotism, false equivalence, and sympathy for autocrats is difficult to calculate. But it is clear that the summit in Helsinki was a tragic mistake.”;

Whereas, on July 17, 2018, in response to the international backlash, President Trump, while claiming he misspoke and blaming the media for reporting what he said, still sowed doubt about the electoral interference by the Russian Federation by claiming it “could be other people also” and not just the Russian Federation;

Whereas the United States faces an unprecedented situation in which the President of the United States refuses to acknowledge an attack on the democracy of the United States;

Whereas the Russian Federation has been interfering not only in the elections of the United States, but also in the elections of other democracies, such as the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, to name a few;

Whereas the goal of the Russian Federation is to advance its own interests by weakening the transatlantic alliance of democracies that arose after the Second World War, while also inflaming internal divisions in each of those countries;

Whereas, on July 13, 2018, Special Counsel Robert Mueller announced indictments of 12 members of the military intelligence service of the Russian Federation known as the Glavnoe Razvedyvatel’noe Upravlenie (referred to in this preamble as the “GRU”);

Whereas, on July 13, 2018, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats raised the alarm on growing cyberattack threats against the United States in a range of areas, including Federal, State, and local government agencies, the military, business, and academia, stating that the situation is at a “critical point”, adding, “In regards to state actions, Russia has been the most aggressive foreign actor. No question. And they continue their efforts to undermine our democracy.”, and comparing the warning signs to the signs the United States faced ahead of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks;

Whereas the cyberattacks by the Russian Federation represent a threat to the democratic system of the United States and the democratic systems of the allies of the United States;

Whereas, domestically, President Putin has undermined democracy in the Russian Federation, crushing free speech, jailing political opponents, harassing and assassinating journalists who criticize him, and in-

creasingly persecuting ethnic and religious minorities and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer citizens;

Whereas, in terms of foreign policy, the Russian Federation has meddled in the elections of democratic countries, stoking political tensions by promoting hatred and suspicion of immigrants and minorities, and trying to undermine longstanding alliances between democratic allies;

Whereas, in 2014, in violation of international law, the Russian Federation invaded neighboring Ukraine, and annexed the Crimea region;

Whereas the Russian Federation has assassinated political opponents abroad, most recently through the use of poison in Salisbury, England, on a former spy and his daughter, an atrocious chemical attack that endangered the lives of hundreds of civilians and which, according to news reports, the Government of the United Kingdom concluded was likely carried out by the GRU; and

Whereas President Trump had an opportunity to raise the issues described in the preceding clauses with President Putin at the July 16, 2018, summit in Helsinki, Finland, but chose not to: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) accepts the assessment of the United States intelligence community with regard to interference by the Russian Federation in elections in the United States and in other democracies;

(2) must move aggressively to protect the election systems of the United States from interference by the Russian Federation or any other foreign power, and work closely with the democratic partners of the United States to do the same for elections in those countries;

(3) demands that the sanctions against the Russian Federation that were enacted in the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44; 131 Stat. 886) be fully implemented by the President;

(4) will not accept any interference with the ongoing investigation of Special Counsel Robert Mueller, such as the offer of preemptive pardons or the firing of Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein; and

(5) declares that the President must cooperate with the investigation of Special Counsel Mueller.

SENATE RESOLUTION 583—COMMENDING THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE FOR ITS INVESTIGATION INTO THE INTERFERENCE BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN THE 2016 UNITED STATES PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION, AND MAINTAINING THAT THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION MUST BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR ITS ACTIONS

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

S. RES. 583

Whereas, on July 13, 2018, an investigation of the Department of Justice resulted in the indictment of 12 officials of the Government of the Russian Federation for interfering with the 2016 United States presidential election;

Whereas, on July 13, 2018, when speaking about the digital infrastructure of the United States being under attack from foreign actors, Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats stated, “In regards to state actions, Russia has been the most aggressive

foreign actor. No question. And they continue their efforts to undermine our democracy.”; and

Whereas, on July 16, 2018, in a joint press conference in Helsinki, Finland, the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, denied that the Russian Federation interfered in the 2016 United States presidential election: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the Department of Justice for its thorough investigation into the interference in the 2016 United States presidential election, which resulted in the indictment of 12 intelligence officers of the Government of the Russian Federation;

(2) agrees with the assessment of the United States intelligence community that the Russian Federation interfered with the 2016 United States presidential election, and rejects the Russian Federation’s denial of such involvement;

(3) reaffirms its position that the Russian Federation must be held accountable for interfering in the 2016 United States presidential election;

(4) calls upon relevant committees of the Senate to exercise congressional oversight, including prompt hearings and the release of relevant notes and information, to better understand the impact of the recent summit in Helsinki, Finland, on the foreign policy and national security of the United States; and

(5) calls for the immediate and full implementation of mandatory sanctions provided for in the Countering America’s Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115-44; 131 Stat. 886), which passed the Senate 98-2, to deter and punish election interference by the Russian Federation.

SENATE RESOLUTION 584—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE AGAINST THE MAKING AVAILABLE OF CURRENT AND FORMER DIPLOMATS, OFFICIALS, AND MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR QUESTIONING BY THE GOVERNMENT OF VLADIMIR PUTIN

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. REED, Mr. LEAHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 584

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States should refuse to make available any current or former diplomat, civil servant, political appointee, law enforcement official, or member of the Armed Forces of the United States for questioning by the government of Vladimir Putin.

SENATE RESOLUTION 585—COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE COMMISSIONING OF THE USS JOHN F. KENNEDY

Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. Kaine) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 585

Whereas the USS John F. Kennedy (CV-67) was named in honor of the 35th president of the United States;

Whereas, on May 27, 1967, President John F. Kennedy's 9-year-old daughter, Caroline Kennedy, christened the USS John F. Kennedy at the Newport News Shipbuilding and Drydock Company in Newport News, Virginia;

Whereas, on September 7, 1968, during the height of the Cold War, the USS John F. Kennedy entered service at its home port of Naval Station Norfolk in Norfolk, Virginia, as the only ship of her class and the last conventionally powered carrier built for the United States Navy;

Whereas the USS John F. Kennedy was a stalwart of the Atlantic Fleet of the United States Navy, sailing to Europe, Africa, and the Middle East, and across the Arctic and Pacific Oceans;

Whereas, on March 28, 1977, the USS John F. Kennedy became the first United States aircraft carrier to make a port call at Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia;

Whereas, on December 4, 1983, the USS John F. Kennedy launched 10 aircraft to bomb Syrian anti-aircraft and artillery positions near Hammama, Lebanon, in response to attacks against aircraft of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas, on July 3 and 4, 1986, the USS John F. Kennedy hosted more than 8,000 people during the International Naval Review honoring the 100th anniversary of the Statue of Liberty and hosted President Ronald Reagan on Independence Day;

Whereas, on January 4, 1989, the USS John F. Kennedy launched two F-14 aircraft from Fighter Squadron 32 to intercept and destroy 2 hostile MiG-23s from the Libyan Air Force;

Whereas, on December 29, 1990, the USS John F. Kennedy entered port in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, as the first United States aircraft carrier to visit Saudi Arabia;

Whereas, on January 17, 1991, the USS John F. Kennedy launched its first strikes in Operation Desert Storm as part of a multi-country coalition to drive the military of Iraq out of neighboring Kuwait;

Whereas, from the beginning of hostilities on January 16, 1991, to their cessation on February 28, 1991, the USS John F. Kennedy launched 2,895 aircraft sorties, which struck 114 targets, delivered 3,500,000 pounds of ordnance, and provided 11,263 aircraft combat hours;

Whereas, on September 22, 1995, the USS John F. Kennedy was transferred to Naval Station Mayport in Jacksonville, Florida, as the new home port of the vessel;

Whereas, on November 1, 1999, the USS John F. Kennedy became the first United States aircraft carrier to make a port call in Al Aqabah, Jordan, and hosted the King of Jordan;

Whereas, on September 11, 2001, the USS John F. Kennedy was called upon to secure the mid-Atlantic seaboard to "help calm a fearful and shocked nation";

Whereas, from March 11 to July 17, 2002, the USS John F. Kennedy deployed and launched strikes in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, and those strikes dropped 64,000 pounds of ordnance on Taliban and Al Qaeda targets;

Whereas, from July 10 to November 20, 2004, the USS John F. Kennedy deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom and launched 8,296 aircraft sorties, which dropped 54,000 pounds of ordnance;

Whereas, on December 13, 2004, the USS John F. Kennedy returned from its 21st and final deployment;

Whereas the USS John F. Kennedy was decommissioned at her final homeport of Naval Station Mayport in Jacksonville, Florida, on March 23, 2007, stricken from the Naval Vessel Register on October 16, 2009, and lays in wait at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, pending

final disposition or the call to serve again in the United States Navy; and

Whereas, from August 23 to 26, 2018, the former crews and supporters of the USS John F. Kennedy will meet in Norfolk, Virginia, to honor the 50th anniversary of the commissioning of the vessel: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 50th anniversary of the commissioning of the USS John F. Kennedy (CV-67); and

(2) honors the USS John F. Kennedy, its crew, and all of the courageous sailors and Marines of the United States who have served on board in the past.

SENATE RESOLUTION 586—HONORING THE 170TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST WOMEN'S RIGHTS CONVENTION HELD IN THE UNITED STATES IN SENECA FALLS, NEW YORK

Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself and Mr. NELSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 586

Whereas 2018 marks the 170th anniversary of the first women's rights convention held in the United States in Seneca Falls, New York, organized by Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott;

Whereas the momentum created by organized women in the 1800s led to the first women's rights convention and the passing of the Declaration of Sentiments in Seneca Falls, New York;

Whereas, at Seneca Falls, New York, 68 women and 32 men signed the Declaration of Sentiments, a plea for the end of discrimination against women;

Whereas the Declaration of Sentiments offered at Seneca Falls, New York, was modeled after the Declaration of Independence and declared that "all men and women are created equal", linking women's rights directly to the founding ideals of the United States;

Whereas women's suffrage activists tirelessly worked together to form organizations that raised public awareness, resulting in the adoption of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in 1920, guaranteeing all women of the United States the right to vote;

Whereas, in 2018, women have made giant leaps in the cause for gender equality, yet still struggle daily for equal treatment;

Whereas women of the United States earn only 80 cents for every dollar earned by men of the United States;

Whereas women constitute 50.8 percent of the population of the United States but only 20 percent of the 115th Congress; and

Whereas empowering women offers tremendous opportunity for economic and social progress: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of the 170th anniversary of the first women's rights convention held in the United States;

(2) promotes meaningful participation of women in every sector of society; and

(3) supports policy measures that promote gender equality and the empowerment of women.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I have 7 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They

have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Kathleen Laura Kraninger, of Ohio, to be Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and Kimberly A. Reed, of West Virginia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

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, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Mary Bridget Neumayr, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Council on Environmental Quality, and John Fleming, of Louisiana, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Charles P. Rettig, of California, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury.

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, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on following nominations: Dennis Dean Kirk, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and to be Chairman of the Merit Systems Protection Board, Julia Akins Clark, of Maryland, and Andrew F. Maunz, of Ohio, both to be a Member of the Merit Systems Protection Board, and Carmen Guericcio McLean, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, David James Porter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for

the Third Circuit, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., of South Carolina, and Julius Ness Richardson, of South Carolina, both to be a United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, Roy Kalman Altman, and Rodolfo Armando Ruiz II, both to be a United States District Judge for the Southern District of Florida, and Raul M. Arias-Marxuach, to be United States District Judge for the District of Puerto Rico.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 19, 2018, at 2 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 114-198, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Creating Options for Veterans' Expedited Recovery (COVER Commission): Thomas E. Harvey of New York.

The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 115-123, on behalf of the majority leader of the Senate, appoints the following individual as a member of the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships: William S. Simon of Arkansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Monday, July 23, the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 1000. I ask consent that the time until 5:30 p.m. be equally divided in the usual form and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on the nomination with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; that no further motions be in order; and that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 6147

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the disposition of the Wilkie nomination, the Senate resume legislative session and proceed to the consideration of H.R. 6147.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 23, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, July 23; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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, following the remarks of Senator SULLIVAN.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO JEANNE FOLLETT

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, it is Thursday afternoon, and it is one of my favorite times of the week. I know for many of my fellow Senators, including the Presiding Officer and the pages, this is one of their favorite times of the week, too, because it is the time that we get to talk about the Alaskan of the Week. I had a couple of people today ask me: Senator, when are you giving your speech on the Alaskan of the Week?

I said: Later.

They said: OK. We will keep an eye on it—because people find a lot of interest in what is happening in the great State of Alaska. The Alaskan of the Week, as many of my colleagues know, is somebody whom we like to highlight who has done great stuff for the State, community, town, maybe country. Sometimes it is someone famous. Oftentimes, it is somebody who has been working really hard for much of their life and doesn't get a lot of recognition. They are the heroes of the community. That is why we like to talk about the Alaskan of the Week.

It is also a great opportunity to talk to people in the Gallery or people watching on TV, on C-SPAN, to get them to come on up to Alaska. Come on up. It will be the trip of a lifetime. Of course, it is a gorgeous, huge State with mountains, glaciers, and wildlife, but when you get off the plane in Alaska, you get the sense of freedom—liberty. You can almost breathe it in ways that you can't in other places.

I tell everybody who is watching: Come on up. You will love it. It will be the trip of a lifetime. You will feel that freedom in the air like you do in almost no other place in the world.

Let me introduce you to our Alaskan of the Week, Jeanne Follett, who has

displayed incredible commitment to keep our State clean and special. Let's talk about Jeanne. She was born in Detroit. She moved to Anchorage when she was just 6 years old and has called Alaska home ever since.

Like so many Alaskans, she has led a very interesting and varied life. She began her professional career as a court reporter for the Anchorage Daily News, our big newspaper, covering all kinds of trials when the State was still new and our court system had just been formed. Remember, we are a very young State.

Eventually, she moved to Girdwood, which is a beautiful ski resort town outside of Anchorage, where she was a breakfast cook and managed condos. She got a bit restless. She packed up her 1965 Mustang and drove across the country but missed Alaska so much she came back home again.

Then she worked on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, TAPS, as we call it, that flows the billions of barrels of oil from the North Slope down to Valdez for an energy-hungry country like ours.

She met her husband Ken as she was working on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. They bought a lodge in a wonderful, small community called Moose Pass—a warm, welcoming, and gorgeous Alaska community in the heart of the Kenai Peninsula, about 100 miles south of Anchorage. If you are going to fish the famous Russian River, Moose Pass is a great home base.

Ken and Jeanne worked at the resort until they both retired. Jeanne always liked to keep her yard and her surroundings clean and organized, free of trash, but when her husband Ken, unfortunately, got sick—and, tragically, she lost him over 13 years ago—Jeanne began to spend her days helping clean up the State; picking up trash on the road by her House, farther and farther from her home in Moose Pass.

Think of this, as the snow melts in Alaska, and in all sorts of weather, to this day, Jeanne laces up her hiking boots, grabs her visors, her gloves, her safety vest, drives up the highway to the spot where she left off the previous day, and she starts cleaning up the highway every single day. She gets out her bags. She starts walking and cleaning up trash on the side of the highway. This highway abuts the majestic, beautiful Chugach National Forest. She guesses that every summer, she spends 3 to 6 hours a day volunteering picking up trash. Think about that.

Alaska is a beautiful, pristine place. As a matter of fact, that is one of the things, when people come to visit, they are going to see, but like all States, in particular highway areas in States, you have some garbage. Jeanne takes action every single day. She doesn't get paid. So 3 to 6 hours a day, 5 days a week, she is out there cleaning up the highway. Remarkable.

Sometimes friends and neighbors come and help out or Boy Scouts join her. One summer, she picked up 800 bags of trash to keep Alaska clean and

pristine. People stop on the side of the road to talk to her or ask where the nearest gas station is. Sometimes people donate gas money to her because, remember, she is starting where she left off the next day, driving up the highway 40 miles to continue. It is not just time and effort, it is actual money. She thinks her presence on the side of the highway helps motivate others.

There was a story recently on KTUU, Channel 2, our big news station in Alaska. She said in that story that she thinks she has helped inspire people to keep the whole State clean, whether it is picking up trash themselves or not throwing litter outside your car.

Why does she do it, several hours a day, with no pay, day after day, week after week? She does it because she loves Alaska. She wants to keep it clean. We have hundreds of thousands—really millions—of tourists who come to our State. She doesn't want them to see trash when it is going to be the trip of a lifetime. She said: It embarrasses me to think that tourists from the lower 48 might show up in Alaska and see trash, so I am going to clean it up.

She does it because it is her way to give back to a State that has given her so much. She also gets to see things that others don't see often: beautiful wildflowers on the road, creeks, secret vistas. I am sure she has seen a few bears and a lot of bald eagles and moose. She even saw a man once walking a chicken. Yes, you see everything in Alaska.

Jeanne has found lost items on the side of the road: fishing licenses, cell phones, cameras. She tries her best to get these back to their owners. Once she found a set of hubcaps that had contact information on it for the owner. When she called and told him she had his hubcaps, he couldn't believe it. He was tickled pink to get his hubcaps back.

I think every State has somebody like Jeanne. There is no doubt, we all owe a debt of gratitude to people like Jeanne, working selflessly, volunteering thousands of hours to keep our States like Alaska clean, to keep America clean.

So, Jeanne, thanks for what you are doing for the great State of Alaska,

and thank you and congratulations on being our Alaskan of the Week.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
JULY 23, 2018, AT 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 23.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:20 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 23, 2018, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

ERIC D. MILLER, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT, VICE RICHARD C. TALLMAN, RETIRED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. TIMOTHY G. SZYMANSKI