



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 17, 2018

No. 81

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

King of Glory, robed with honor and majesty, enter the hearts of our lawmakers today, and use them for Your glory. Fortify them with the knowledge that You will never leave or forsake them.

Lord, show them Your ways and teach them Your path. Leaning on Your wisdom, may they make ethical decisions that will receive Heaven's approval. Undergird them with Your might, enabling them to accomplish with Your power what they could not do on their own.

We pray in Your wonderful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 17, 2018.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DEAN HELLER, a Sen-

ator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HELLER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 847, Gina Haspel.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E.

Risch, John Thune, Todd Young, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

NOMINATION OF GINA HASPEL

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, the Intelligence Committee took an important step toward confirming Gina Haspel to become the next Director of the CIA. A bipartisan majority voted to report her nomination favorably to the Senate. I look forward to promptly moving to a confirmation vote.

The committee's confidence is indicative of the strength of Ms. Haspel's testimony and her 30-plus-year record of CIA service. Throughout the process, she demonstrated candor, integrity, and a forthright approach to the committee's questions. She displayed the talent and expertise that make her uniquely qualified to face America's biggest national security challenges, whether in the area of counterterrorism or renewed international competition among great powers.

Out of the spotlight, whether at Langley or deployed abroad, Ms. Haspel has quietly earned the respect and admiration of those who matter most—the men and women of the CIA and distinguished current and former intelligence community leaders.

The safety and security of the American people depend on capable intelligence leadership. Gina Haspel is the

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2735

right woman at the right time. Senators on both sides of the aisle agree. So I urge each of my colleagues to rise to the occasion and swiftly confirm our next CIA Director.

TAX REFORM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, with Republican policies shaking the regulatory rust off of the U.S. economy, American job creators, entrepreneurs, and working families have been thinking big again.

For 8 years, Democrats pushed a one-size-fits-all agenda that heaped outsized benefits on the largest cities and left the rest of the country struggling to catch up. Now Main Street businesses across America feel the wind is at their backs. So they are expanding their operations, buying more equipment, and hiring new workers.

For too long, taxpayers grappled with an outdated Federal Tax Code that seemed to keep more of their hard-earned income every year. Now, thanks to Republican tax reform, working families are seeing paychecks grow, special bonuses hit their bank accounts, and will send thousands of dollars less to the IRS next year.

Now that Congress and the President have put a stop to the last administration's rampant, top-down Federal rule-making, U.S. manufacturing is churning back to life as well. The new economic climate that is taking hold across the country has producers feeling more confident about planting deeper roots right here in the United States—new capital investment, new factories, new American jobs.

Novelis, a leading producer of rolled and recycled aluminum, broke ground just this week on a new factory in Guthrie, KY. The company is choosing the Commonwealth in which to build the 400,000-square-foot facility and create at least 125 new jobs, and they are not keeping any secrets about what is helping them make this investment. Here is a quote: "A favorable economic environment," including "the significant positive impact of tax reform in the U.S., reinforces Novelis' decision to expand at this time."

This is not just a Kentucky phenomenon. According to new survey data from the National Association of Manufacturers, more than 93 percent of U.S. manufacturing firms have a positive outlook. Already, 77 percent of manufacturers are reporting hiring new workers, and 86 percent say they are investing in plants and equipment.

Many American communities revolve around these manufacturing facilities. Sadly, during the Obama years, they were among the most likely to be left behind by the so-called "recovery," but now that is changing. Today, manufacturing wages are growing at their fastest pace in 17 years. These are just a few signs of our Nation's economic comeback under Republicans' pro-growth, pro-opportunity agenda.

Remember, not one of our Democratic colleagues voted with us to set

this train in motion—not one. They voted against cutting redtape for American manufacturers. They voted against the tax reforms that are growing paychecks and helping to create new jobs. They voted against the newly lowered utility rates that benefit both families and employers.

My Democratic colleagues like to talk about supporting the middle class. These days, it is looking more and more like that is all it is—just talk. Yet, while they occupy themselves with partisan politics, Republicans will keep on clearing the tracks and letting the American economy roll on ahead.

TRIBUTE TO BRENDAN DUNN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, speaking of tax reform, I have to bid farewell to an outstanding member of my staff.

Brendan Dunn has been a key member of my leadership office team for the last 6 years. He has made an outsized impact as a trusted counselor and friend.

I, actually, stole Brendan from the Finance Committee in 2012. I am not sure if Chairman HATCH ever quite forgave me for it. If you have ever had the pleasure of witnessing Brendan in action, you will understand why he is a sought-after commodity, whether you need deep expertise on tax policy or the perfect movie quote for any occasion.

Brendan has been my trusted adviser on issues including tax policy, banking, trade, and pensions. So I am just glad that his last few months in the office could be a calm and laid-back period. All he had to do was play a leading role in crafting generational tax reform and help steer it across the finish line. Oh, then came Dodd-Frank reform, for good measure.

This Maryland native holds degrees from Holy Cross, Fordham, Georgetown, and Notre Dame, but you would not know that this unassuming leader and reliable source of comic relief holds a J.D. and a Ph.D. in political philosophy unless you needed to. That is the kind of guy Brendan is.

His many contributions to my team have benefited this body, the people of Kentucky, and the Nation. I know everyone who has gotten to work closely with him is sad to see him depart the Senate. I certainly am. Yet I have a hunch that his lovely wife, Lee, and his children—Patrick, Audrey, and Mary—will not mind seeing a little bit more of him.

So I offer Brendan my sincere thanks for a job very well done and wish him Godspeed for what lies ahead.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the consideration of S. Con. Res. 36.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 384, S. Con. Res. 36, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2019 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2020 through 2028.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be 45 minutes under the control of Senator PAUL or his designee and 45 minutes under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, this year there will be no budget presented by the Republicans or the Democrats. I think that is a bad idea. I think the government should have a budget. There should be a document that says what we are for, what we are against, and how we are going to spend our money. I think it is particularly important because we are incurring so much debt.

We may remember when Republicans campaigned against enormous spending by President Obama and \$1 trillion annual deficits. Now we are faced with enormous spending and \$1 trillion annual deficits from Republicans. I think it is important that we have a discussion about this.

Do we have too much debt? Some will say: Well, I have debt for my house, and that is not bad. The country has a lot of debt that they borrow against capital expenditures—things that don't expire. I think there is some truth to that. You can have a manageable amount of debt, particularly if it is against something you are borrowing that doesn't go away. But if you are borrowing money for the grocery store or for your apartment, that might be a bad thing. It will not last very long. You will do it for a month or two, and pretty soon the bank will come calling. So there is a point at which debt is too cumbersome, and there is too much of it.

Carmen Reinhart of the University of Maryland and Kenneth Rogoff of Harvard did a study linking debt to economic growth. They concluded that when a country exceeds 90 percent of their GDP, when their debt is almost

equal to their GDP, economic growth begins to slow, and you lose probably 1 to 2 points just because of the burden of the debt. This is all of the debt—what the government owes to the public at large and to themselves. They said that when it exceeds 90 percent, it is a problem. Currently, our debt is at 105 percent; our gross public debt is 105 percent of our GDP.

We now have a national debt of about \$21 trillion. Historically, Congress had sort of a cover on this. Congress would try to rein in the debt. There would be a big debate every time we raised the debt ceiling. Congress would have to lift it each time, and there was some punishment out there for those who voted to raise the debt ceiling.

Now we don't raise the debt ceiling by a certain amount because that became embarrassing and limiting, making them come back each time to try to raise the debt ceiling. Now what we do is raise it for a period of time.

Currently, the debt ceiling has been raised, and you can spend as much as you want for a little over a year. We did it, I believe, back in December. For about 1½ years, the government can borrow as much as they can possibly borrow for that period of time. Basically, there is no limit. The debt ceiling vote has become a meaningless vote because we just raise it for a period of time.

Is the debt a problem? How much interest do we pay on the debt? We pay \$300 billion in interest. You say: Well, is that a problem? Paying on the interest crowds out other things that you want from the government. So when people come to my office and say "I want this from my government," I say "Well, part of the problem is we are paying \$300 billion in interest, and part of the problem is we don't have anything to give you because we are borrowing about 25 percent of every dollar we spend."

Every time the government spends a dollar, 25 percent of that is borrowed. This is on current accounts of things people want. For example, if I were to ask you: Is it a good idea to borrow money to give to your church? People say: Well, my church is a good thing, and I want to give money to my church. But is it a good idea and will it last very long if you go to the bank to borrow 25 percent of every dollar you spend and tithe 25 percent to your church? You say: My church is a good thing. But is it a good thing to borrow that money, and will the bank keep loaning you that money, and are there repercussions to having so much debt?

We have a \$300 billion interest payment at about a 2-percent interest rate. The interest rate is manipulated by the Federal Reserve, and there are those who report that the main reason the interest rates are kept low by the Federal Reserve is not necessarily to stimulate economic growth; it is to finance this enormous burden of debt.

What happens when interest rates normalize? Many are predicting they

will. As economic growth begins to pick up, you are going to see an acceleration in interest rates. What happens at 5 percent? Can we even manage our debt at 5 percent?

People have looked at what the interest will be, even saying interest rates stay stable, and they say that within about a decade, interest rates will exceed all other payments of the government. The estimate is that within 10 years, interest payments alone will be about \$761 billion—greater than national defense, greater than any other area of the budget. Even now, the second biggest item in the budget after defense is interest.

So some say: But we have to finance the military, and the military needs more money. That is why you hear Republicans now no longer caring about the debt. They got more money for the military, but they had to make an unholy alliance with Democrats and give them more for social welfare. So we have guns and butter. Everybody gets what they want—except for the taxpayer and those of us who care about the debt.

So the debt has exploded now under Republican control. You say: Well, don't we need it for the military?

Well, I think there are some arguments we should probably engage in before we decide that. We have doubled the amount in nominal terms that we spend on the military since 9/11. In real terms, there is about a 36-percent increase in national defense. We spend more on the military than the next eight countries combined.

There is an argument that it isn't necessarily that the budget has not grown enough, but it is that maybe the military mission is too large. Maybe it is not that the budget is too small but that our military mission is too large, that we are at war in too many places around the globe and that we should reassess that.

Many Republicans will say: Well, that is all good and well, but really the culprit is entitlements.

Entitlements are growing at 6 percent—Social Security, Medicare, food stamps. There is truth to that, but watch closely the people who tell you that the problem is entitlements and ask yourself if they are doing anything to fix entitlements. Ask them whether they have put forward a bill on the floor of the Senate to rein in spending and entitlements. Ask them whether they have even cosponsored a bill or whether they are agitating for a bill to rein in entitlements. No. They are petrified of looking at entitlements. So everybody complains about it, and nobody does anything about it.

Everybody says they are for a balanced budget. Yet, when we have a vote in a few minutes on a budget that actually balances in 5 years, consistent with the balanced budget amendment, I think we will get a handful—maybe a dozen or maybe two dozen. But the majority of Republicans will say: Oh my goodness, we could never cut spending.

So in the abstract, they are for a balanced budget. They are for a balanced budget amendment. They will all vote for it. They will all come down here. I think we had a unanimous vote a few years ago. Republicans all voted for the balanced budget amendment. Just a month ago in the House, all the people who voted to bust the budget caps, all the people who voted for the extra spending, all these Republicans then voted for the balanced budget amendment, which says you have to balance in 5 years. Typically, when they have brought forward a budget, they have tried to balance it in 10 years and struggled. So they vote for a balanced budget amendment that balances in 5 years, and yet they struggle to come up with a budget that is not fake to balance in 10 years.

We passed a budget last year. It was a Republican budget. I voted against it because I think it had fake cuts in it, and it had fake reporting, and they weren't serious about it. I will give an example. The budget last year that the Republicans passed had about \$4 trillion in entitlement savings over 10 years. You say: Well, did they enact any of that? Zero. Do they have any bills to do any entitlement reform? Zero. Did we ever debate and vote on any bills that would have done anything to entitlement spending? No. In fact, in the first year of the Republican budget last year, there was \$96 billion—that is a significant savings—all in entitlements, and yet nobody had a bill that even went to committee. There was never a committee vote. There was never a floor vote. No one lifted a finger to do anything about entitlement spending.

So it is a canard for those who say: Well, the real problem is not military; the real problem is not nonmilitary discretionary; the real problem is entitlements. Sure, entitlements are growing faster, but unless we are doing something about it, it is simply saying: Oh, we have to keep spending over here because the real problem is over here, but we are not going to do anything over here, which runs into really the hypocrisy that we face today.

I have often said that the Republican Party is an empty vessel unless we imbue it with value. We say we are against big spending. We say we are against big government. We say we are for devolving power, structure, and money back to the States. Yet the government grows under Democrats and it grows under Republicans.

Democrats are sometimes more honest about wanting to grow government. They will go home and say they are going to make government big enough to put a ham on every table, a chicken in every pot. They are a little bit more honest about it. Republicans go home and say they believe in the free market. They go to the Rotary Club and say: Well, I voted for the balanced budget amendment. But the question is, Why won't they vote for an actual budget that balances? Why won't they

vote for a budget that actually is consistent with the balanced budget amendment?

So what I have done is put forward my own budget. It is something I have talked about for several years now. It wasn't originally my idea; others have talked about it. It is called the penny plan. It says that we would cut one penny out of every dollar the Federal Government spends—1 percent. Could we not get to a point where we could actually cut one penny out of every dollar? Isn't there enough waste going on in government that we could actually cut a penny out of every dollar?

Like everything else, people argue the numbers. There is a lot of fake math that goes on around here. Those on the left will say, oh, but this will be cutting \$13 trillion, when, in fact, it might not cut any. For example, if we were to freeze government spending for 10 years, the left would say: You have cut spending by \$15 trillion because we were going to increase spending by \$15 trillion. So it is sort of fake accounting. If we spend \$3.2 trillion and next year we spend \$32 billion less, that is a 1-percent cut, but the left will say: Oh, no, we were going to increase spending by 6 percent, and so you are really cutting spending by 7 percent. This enormous number comes up, but in reality, we are taking last year's spending—\$3.2 trillion—and we are going to cut it by 1 percent, \$30 billion. If we do that every year for 5 years, the budget balances.

You say: Well, some people might not get all their money. Yes, there would be some programs across government that would get less. I challenge any American to call up my office and present proof that there is not 1 percent waste and fraud in any program going on. I will give an example. The earned-income tax credit and the child tax credit are estimated to have 25 percent fraud. For years, you could get this credit without a Social Security number. You could simply say: My kids and I don't have one. The government would generate a taxpayer ID number for you and give you a refund. This is to the tune of billions of dollars. It is about \$100 billion in the EITC, the earned-income tax credit, and the additional child credit—many of those going to people who were in our country illegally and had no Social Security number.

There is waste from top to bottom in government. How would you ever find it? See, many people in this body on both sides of the aisle will say: I am for rooting out waste. Yet you never find waste if you keep giving them more money. If you reward government agencies with more money, you are never going to get less waste.

The penny plan budget I am presenting would cut 1 percent. Does anybody in America think government couldn't do with 1 percent less? Many American families have had a bad year here and there and have to deal with more than 1 percent less. One percent

of this enormous government, if it were cut each year, would go a long way toward making us a stronger nation.

People say: Well, what about the military? I think that if the government ran a balanced budget, we would have a stronger and more secure nation. Admiral Mullen said he thought the No. 1 threat to our national security was actually our debt. So there are many realistic people, even high-ranking people in the military, who are saying: You know what, if we want to secure our Nation, we have to make sure that we have a sound economy and that we have a sound government that is not borrowing so much money.

How rapidly do we borrow money? We borrow \$1 million every minute—\$1 million a minute. In fact, it is a little bit higher than that now. It is about \$1.5 million, and the curve over the next 10 years gets to about \$2 million a minute. Imagine how fast the money is flying out of here. How big is \$1 million? People have said that if you put hundred-dollar bills in your hand, it is about 4 inches high to get to \$1 million. We are borrowing \$1 million or more every minute.

How would we get to \$30 billion? How could we possibly cut \$30 billion from the budget? I will give examples of where some of the money is.

Foreign aid is about \$30 billion. You say: Well, I want to help the poor people in the world. I am all for you. If you want to give out of your savings to help poor people around the world, all the benefit and all the accolades for being generous, but if you want to borrow money, you won't be able to do it for very long.

Should the U.S. Government borrow? We are going to borrow \$1 trillion this year. Should we borrow money to send it to poor countries, or should we borrow money to send armaments to countries? I think it is a big mistake. That is about \$30 billion. So if you were to cut 1 percent next year, you could actually cut 1 percent by simply eliminating foreign aid.

How much do we spend in Afghanistan building their roads, building their bridges, building their schools before they blow them up again and then we rebuild them again? We have rebuilt some buildings in Afghanistan seven times. That is nearly \$50 billion, which is about a year, year and a half, of the penny plan right there if we were to say: Guess what. We won the Afghan war, and we are not going to stay forever. We have some needs here at home that we are going to take care of and not send all that money to Afghanistan.

Corporate welfare. Rich corporations in our country—I am all for them. If they freely sell something to you and they make money because you like their product and buy it, more power to them, but if they want money from the Federal Government, that is ridiculous. I don't think private business should be getting any money from the Federal Government. It is estimated

that corporate welfare is over \$100 billion. I know for certain that we could find enough corporate welfare that we could actually, by eliminating corporate welfare, do 1 year of the penny plan.

Waste. Our office alone has found \$3 billion in waste.

Interest. It is \$300 billion, going up to \$760 billion.

There are a lot of areas in our government that we could actually look at and actually adhere to the penny plan and balance our budget. I would like to go through a few items.

If there is anybody in America who believes their government is not wasting their money, I would like to show them a few areas where the government is wasting their money.

My staff recently went to Afghanistan. This is a picture of a luxury hotel that your taxpayer dollars went to build. Your first question might be why your taxpayer dollars would be going to a luxury hotel in some Third World country. It is about 400 feet from our Embassy, and this is what it looks like. They have been building it for 11 years, and it is unfinished. Nothing was done to code, it is falling down, and at this point, the hotel is so dangerous that we have to send our soldiers to patrol it to make sure snipers aren't using the hotel to shoot at our Embassy. So it is not only a waste of \$90 million, never having been completed, but it is now a danger to our troops. The talk now is on how they are going to fix the problem.

Does anybody in Washington think we should spend less in Afghanistan? Virtually no one. Both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats, can't spend money fast enough in Afghanistan. No one is making a stand and saying: Enough is enough. It is time to announce that we won, and it is time to come home. The money just keeps going, good money after bad—\$90 million for a hotel that will never be built.

To add insult to injury, do you know what they are going to do now? They are talking about selling the unfinished hotel. Do you know who they are going to sell it to? Another branch of government. So government built this—U.S. taxpayer dollars built this—and now they are going to sell it to the State Department. Do you know what the State Department is going to do with this luxury hotel in Kabul? They are going to tear it down. So that is \$90 million flushed down the toilet.

You can't tell me this waste isn't rotting in our government from top to bottom, and it is never rooted out. Why? Because we never give any agency less money; everybody gets more money. If you are running an agency or business and someone gives you more money, are you more likely to root out waste or less likely to root out waste? The only way they would ever root out waste is if they got a commandment—thou shalt do this—from Congress, from the Senate, to say: Enough is

enough. Let's declare victory and come home.

This hotel—\$90 million flushed down the toilet. It is now a danger to our troops, and they are going to tear it down. It was never completed.

Also, in Afghanistan, there is brandnew equipment that we send over there that is shredded. They have big, huge industrial shredders. My staff saw them. They found boxes of new equipment—electrical outlet boxes, all kinds of things—being shoved into the shredder. So we buy brandnew equipment, and it is shoved into the shredder. There is \$50 million of brandnew, never-used equipment that has been destroyed. This doesn't even count the old stuff we are destroying. There are reports that \$7 billion—7 with a "b," billion dollars—of used equipment, such as tanks, humvees, et cetera, has been destroyed. Why? Our allies are so unreliable, we are afraid that if we leave a tank or a humvee there, it might be taken by the opposition and used against us. So we have destroyed \$7 billion of it because it is cheaper to destroy it than to load it on planes and bring it over here. That is \$7 billion.

The Department of Defense loses \$29 million of heavy equipment. What does that mean? They can't find it. It can't be accounted for. They don't know where the equipment is. There is \$29 million unaccounted for in heavy equipment.

They tried to establish an Afghan equivalent for the Army Corps of Engineers and lost \$20 million of heavy equipment in the process.

There is \$28 million worth of uniforms that are missing. Someone got paid. We can't find the uniforms. We can't prove that anyone ever got the uniforms.

Even more troubling than that, there was \$700,000 worth of ammunition missing. You would think we could at least keep up with ammunition. Do you think that might be a danger and an insult to our young men and women we send to Afghanistan, that we can't account for where the ammunition is? I think if you can't account for it, there is a decent chance the enemy has your ammunition or rogue elements in the Afghan Government—which could be anyone—have sold it on the black market to make money.

Where does your money go? I want you to realize as Americans where your money is going. They spent \$500,000 to study if selfies make you happier. You take selfies of yourself smiling, then you look at them to see if that makes you happier. Now, you may want to do this on your own time, but do you want to spend \$500,000 of taxpayer money when we are a trillion dollars short?

This stuff has been going on with the National Science Foundation since the 1970s. William Proxmire was a Senator back in the 1970s—a conservative Democrat or a Democrat of some stripe. He used to do the Golden Fleece Award. Many of them went to the National Science Foundation around 1972. He

complained about it for 10 years before he retired. I have been complaining about it for 6 years.

What do the Republicans and Democrats do? They say: Oh, it is science. You wouldn't know, sir, about science. We have to give them more money. You are not smart enough to know there is a lot of science in taking selfies. We could learn something really important, and it is so important for the future of mankind to learn whether selfies of people smiling will help the world in the end.

NIH. Everybody loves the NIH. They can do no wrong. NIH did a \$2 million study to see whether, if you are following somebody in the cafeteria line and the guy or woman in front of you sneezes on the food, you are more or less likely to take the food. Really? I think we could have polled the audience on that. I mean, how ridiculous is that? Money like that—particularly when there are things the government needs to do. There is a trillion-dollar deficit, and we spend \$2 million studying what your reaction is to people sneezing on the food?

Then \$356,000 of your money was spent studying whether Japanese quail are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine. These guys have some great studies. This is, once again, I believe, the National Science Foundation. Hurray for the National Science Foundation. I know I am going to get hate mail from them. They spent \$356,000 to study whether Japanese quail are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine. You can't make this stuff up.

The reform I have proposed is that we have a taxpayer advocate on the committee to determine who gets these grants. Do you know what they say? We can't have any nonscientists. They wouldn't understand the science. I want the scientist who did this to come forward and explain why we need this study. There is no point to us spending this money. There could have been something better.

I offered one thing to try to fix it. Put a taxpayer advocate on the committee approving grants, and I think we should have a scientist who isn't in that field. This is sort of behavioral science for Japanese quail, I guess. We need to have somebody who studies diabetes, heart disease, cancer, AIDS—some of the diseases that affect more people. They need to be on the committee because they need to be scratching their heads saying: We can spend it on Japanese quail and their sexual habits or we can spend it on diabetes. The taxpayer advocate could say: We can spend it on Japanese quail or maybe we can reduce the debt. Maybe both could happen. Maybe we could reduce the debt and try to do only better scientific projects.

This one looks like something you really want your government to spend money on. They spent \$150,000 to investigate supernatural events in Alaska. They can look at unexplained lights, animals with transformative powers,

all kinds of different mythological animals, landscape features that had special powers, and, of course, you wouldn't want to leave out sea monsters. People say: What is \$150,000? That is the problem with government. Milton Friedman had it right when he said: "Nobody spends somebody else's money as wisely as he spends his own." Why does nobody care about the \$150,000? Because it wasn't their money to spend. This is the problem with government at-large and why the government is never good at anything they do. They are terribly ineffective because they are spending somebody else's money.

Government should be so small that they have less room to make errors like this. We should devolve most of the power of this place back to the States. That is what our Founding Fathers intended, and we should try to say we are not going to tolerate this kind of stuff.

This \$250,000 was spent to send 24 kids from Pakistan to Space Camp and Dollywood. My first question would be: Is there anybody in America who didn't get to go to Dollywood or Space Camp last year? I think when everybody in America has gone, we might consider sending some Pakistani kids. Frankly, there is nothing in the Constitution that says we should be sending Pakistani kids to Dollywood. There is nothing wrong if you want to send your kids from Pakistan to Dollywood—by all means. You should not take taxpayer money to do things like this.

May I ask the Presiding Officer how much time I have remaining of my 45 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). There is 19 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Thank you.

This is here in Washington, about a mile from here. We call it a "Streetcar Named Waste." Spending \$1.6 million to study the expansion of the DC streetcar—and this is a streetcar that nobody is actually riding on. It is a ghost car. Nobody is riding on it. It goes nowhere. It goes about a mile, from nowhere to nowhere, and is much slower than walking. I walked, and I can outwalk it. We thought about filming me in a race with the streetcar to see who wins, me walking or it driving; once again, going back to some technology from hundreds of years ago that still requires wires to be running down the street, and it is really not a useful expense of government money. DC gets a lot of Federal money.

Where else do they spend your money? This is one of my favorites. I just can't even imagine who spent this money. When I tell you, you will say: Certainly, that person was fired. No way. He works for the Federal Government. Nobody is ever fired in the Federal Government. They spent \$700,000 to study what Neil Armstrong said when he landed on the Moon. Did he say, "One small step for man, one giant leap for mankind," or did he say, "One small step for a man"? They wanted to

study whether the preposition “a” was mentioned by Neil Armstrong or whether he said: “One small step for man.” Where did the money come from? The grant was originally supposed to be for autism. We can debate whether the Federal Government should be involved in that. It sounds like a much more just study if it had something to do with autism than studying Neil Armstrong’s statement on the Moon.

You can’t make this stuff up. This is incredibly ridiculous, but it should be insulting. There should not be a taxpayer at home in America who says: All right. Today they are going to vote on a budget to cut one penny out of every dollar. We spent \$700,000 on what Neil Armstrong did or did not say on the Moon. You know what their conclusion at the end was? They don’t know. It is inconclusive. They listened to the tape over and over again. Someone should be fired.

It also should be a message to our body that we should cut some spending. Instead, we have done the opposite. Under Republican control of the Senate and the House, we busted the budget caps by \$300 billion just 2 months ago. Part of what my plan would do would be to restore the caps. They are put in place for a reason, to try to control our proclivity to spend too much money. We put the budget caps in place, then we cut 1 percent a year—about \$30 billion every year for 5 years, and then the government would begin to grow again at about 1 percent.

I know we could live within our means. What would happen is this guy would be fired, and that kind of study would not happen when they have 1 percent less. Maybe a program like the National Science Foundation would get 50 percent less or 75 percent less to really put them on notice that we are tired, after 30 years of crazy research, of them continuing without reform.

This was also spent in Afghanistan. This is your money. They used \$850,000 to set up a televised cricket league. The first problem is, most people don’t have TVs in Afghanistan. Really, a televised cricket league? They don’t even have TVs to watch it on. This is \$850,000 to make them feel better about their National Cricket League. Boondoggle. It has nothing to do with national defense. It makes us weaker by putting us further into debt.

Will this get better if we continue to increase money? No, it only gets worse. If you give them more money, they will spend it. In fact, we have studied spending at the end of the year. When you get to the end of the year, the government spends money four to five times faster than any other month in the year. The last 30 days of the fiscal year spending increases every day. In fact, on the last day of the fiscal year, you can watch spending accelerate as the Sun sets in the West. As offices begin to close in the East, the spending shifts to the Midwest. As the Sun sets farther in the western sky and the of-

fices are still open in California, they are spending money as fast as they can. If they don’t spend it, they will not get it next year—use it or lose it.

It is a phenomenon of government that has been going on forever. This kind of stuff happens. As long as you give them more money, they will do it. As long as they are rewarded for doing the spending, we should study which agencies do it. We should study which agencies go to Las Vegas and have their conference there for a million dollars, sipping champagne in a hot tub. That agency should get less money. I think those people actually did get fired—one of the few people ever fired.

We could have a debate on another occasion about climate change, but we probably agree that a \$450,000 app for your phone so you can play a climate change game that will, I guess, attempt to convince you and ensure that you are convinced that we are having climate change—\$450,000 for an app on a phone. Apps are everywhere. People are developing them all the time. Government doesn’t need to be spending \$450,000 for what somebody probably spends \$1,000 in their garage to develop.

Remember ObamaCare, when they tried to set up the website with millions of dollars, and then it failed? Remember the IRS just 3 weeks ago failing? We need to be very careful about giving government more money.

The budget I am introducing is called the penny plan budget. It cuts one penny out of every dollar. This is important for the country to see we are having this vote. They are not that excited to have this vote. We are only having this vote because the Senate rules basically mandate it. It can’t be avoided because Republicans didn’t create a budget. Democrats didn’t create a budget. So I decided, what the heck, I will create my own budget.

The penny plan budget has come forward. If we were to pass this, there are many good things. Through a simple majority, we could do many good things that conservative Republicans have wanted, like make the tax cuts permanent, and get rid of more regulations. We could do the REINS Act, which would say, new regulations that are very expensive have to be voted on by Congress. We should cut out more waste. There are all kinds of things we could do.

What we have chosen to do in our budget is actually give instructions to expand health savings accounts. One of the big problems we have in healthcare is rising costs. Costs are going up about 25 percent a year. The answer around here has been, I think, lame, uneducated, ill-informed, and counterproductive. Other than that, they are right on target. What they are trying to say is: Oh, your individual rates are going up 25 percent a year. Here is some money so you can pay for it. It does nothing to bring the curve down. It may accelerate the curve. If you subsidize something, it will become more

expensive. You are subsidizing the demand for it. We ought to expand health savings accounts where people pay for their healthcare. People say: I don’t want to pay for my healthcare. When you pay—when you have skin in the game—you ask the price of things. When the government pays or somebody else pays, you don’t ask the price of things, and the price rises.

Competition is the fundamental aspect of capitalism, but you have to have freely fluctuating prices, which we don’t in Medicare, Medicaid, and actually mostly private insurance. We have never really adjusted the fundamental problem of healthcare, which is that we don’t have capitalism in healthcare.

What do we do? Because we don’t have enough capitalism, we take more capitalism away and add more government, and it is more broken since we have done Obamacare. One of the answers—since many Republicans will not vote to repeal ObamaCare—is let us try to start expanding the marketplace.

My budget today could pass if every Republican voted for it. If it passes, we could move on to doing something like expanding the health savings accounts. This gets to an argument that is an inside baseball argument that happens in Washington. They will tell you: Young man, you must vote for our budget because the budget is simply a vehicle to do other good things. I look back at him and say: If it is a vehicle, and you don’t care what is in it, why not put something good in it? We always put something crappy in it that never works, never balances, and does not represent who we are as a party. They shove it down our throat and say: Vote for it. You have to do it because that is the only way to get to a tax cut. That is the only way we get to repeal ObamaCare, although they are not really for that anymore. But the thing is, they can do it by voting for something they actually are for. Everyone in our caucus is for the balanced budget amendment. If we put it forward on the floor, they will all vote for it, but there will not be enough votes for it to be law, so it is a free vote. This would be the actual platform, the actual symbol of what we run on and what we do next year. Yet we will not have a chance to do that unless they are willing to do it.

They want the budget to be meaningless. They want it to be a vehicle, but then they want it to be their meaningless symbol, and I can’t do that. I think there has to be someone left in the Republican Party who says enough is enough. We are not going to not tolerate the waste, spending, and debt, and we are going to say the same things we said to President Obama: Big government spending and debt are wrong.

I don’t think we should change this because we are in power. When the Republican Party is out of power, they are the conservative party. But the

problem is, when the Republican Party is in power, there is no conservative party. What I am arguing for today is that we should be who we say we are. I urge a “yes” vote on the penny plan budget.

Madam President, I will reserve the remainder of my time if I can get an update of what I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is 9 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Perfect. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PAUL. I will reserve the bulk of my time that is remaining and suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to use leader time.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you, Madam President.

Before I get into the substance of my remarks, I always listen diligently to my friend from Kentucky. There is a number that is missing in his charts; it is 1.5 trillion. The reason we don't like government spending is—he thinks—a lot of it is wasteful, but, ultimately, the reason is also that there is a huge deficit.

Our side scratches our heads not only with our friend from Kentucky, but with everyone on the other side who rails about too much government spending and creation of the deficit when they created the deepest hole they could have with the tax break that could have been paid for by closing loopholes. A group—a bipartisan group—had put something together that would have reduced the corporate rate to 25 percent, brought the money from overseas at 8, 9 percent, increased the child tax credit, left the individual side alone, and would have barely increased the deficit. So our side, at least, rankles when we hear these budgets that relate to deficit spending when, on the tax side, that doesn't seem to apply at all.

I say that with due respect to my good friend, who I know is sincere in his beliefs. He will argue with me that cutting taxes increases the economy. I would say that spending money on education and infrastructure also increases the economy. It is a slippery slope once you say: We can cut all the taxes we want; the deficit doesn't matter. It would be like our side saying: You can spend all the money you want; the deficit doesn't matter. We don't quite say that.

I thank my friend.

NET NEUTRALITY

Madam President, yesterday was a good day for the future of the internet. Democrats forced the Senate to take an important step closer to restoring net neutrality. It is another step closer to ensuring that large internet service providers don't get to hold all the cards, another step closer to protecting equality of access to the internet. In doing so, Senate Democrats stood with the 86 percent of Americans who oppose the repeal of net neutrality.

I am proud to say that Senator MARKEY's Congressional Review Act resolution passed yesterday afternoon with the votes of every single Democrat, as well as three of our Republican colleagues. I thank Senators COLLINS, MURKOWSKI, and KENNEDY for supporting this fine legislation.

Here is what my friend the Republican Senator from Louisiana had to say after the vote:

If you trust your cable company, you won't like my vote. If you don't trust your cable company, you will like my vote.

He is right. It is that simple. So you have to wonder why 47 Republicans voted no yesterday. Do they trust the cable companies and the large ISPs to do what is level best for the average American family? Do they believe that cable companies are really popular with the American people? I don't think so.

Now Republicans in the House have to take up this bipartisan resolution. We hope they will.

This isn't some partisan stunt. Absolutely not. It is a real, bipartisan effort to right the FCC's wrong and protect the free and open internet. It is very crucial to the future of the country.

House Republicans don't have to choose the same path that the vast majority of Republicans in the Senate decided to follow. Speaker RYAN should bring this up for a vote immediately. The American people have spoken. The Senate has spoken. Speaker RYAN should listen and bring the net neutrality CRA to the floor of the House.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Madam President, 1 year ago, former FBI Director Robert Mueller was appointed to lead the FBI's investigation into Russia's interference in the 2016 election. Of course, the investigation began long before that. According to the New York Times, it began in the middle of 2016 as a result of information we received from the Australian Ambassador, who told the FBI that Russian intelligence was working to share information with the Trump campaign.

At that time, we heard a lot about the FBI's investigation of Hillary Clinton's emails, but remarkably, we heard nothing about this other investigation. Now we know that one of those two investigations is much more serious than the other one was. We also know that if it were a witch hunt—as the President seems to think it is—if they were out

to get him, they certainly would have leaked information about that during the election campaign. They didn't.

The probe led by Special Counsel Mueller, a Republican and decorated marine veteran, concerns the campaign of a hostile foreign power to interfere in and influence the outcome of an American election. There is nothing—nothing—more serious to the integrity of a democracy than the guarantee of free and fair elections.

The Founding Fathers warned about foreign interference. When I used to read that clause in high school, I said: What do they mean? That is not going to happen. Well, they were a lot smarter than we are—as always. They knew this danger. Here it is, 2018, and we see how real it is. It is the core of the special counsel's investigation.

The investigation has already yielded multiple indictments and guilty pleas. Yesterday the Senate Intelligence Committee, in a bipartisan manner, confirmed that Russia sought to interfere with our elections, sow discord, and tip the scales toward Donald Trump and against Secretary Clinton. The Trump administration itself has even taken punitive action against Russia's actors named in Mueller's investigation.

I salute the chairman of the Intelligence Committee, the Republican Senator from North Carolina, for being straightforward about this. Not so many on the other side of the aisle are.

Yet, again this morning, President Trump called the investigation a “disturbing, illegal, and unwarranted witch hunt . . . the greatest witch hunt in American history.” The rhetoric this man uses is amazing.

I say to the President: It is not a witch hunt when 17 Russians have been indicted. It is not a witch hunt when some of the most senior members of the Trump campaign have been indicted. It is not a witch hunt when Democrats and Republicans agree with the intelligence community that Russia interfered in our election to aid President Trump.

Any fair-minded citizen, even the most ardent partisan, should be able to look at the facts and say that this investigation is not a witch hunt. The FBI Director, Christopher Wray, appointed by President Trump, a Republican, said as much yesterday.

Truly, we should all be aghast, on this 1-year anniversary of Mueller's appointment, at the smear campaign by the President and his allies. We should all be aghast at the relentless parade of conspiracies manufactured by the most extreme elements of the Republican Party and conservative media to distract from the special counsel's investigation. From “deep state” leaks to unmasking requests, phone taps at Trump Tower, Uranium One, Nunes's midnight run to the White House, and the Nunes memo—these are all attempts to derail a legitimate and important investigation.

Now House conservatives are badgering DOJ officials for classified documents, hunting desperately for any scrap of information that would help them sully the investigation. By the way, for all of their ranting and raving and interfering, they don't have a scintilla of evidence to support that this is a witch hunt, that this is unfair, or that this is politically motivated.

The President and his allies don't quit with all these conspiracy theories, with all these ridiculous fomentations. Frankly, it is because they are afraid of what Mueller's investigation will reveal.

Every American who looks at the President's actions says that he is afraid of what the Mueller investigation will reveal. Yet the volume of mistruth, the weight of all the distortion and fabrication is hurting our democracy.

The double standard is enormous. The Times article shows no leaks when Trump was under investigation during the campaign; obviously, it was made public when Hillary Clinton was. Again, if this were a witch hunt, why didn't the FBI, which the President seems to feel is politically motivated with no scintilla of proof—why wouldn't they leak it?

One more point before I leave the floor—yesterday, the words of former Secretary Tillerson were these: “If our leaders seek to conceal the truth or we as a people become accepting of alternative realities that are no longer grounded in facts, then we as American citizens are on the pathway to relinquishing our freedom.”

He is exactly right. When distortion, lies, and intimidation come repeatedly from the other side and some conservative news media, and that becomes the accepted way, when it is just he said, she said, where one side is blatantly lying, and that becomes accepted, our democracy is at risk.

We are a beautiful thing here—founded on facts, real facts. What we have seen from the President and some of his allies, the way they are behaving, makes you worry about the future of this democracy.

Ultimately, I have a firm belief that they will not succeed. The Founding Fathers were geniuses—geniuses—when they set up a system of checks and balances that we read about in our classes and we study, but it is almost mystical. It always rises to the occasion. It will again, despite the efforts of the President, despite the efforts of some of his allies who have gone way overboard; I might mention Chairman NUNES on the other side. I believe the checks and balances of this country will hold, and we will eventually find out the truth, no matter where it leads.

Today is a good day to remember that the special counsel's investigation is serious, it is nonpartisan, and it is critical to the integrity of our democracy. We must allow it to proceed without political interference, without intimidation, to follow all the facts in

pursuit of the unvarnished truth on such an important issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2872

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2872) to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reform the procedures provided under such Act for the initiation, investigation, and resolution of claims alleging that employing offices of the legislative branch have violated the rights and protections provided to their employees under such Act, including protections against sexual harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Madam President, 100 days ago, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to pass the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act, the bill that would fix the way we deal with sexual harassment and discrimination here in Congress.

The current system is broken. It makes no sense that a staffer who is sexually harassed or discriminated against has to possibly wait months for mediation, for counseling, or for a cooling off before she or he is able to even file a claim.

This bill would also make sure that when a Member of Congress has sexually harassed or discriminated against someone on their staff, the taxpayers are not left holding the bag. That is what the bill does. There is no reasonable excuse for anyone to stand in the way.

Our constituents do not deserve to have their hard-earned dollars paying for these settlements. What they deserve is a vote on this reform now. But what have we seen since the House acted? Nothing but politics as usual, despite having significant bipartisan support on this issue.

I thank my colleagues—Minority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER, Senator KLOBUCHAR, and Senator MURRAY—for their strong leadership on this issue and all of their efforts to pass this bill in the Senate. They have been great partners in trying to move this forward.

It is long since time that we should be acting on this issue. We need to pass this bill and send it to the President's desk so he can sign it into law, because what we have seen so clearly, after the several months and years that we have

been talking about this, is that sexual harassment and discrimination in the workplace is far more pervasive and egregious than we previously might have recognized.

We have all witnessed harassment and discrimination. We all see what it actually does to society—whether it is happening in factories, in restaurants, in Hollywood, in the Halls of Congress, or right here in this building. But the difference is that while practically every other industry in the country seems to be taking this issue far more seriously and at least trying to make an effort to change their workplaces, Congress is dragging its feet.

Once again, a problem is staring us right in the face, and we are looking the other way. Enough is enough. We should do better. We have waited 100 days, and we should not have to wait any longer.

So I urge my colleagues to do the right thing now, to support this bill. Fix this system here in Congress that is failing our staffers on this issue of sexual harassment. This one is as easy as it gets. So let's have a vote and let's pass it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I appreciate being recognized. I am going to talk about a budget proposal by my colleague from Kentucky, Senator PAUL.

To those who want to balance our budget and get us out of debt, count me in. How do we do that? I would like to do it without destroying the military. I would like not to open up the wound when it comes to the effects of sequestration.

Unfortunately, Senator PAUL's approach is devastating to the military. It creates unpredictability at a time when we need predictability. It throws us back into the old system where nobody knows what is going to happen.

Let me tell you about how you balance the budget and get us out of debt.

In 2008, this blue line represents discretionary spending. This is about 30 percent of overall Federal spending. You can see that from 2008 to 2028 it has been relatively flat. In the budget agreement we entered into just a few weeks ago, we are spending less on non-defense discretionary spending by \$2 billion than we did in 2010. This red line represents about the 65 to 70 percent of Federal spending called entitlements, and it is going through the roof. So if you want to balance the budget, you have to deal with the red line. You can't take it all out of the blue line.

Sequestration has taken about \$1 trillion out of the military. I compliment President Trump for entering into a budget agreement that will restore funding to the military at a time when we need it the most.

What did sequestration do to the military? According to Secretary Mattis, “no enemy in the field has done more to harm the combat readiness of

our military than sequestration.” What a stunning statement that is. In other words, Congress has sunk more ships, shot down more planes, and taken more soldiers off the battlefield than any enemy.

Under sequestration, we are at the smallest level for the Navy since 1915, the smallest Army since 1940, and the smallest Air Force in modern history. That is about to change with the budget agreement—\$700 billion for the military to retool, to buy new equipment, to have more people so that our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines can spend a little bit of time with their families instead of being deployed all the time. So I applaud Senator PAUL’s zeal to balance the budget.

What I want to do is to expose what this budget actually does. If you are a defense hawk, you should be against this approach because it does the one thing we can’t afford to do. It creates unpredictability when it comes to our national defense strategy.

At times like this, I miss Senator MCCAIN because I know he would be here with me.

Under this proposal, we are going to cut \$404.8 billion next year. How much comes out of defense? Well, we will figure that out later. We know \$6 billion has to come out of it, but it effectively sets aside the budget agreement that plussed up defense. Over the next decade, \$13.358 trillion will be cut. Of that, how much comes out of defense? Well, we will figure that out later.

Let me tell you what that means to the military: devastation. Here is what Secretary Mattis said on April 26 about predictability: We need predictability so that we can actually put a strategy into effect. If you do not have a budget that reflects the strategy, it does not work.

Under the budget agreement, we have predictability for the next couple of years. We are restoring the cuts, and we have to build on what we have done in the next 2 years through the next 10 years.

What does this budget proposal do? It destroys predictability. It requires \$404.8 billion, and it doesn’t tell the Department of Defense how much they are going to have to pay. We know \$6 billion.

Here is what I would suggest. If the past is any indication of the future, our friends on the other side are not going to let us exempt defense. Sequestration was half out of defense, half out of non-defense, and left entitlements pretty much alone.

Senator PAUL says we are not going to deal with Social Security. Social Security is going broke. Somebody needs to deal with it. Ronald Reagan and Tip O’Neill dealt with it by adjusting the age of retirement to save Social Security benefits. So when you take Social Security off the table—and let’s say, magically, that everybody agreed with me that we should not undercut the defense budget, that we should actually add to it and give predictability—how

do you get \$13 trillion if you take Social Security and defense off the table? Well, we won’t because you can’t.

So to those who claim to be defense hawks—which I proudly claim to be—this is a symbolic vote. Yes, the symbolism here is that we don’t care about predictability when it comes to defense spending, that we are undercutting the agreement we achieved just a month ago to give the military the funds they need to defend this Nation.

Now, if you live in a world where the military is small and we don’t have any troops deployed anywhere, this might work. On September 10, 2001, we didn’t have one soldier in Afghanistan. We didn’t have an embassy, and not one dime in foreign aid went to Afghanistan. The next day, we got attacked, coming from Afghanistan, because radical Islam will not leave you alone just because you want to leave them alone.

President Trump is right to rebuild the military. He campaigned on setting aside sequestration. It was dumb. It hollowed out our force. It has been a nightmare for our military. Planes have been falling out of the sky.

What does this budget do? It puts us back into a level of unpredictability. It requires \$404 billion out of the 2019 budget. It says that \$6 billion has to come from defense. After that, we don’t know.

Here is what I know. It is going to undercut everything we have done to provide predictability. At the end of the day, this budget puts everything every defense person has been hoping for in jeopardy. It takes the efforts of President Trump to rebuild the military and throws it in a ditch, because if you take Social Security off the table, if you took defense off the table, then you can’t get there from here. Do you want to destroy the FBI, the CIA, the Department of Justice, the NIH?

This is a symbolic statement. These budgets usually don’t get many votes. I am tired of symbolism at the expense of our fighting men and women.

Here is my message. I will engage in entitlement reform. Senator PAUL had an entitlement reform bill for Medicare. I joined with him. As for Social Security, to my friends on the other side, let’s do something like Simpson-Bowles. Let’s go ahead and find a way to do entitlement reform and deal with the discretionary budget, not in a haphazard guessing kind of way.

Count me in for wanting to balance the budget, but you have to go where the money is. You have to do what Ronald Reagan and Tip O’Neill did. We have to do things for Medicare like the Gang of Six, Simpson-Bowles. What I will not symbolically lend my vote to is an approach to balance the budget that doesn’t give you a clue about how much money we are going to spend on the military for the next decade. That, by its very nature, undercuts all of the gains we have achieved to rebuild the military, to throw the military budget to the wolves.

I can tell you this: \$404.8 billion is coming out of the fiscal year 2019 budget. If you believe we can do that without affecting the military, then the last 7 or 8 years seems not to have meant anything, because for the last 6 or 7 years we have been cutting the military a lot because of a budget agreement that everybody thought would never happen. Nobody believed that sequestration would actually hit, that we would do \$1 trillion over a decade. The sequestration clause was a penalty clause to urge people to get it right by putting the Defense Department at risk, with 50 percent of sequestration cuts coming out of defense. The reason they put it on the table is because they thought Congress wouldn’t be dumb enough to actually get into sequestration. Guess what. We were that dumb. According to General Mattis, we have done more damage to the military than any enemy in the field since 9/11—what a title to claim as a Congress.

This budget throws us back into that situation on steroids. So, symbolically, I stand for balancing the budget, doing it in a responsible way that has entitlement reform as the heart of the effort in a bipartisan fashion.

Symbolically, I will not vote for a budget that does not give the Department of Defense the resources they need and the predictability they need to protect this country. That is what this budget does.

So to those of us on the Armed Services Committee, you should know better. You should know that of the \$13.5 trillion being cut over the next decade, a lot of it is going to come out of defense if it actually was a reality. If you take defense and Social Security off the table, it is a joke. Now is not the time to be funny. Now is the time to be serious. I am deadly serious about voting against any budget that doesn’t give the military the predictability they need to defend this Nation. This budget throws our military in a ditch, and I am tired of doing that.

I am going to vote no. I urge everyone who cares about Defense Department funding and predictability to vote no. Balance the budget, yes. Throw the military to the wolves, no.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND HARASSMENT REFORM BILL

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I am pleased to be here on the floor in support of my colleague Senator GILLIBRAND’s bill, the Congressional Accountability and Harassment Reform Act. I am pleased that so many Members of the Senate have supported the earlier version of the bill and are signing up to support this version as well.

It has been 100 days since the House acted on a significant and substantive reform of the process here in Congress on how we address sexual harassment. There have been plenty of stories about how unacceptable the current system is.

In spite of how far women's rights and equality have come in America, too many women continue to face inequality, discrimination, and harassment day in and day out. Our congressional workplace is not immune to that.

The world is changing, and the world is changing quickly, and movements like the "me too." campaign are finally giving women the voice they need to stand up and say no more.

Yet, in spite of this tide of change, the Senate refuses to act on our unacceptably obscure, complex, and difficult system for staff members to address sexual harassment and discrimination—a system that is difficult to navigate and void of transparency. It needs to change. It must change. One hundred days ago, the House said absolutely it must change, and we have seen no bill allowed to come to the floor to address it in the Senate.

The House did its duty. They put forward a vision of updating and strengthening procedures to protect women from sexual harassment and to address it, should it occur. Now it is time for the Senate to act, to hold ourselves to a much higher standard, to lead by example on Capitol Hill and for the rest of the Nation, to give those who work on our team who have been victimized by sexual harassment or discrimination a fair and transparent process to tell their stories, to pursue justice, to be free from the fear of professional or political retribution. That is exactly what the Congressional Accountability and Harassment Reform Act does. It requires sexual harassment awareness training. It simplifies a process for staffers to file complaints. It eliminates a mandatory, laborious process of required counseling and mediation. It protects a victim's option to publicly discuss their claims. It prohibits members found responsible for such behavior from using government funds—their office funds—to settle the claims, and it requires all settlements to be disclosed publicly unless the victim prefers otherwise. No longer would we be able to silence the victims or hide the misdeeds of the perpetrators from the American people.

I understand Members on the floor of the Senate may say: I want to hide from my actions; I want to pay off any settlement with my government funds, but being able to hide from your actions is unacceptable, and using government funds to pay off the situation is completely unacceptable.

Action is way past due. I am glad to join with my colleagues Senator GILLIBRAND, Senator WARREN, Senator HARRIS, and Senator MURRAY—so many who have come into this battle of equality, fairness, and fighting for those who have been victimized. That is what this act is about, and it is not acceptable that for 100 days the leadership of this body has sat on this bill, blocking it from being considered.

Let us recognize that we have a responsibility to our team members for

fairness, for transparency, and for accountability and to bring this bill to the floor immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). The Senator from Massachusetts.

NOMINATION OF GINA HASPEL

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I am here to express my strong opposition to President Trump's nomination of Gina Haspel to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. There are two reasons I oppose this nomination: Ms. Haspel's support for torture and her willingness to destroy evidence of the CIA's use of torture.

For years, apologists for the CIA's program have tried to redescribe this inhumane practice to make it seem less appalling to the American people. They have even renamed it. Torture has been rebranded as "enhanced interrogation."

There is no way to hide the basic facts. The techniques used by the CIA were torture: waterboarding so the person had the repeated sensation of drowning, confining people to small boxes for hours on end, depriving people of sleep for days, forcing people to hold painful stress positions.

The CIA did not invent these tactics. Listen to an American war hero describe what he endured as a prisoner of war in Vietnam.

I was being forced to stand up continuously—sometimes they'd make you stand up or sit on a stool for a long period of time. I'd stood up for a couple of days, with a respite only because one of the guards—the only real human being that I ever met over there—let me lie down for a couple of hours while he was on watch in the middle of one night.

Speaking about his captors, this former American POW said:

They bounced me from pillar to post, kicking and laughing and scratching. After a few hours of that, ropes were put on me and I sat that night bound with ropes.

They beat me around a little bit. I was in such bad shape that when they hit me it would knock me unconscious. They kept saying, "You will not receive any medical treatment until you talk."

I was getting about three or four spoonfuls of food twice a day. Sometimes I'd go for a day or so without eating.

I had learned what we all learned over there: Every man has his breaking point. I had reached mine. . . . I had been reduced to an animal during this period of beating and torture.

These are the words of Senator JOHN MCCAIN—our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Arizona, a decorated Naval aviator who was beaten, broken, and tortured for 2 years after being captured in North Vietnam.

No matter how you dress it up, torture is torture, and it is wrong. It is inhumane, it is infective, and it is un-American.

That was the conclusion of the 2014 Senate Intelligence Committee report on the CIA's Detention and Interrogation Program during the Bush administration. The committee drew a definitive conclusion: Torture did not work. In fact, not only does torture not work, it makes it more difficult for other

agencies in our government to protect our national security.

Surely a person who is seeking to be the Director of the CIA in 2018 should agree with this assessment or be able to give a really good explanation of why not. Someone seeking to be the Director of the CIA should be able to state clearly that torture is wrong, but when repeatedly asked a yes-or-no question by my colleague Senator KAMALA HARRIS: Were the CIA's actions immoral, Ms. Haspel danced around the answer. These are not the answers of a person who can be trusted to administer the powerful CIA.

That question of trust goes to my second objection: The Director of the CIA will make many decisions that will be held in secret and never reviewed by the American people. It is critical we trust her judgment and that we have complete confidence in her honesty and willingness to submit to congressional oversight. I do not have that confidence in Ms. Haspel, and here is why. As we now know from the public reports, between October and December of 2002, Ms. Haspel oversaw a CIA prison in Thailand. Under her leadership, at least one detainee was waterboarded and subjected to other torture methods. As far as we know, Ms. Haspel raised no objections.

According to news reports, in 2005, Ms. Haspel recommended that the CIA destroy 92 videotapes of interrogations of detainees. CIA officials remember, at the time, Ms. Haspel was one of "the staunchest advocates inside the building for destroying the tapes"—"the staunchest advocates inside the building for destroying the tapes." She went so far as to draft the order for her boss, the Director of the National Clandestine Service, to sign, urging them to use "an industrial strength shredder," just to make sure they were completely destroyed.

Ms. Haspel destroyed these tapes despite Federal court orders requiring the preservation of the CIA's records, despite the objections of Members of Congress, and against the order of the Director of National Intelligence, the CIA Director, two White House Counsels, and senior Department of Justice officials. In a convenient coincidence for Ms. Haspel, the tapes she ordered destroyed reportedly documented the interrogation of detainees at the very same CIA prison in Thailand that Ms. Haspel previously supervised. Even more conveniently, some of the tapes reportedly documented the interrogation of the very detainee who was waterboarded under Ms. Haspel's leadership.

When Senator ANGUS KING asked about her destruction of the tapes, Ms. Haspel could come up with no credible explanation. How can we trust her to be fully forthright with Congress in the future if she cannot acknowledge missteps of the past?

Ms. Haspel had numerous opportunities to question the directives she was given during this era. According to the

Senate Intelligence Committee report, other CIA officers regularly called into question the effectiveness and safety of the techniques being used but not Gina Haspel. It was happening right before her eyes, and she did nothing to stop it. While her colleagues questioned the legitimacy of the CIA's program, according to public reports, Ms. Haspel vigorously defended it. According to those same reports, the Trump White House reviewed CIA message logs that "made it clear just how accepting she had been of since disavowed interrogation techniques."

The fact is, so far as the record indicates, the only action Ms. Haspel has taken with regard to U.S. torture practices has been to do her best to cover it up.

Why relitigate the choices that were made during those dark days after 9/11? Because this matters, especially with a President like Donald Trump. As a candidate, Donald Trump said he would "bring back a hell of a lot worse than waterboarding" because even "if it doesn't work, they deserve it anyway." As President, Donald Trump pulled back from his plan to reinstate the use of secret CIA prisons overseas only after overwhelming bipartisan outrage.

The stakes are high. The use of torture is one of the darkest chapters in our Nation's modern history. We cannot give this President any reason to drag this country back. We cannot allow any room for that mistake to occur again.

Gina Haspel has spent 33 years at the CIA. She has a decorated career and has sacrificed for this country in many ways Americans will never know. I have no doubt her current and former colleagues who praise her as a patriot are sincere, but patriotism and judgment are not the same thing. Someone who puts protecting the Agency above following the law cannot be trusted.

When announcing his opposition to Gina Haspel's nomination, Senator McCAIN recently said that "the methods we employ to keep our nation safe must be as right and just as the values we aspire to live up to and promote in the world." I agree with Senator McCAIN, and I urge my colleagues to reject her nomination.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, I rise to honor the lives of six Massachusetts police officers who lost their lives in the line of duty. On April 12, our Commonwealth suffered a terrible loss when Sergeant Sean Gannon of the Yarmouth Police Department was killed while serving an arrest warrant. He was only 32 years old.

A native of New Bedford, MA, Sergeant Gannon graduated from Bishop Stang High School in North Dartmouth and then earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from Westfield State University and a master's in emergency management from the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

After college, Sergeant Gannon jumped headfirst into public service,

first serving as a public safety officer and later becoming a police officer with the Yarmouth Police Department, where he served for 8 years. Sergeant Gannon loved working with police dogs, and he was the first full-time K-9 narcotics officer at the Yarmouth PD. His loyal patrol dog, Near-Oh, was seriously injured in the incident that claimed Sergeant Gannon's life, but he is expected to recover and return to the Gannon family.

Sergeant Gannon had a huge heart and spent his free time volunteering with Big Brothers, Big Sisters, traveling, enjoying the outdoors, and working with his hands.

Thousands of mourners, including law enforcement officials from across the country, gathered to pay their respects at Sergeant Gannon's wake—a testament to the high esteem with which his community held him and to the power of his sacrifice.

Yarmouth police chief Frank Frederickson calls Sergeant Gannon the "Tom Brady of our department" and posthumously promoted him to the rank of sergeant.

Last month, I spoke with Sergeant Gannon's wife, Dara, and his parents, Patrick and Denise, to offer my condolences, my thoughts, and my prayers, and I continue to hold them in my heart.

Next year, Sergeant Gannon's name will be added to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, recognizing law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice in service to their communities. We owe Sergeant Gannon and all of them a deep debt of gratitude. They died as heroes.

I would also like to recognize the five Massachusetts officers whose names were added to the memorial this year. Patrolman Seth A. Noyes, of the Boston Police Department, died on October 18, 1870, from injuries sustained in the line of duty. He was 41 years old. Sergeant John J. Shanahan, of the Revere Police Department, died on November 19, 1928, when he was hit by a truck while directing traffic around the scene of a car accident. He was 54 years old. Patrolman Jeremiah J. O'Connor, of the Lawrence Police Department, died on November 14, 1950, when he had a heart attack after pursuing a subject. He was 61 years old. Patrolman Frederick A. Bell, of the Newton Police Department, died on September 5, 1954, 4 months after he suffered severe injuries in a car crash. He was 39 years old. Sergeant Raymond P. Cimino, of the Chelsea Police Department, died on February 28, 1985, after suffering a heart attack. He was 44 years old.

We honor their service, we honor their sacrifice, and most importantly, we honor the lives they led and the legacies they leave behind.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this morning we will be voting on a budget resolution written by my Republican

colleague Senator RAND PAUL from Kentucky.

This is a budget that would lead to devastating cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and education, while paving the way for even more tax breaks to the top 1 percent and large, profitable corporations.

Make no mistake about it: Senator PAUL's budget is an immoral budget. It is bad economic policy. While I am confident that this resolution will be defeated in the Senate, let me be very clear.

Senator PAUL's vision of America—balancing the budget on the backs of working families, the elderly, the sick, the children, and the poor in order to make the richest people in America even richer—is the exact same vision of the Republican Party in the House and the Republican Party in Washington, DC.

So let me commend Senator PAUL for being honest with the American people in terms of what he believes and for putting down on paper what a majority of Republicans in the House and billionaire campaign contributors like the Koch brothers and Sheldon Adelson believe.

And this is what they want.

At a time of massive wealth and income inequality, Senator PAUL and the Republicans in the House do not believe that it was good enough to provide over \$1 trillion in tax breaks to the wealthiest people and most profitable corporations. The budget that we are debating today would give the wealthy and the powerful an even bigger tax break.

Last year, the congressional leadership came up with a bill to throw 32 million Americans off of health insurance. Senator PAUL and many Republicans in the House do not believe that bill went far enough. The budget we are debating today would throw up to 45 million Americans off of Medicaid.

A few months ago, President Trump proposed a budget calling for Medicare to be cut by nearly \$500 billion. Senator PAUL and a majority of Republicans do not believe those cuts went far enough. The budget we are debating today would cut Medicare by up to \$3.3 trillion over the next decade.

At a time when 10,000 people die each and every year waiting for their Social Security disability benefits to be processed, Donald Trump's budget proposed making a bad situation even worse by cutting the Social Security Disability Insurance Program.

Senator PAUL and a majority of Republicans do not believe that those cuts went far enough. The Paul budget would not only cut Social Security for the disabled, his budget would cut the entire Social Security program by \$442 billion over the next decade compared to current law.

Overall, Senator PAUL's resolution calls for slashing the budget by more than 51 percent by the end of the decade.

Not too long ago, if someone proposed ending Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid as we know it so

that billionaires could get a huge tax break, that would have been considered a radical and extreme agenda. Today it is the mainstream position of the Republican Party in Washington.

The reality is that Republicans in Washington have never believed in Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, Federal assistance in education, or providing any direct government assistance to those in need. They have always believed that tax breaks for the wealthy and the powerful would somehow miraculously trickle down to every American, despite all history and evidence to the contrary.

Needless to say, and I am only speaking for myself, I have a very different vision of America.

In my view, we need to create a government and an economy that works for all of us, not just a handful of billionaires.

What does that mean?

It means that instead of giving over a trillion dollars in tax breaks to the top 1 percent and large profitable corporations, we must demand that Wall Street, the billionaire class and large, profitable corporations start paying their fair share in taxes.

Instead of trying to abolish the estate tax, which impacts less than two-tenths of 1 percent, we must substantially increase the inheritance tax not only to bring in needed revenue, but to dismantle the oligarchs that now control so much of our economic and political lives.

Instead of making it easier for corporations to avoid paying U.S. taxes by stashing their cash in the Cayman Islands, we need to crack down on offshore tax haven abuse and use this revenue to create 15 million good-paying American jobs rebuilding our crumbling infrastructure.

Instead of cutting Social Security, we need to expand Social Security so that every American can retire with the dignity and the respect they deserve. We pay for that by making sure everyone who makes over \$250,000 a year pays the same percentage of their income into Social Security as the middle class.

Instead of cutting Medicare, we need to guarantee healthcare as a right to every man, woman, and child in America through a Medicare for all, single-payer healthcare program.

Instead of slashing Federal aid to education, we must make every public college and university in America tuition free, and we pay for that by imposing a tax on Wall Street speculation. If we could bail out Wall Street 10 years ago, we can tax Wall Street so that every American who has the desire and the ability can get a higher education regardless of their income.

Instead of listening to the Koch brothers, Sheldon Adelson, and other multibillionaire campaign contributors, it is time to start listening to the overwhelming majority of Americans who want a government and an economy that works for the many, not just the few.

Let us not only defeat the Paul resolution, but let us have the guts to take on the greed of Wall Street, the greed of the pharmaceutical and healthcare industry, the greed of Big Oil, and the greed of corporate America and break up the oligarchy that is destroying the social fabric of our society.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, shortly, we will be voting on the penny plan budget. This is a budget that cuts one penny out of every dollar.

As we have gone through time and again, we have seen that there is so much waste in government, from \$700,000 spent studying Neil Armstrong's statement on the Moon—did he say "one small step for man and one giant leap for mankind," or did he say "one small step for a man"? We spent \$700,000 trying to discover whether Neil Armstrong said "a man" or just "man." It is a complete boondoggle, a complete waste of money. But does it get better? No, because we keep giving people more money.

Some have come to the floor and said: Well, this is just an end-around attempt to cut military spending. We can't cut any military spending.

That is simply not true. The penny plan budget says nothing about cutting military spending. The penny plan budget says this: We cut 1 percent of the budgetary spending. Where it is cut in the budget is left up to the appropriations committees. It could be cut equally, or it could be cut more in some areas and less in other areas. We could cut some from military; we could cut zero from military. It is left up to the appropriators.

Some would argue: Well, it doesn't define where it would come from.

Well, that is the job of the appropriators and the job of the Senate to vote up or down on it.

To those who argue that unlimited spending for the military is good for our national security, they might want to think about whether there is a possible problem in that China has \$1 trillion worth of our debt.

Let's say for some reason there was a conflict in the South China Sea and we were somehow involved militarily there. What if China were to say: We are going to dump your dollars. We are going to dump your Treasury bills.

Could they wreak havoc, dumping \$1 trillion? Yes. Would it hurt their assets? Yes, but it could be used as a weapon against the United States.

Our insecurity is our enormous debt—\$21 trillion.

In some ways, the budget vote is symbolism, but the question is whether that symbolism will be who we are as a Republican Party or whether that symbolism will be that we are simply the same as the Democrats, that we simply don't care about the debt, we don't care that interest on the debt is the second biggest item.

After the Defense Department—about \$700 billion—the next biggest item is

\$300 billion in interest. What happens when interest rates rise? The Federal Reserve has artificially kept interest rates low. What about when interest rates go to 5 percent? Could that happen? Yes. Could it be precipitated by a foreign nation no longer buying our debt? Yes.

If interest rates were to go to 5 percent currently, I don't know that we would be able to manage our debt. That would probably be a doubling of our interest payment, or more—\$600 billion. If we do nothing and the Federal Reserve is able to keep our interest rates in the 2 percent range, interest rates will still be about the same as the Department of Defense within 10 years. The Department of Defense is about \$700 billion, and it will grow probably to \$800-and-some-odd billion, but interest rates will be \$761 billion within a decade. If that is not a threat to our national security, I don't know what is.

Really what we have is a threat to our honor as public servants who make promises to voters. We came to power in Washington because we said President Obama spent too much and borrowed too much. We said it over and over and over again until voters chose us. But what if, when we come into power, we forget who we are? When Republicans are in the minority, they are the conservative party. The problem is that when the Republicans become the majority, there is no conservative party.

What I am arguing for today is to cut one penny out of every dollar. There is waste from top to bottom in every department of government, including the military.

Defense Logistics—they build stuff. They have \$800 million they say is missing.

Defense spending or military spending in Afghanistan—\$700 million of ammunition missing. Do we think that might be a little bit worrisome given all the different characters in the Afghan civil war? There is \$700 million in ammunition that cannot be accounted for and \$28 million in uniforms that cannot be accounted for.

They built a \$45 million gas station in Afghanistan, but it is for natural gas. The first problem is that they don't have cars in Afghanistan. The second problem is that none of them run on natural gas. So how did we fix that problem? We bought them cars. We bought them cars that run on natural gas, and they still couldn't afford the gas, so we gave them credit cards. How moronic are we as a people to keep flushing money down a rat hole in Afghanistan—nearly \$50 billion.

What I am asking is that we cut 1 percent—1 penny out of every dollar.

Could we save some in the military? Absolutely. Is this done to punish the military? No. It is to make us stronger as a country. Could the military suffer a 1-percent cut and actually become more efficient? Absolutely. It is not a question of whether our military budget is too big or too small; it is a question of whether our military mission is

too large. We are at war in half a dozen countries or more. We have 6,000 troops in Africa, and I would suspect that there is not one person in 1,000 in America who knows whom we are fighting or why we are fighting in Africa.

But that is not really what this is about. It is about spending in every department of government. It is about whether one penny out of every dollar is being wasted.

People say: I am against the waste. I am against all the waste. I am against the study on Japanese quail to see if they are more sexually promiscuous on cocaine. I am against the Neal Armstrong study on whether he said one man on the Moon or just man on the Moon.

The thing is, we can't get rid of waste unless we actually reduce top-line spending because nobody has any incentive to do it.

When the sequester first came into place, even though people didn't like it, people throughout government began finding savings. You cannot get rid of waste in government if you keep giving people more money.

The National Science Foundation has wasted millions and millions of dollars over a 30-year history. William Proxmire first reported in the early 1970s, and he said that one of the first studies was \$50,000—back then, that was more money than it is now—to study why men like women. Really? That is a good use of taxpayer funds?

This year, we will spend \$1 trillion we don't have. There will be nearly a \$1 trillion deficit this year. That is what we complained about under President Obama, was big, annual \$1 trillion deficits. Are we going to be the party that is actually true to what we say we are for, that we are fiscally conservative? Can we not cut one penny out of every dollar?

So I implore my colleagues to think long and hard about this vote. Think about how the people at home would want you to vote. You have gone home and said you were for a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. The balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, which virtually all of my Republican colleagues voted for, says we will balance the budget in 5 years. Well, we are either honest and serious or we are not. So if you can vote for a balanced budget amendment that balances the budget, why would you not vote for a budget that balances in 5 years?

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. PAUL. I will finish in a few minutes.

It is a canard to say that the cut is coming from the military. The cut is a 1-percent cut. It is \$3.2 trillion spent, and it is \$32 billion that would be cut. Every year, we send \$30 billion to foreign countries that hate us. We spend nearly \$50 billion in Afghanistan every year. If we were simply looking at the

Department of Commerce—\$14 billion—and the Department of Education—\$70 billion—I think we could find \$30 billion that we would never know was gone.

The bottom line is whether the debt is threatening our national security, whether it is threatening the security of the economic foundation of our country, and I think without question it is.

This vote is a litmus test for conservatives. Are you a conservative? Do you think we could cut one penny out of every dollar? I think it is a conservative notion that we have long said we are for. Now it is time to step up to the plate and actually vote what you say you stand for.

With that, I yield back my time and ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. INHOFE. Will the Senator yield for a moment for a unanimous consent request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There does not appear to be a sufficient second at this time.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask to propound a unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask that I be recognized for 1 minute. No, I don't. I ask that I be recognized at the conclusion of this vote to explain why the Paul amendment would be damaging to our national security. That is my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, would it be appropriate at this time for me to ask for 1 minute prior to the vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. INHOFE. Thank you very much.

I know the intentions are good; we have voted on the same thing for the last 5 years. I can tell you right now what the vote result is going to be because it has been the same for the last 5 years.

No one has had a more consistently conservative record than I have, but I would have to say that this would undo a lot of what we have accomplished with the last vote to allow us to start rebuilding our systems. We got in a position where we didn't have brigade combat teams that were adequately prepared to go to battle. Sixty percent of our F-18s were not flying. We are trying to recover from all of these things. We have now started that recovery.

My concern is—and I think Senator GRAHAM said it very well—in the event that we pass this—if it did pass; it won't, but if it did—that is going to be a problem and a problem that we can't overcome.

Right now, our No. 1 concern should be defending this Nation. This is the opportunity to at least let people know that there is a legitimate vote for conservatives to vote for a strong national defense.

I don't want to send a signal to our kids overseas—our kids in battles and in harm's way—that we are not going to take care of their needs, as we just started just a year ago to do. We have to continue that.

For the sake of our national security, I suggest that we vote against the Paul proposal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed to S. Con. Res. 36.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 76, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 99 Leg.]

YEAS—21

Barrasso	Fischer	Moran
Cornyn	Flake	Paul
Crapo	Grassley	Risch
Cruz	Johnson	Rubio
Daines	Kennedy	Sasse
Enzi	Lankford	Scott
Ernst	Lee	Toomey

NAYS—76

Alexander	Hassan	Peters
Baldwin	Hatch	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Roberts
Blunt	Heller	Rounds
Boozman	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Hoeven	Schatz
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Cantwell	Inhofe	Shaheen
Capito	Isakson	Shelby
Cardin	Jones	Smith
Carper	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	King	Sullivan
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Tester
Collins	Leahy	Thune
Coons	Manchin	Tillis
Corker	Markey	Udall
Cortez Masto	McCaskill	Van Hollen
Cotton	McConnell	Warner
Donnelly	Menendez	Warren
Durbin	Merkley	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wicker
Gardner	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	Young
Graham	Nelson	
Harris	Perdue	

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Duckworth	McCain
--------	-----------	--------

The motion was rejected.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WARNER. The Senator will yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I thank the Senator, and I appreciate that very much.

I just want to make a brief statement about the vote that just took place. I tried to communicate this, and there wasn't time before the vote. Right now, we have more threats than we have ever had in the history of this country. I think we all realize that.

General Dunford said that we are losing our qualitative and quantitative advantage over our adversaries. He was talking about Russia and China, in this case. We have adversaries out there that are actually ahead of us in terms of their capabilities in artillery and other areas.

Here we are, and, quite frankly, we knew how this vote was going to come out. I have a list of the same vote that has taken place for the last 5 years, and it came out the same way it did before. The point here is that even though it wasn't going to pass, the problem is, it is sending a message to our kids who are out there in harm's way.

We look and we see that we have started our road to recovery, and it has been an exciting thing because we came so close to being in a position where one-third of our brigade combat teams didn't work. The F-35s in the field—the Marines could use less than half of them. All of these things were going on because of what has happened to our military.

Finally, we turned the corner. We turned the corner on the last vote—not the one we took today but the one we took a few months ago—and we now are rebuilding our military.

I had breakfast this morning with the Secretary of the Army and with the Chief of the Army, and really good things are happening. I can't think of anything worse than to send a message to our kids in the field that we are going to go back and undo the positive things that have pulled us up into a competitive position.

For the sake of our military, for the sake of defending America, the vote there was to vote against sending the wrong message to our kids in harm's way.

I thank Senator WARNER for yielding.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume executive session and consideration of the Haspel nomination.

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

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, I thank our friend, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Carolina.

We have gone through a lot over the last couple of years, and I appreciate the fact that in terms of timing, he is going to allow me to speak first on Gina Haspel.

Gina Haspel is among the most qualified people to be nominated for the position of the Director of the CIA. She has served with the Agency for 33 years, including tours as a Case Officer, four times as a Station Chief, the Deputy Chief of National Resources Division, the Deputy Director of the National Clandestine Service, and currently as the Deputy Director of the Agency. In many ways, her story is representative of the thousands of people at the Agency and throughout the intelligence community who serve quietly, without recognition, and often at great personal risk in order to keep our Nation safe from those who wish to do us harm.

In addition, while she has not emphasized this, we should not overlook the historic nature of Ms. Haspel's nomination as the first woman to be nominated as Director of the CIA. Seeing her portrait in the halls of the Agency next to the long line of former Directors will be a long overdue but important breakthrough for the intelligence community.

I would also note that as a Senator from Virginia, the home to thousands of CIA personnel and the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I have heard from many Agency officers—and for that matter, members of the rank and file of other intelligence community agencies—and almost to a person, the rank and file have supported her nomination.

Let me be clear. This has not been an easy decision for me. Over the past several weeks, I have held multiple meetings and calls with Ms. Haspel and many others about her record and her character. In our open hearing, I raised questions about her involvement with the rendition, detention, and interrogation program and, if she were to be confirmed, her willingness to push back if President Trump asked her to undertake any immoral or legally questionable activity. I questioned her willingness to declassify, to the extent possible, more information about her background at the Agency. I still wish more could be done to discuss her background in an open setting. The Agency just recently has declassified more information about her service with the counterterrorism center. I thank them for that but still believe it would have been preferable if we could have found a way to be even more transparent. If she is confirmed as Director, I would encourage Ms. Haspel to keep this in mind.

To those here who have concluded that Ms. Haspel's background with the RDI program should preclude her from leading the CIA, well, I respect their arguments, and I know the passion with which they put forward their position. I myself struggled with this point.

Many people at the CIA participated in the program. They were told it was legal by the Justice Department and ordered by the President, but some of the actions undertaken were repugnant and amounted to torture. Since those days, America has had a long debate about the standards that we, as a nation, can and should apply to the treatment of detainees regardless of who they might be. That is why I was one of the 17 cosponsors in the Senate of the McCain-Feinstein amendment to prohibit torture and to prohibit any interrogation techniques not authorized by the U.S. Army Field Manual. That is why I voted to both approve and to declassify the Senate Intelligence Committee's extensive study of the RDI program.

I strongly believe that we, as Americans, have a duty to look squarely at our mistakes and not to sweep them under the rug but to learn from them and, in the future, to do better. Nor do I believe that we can excuse torture or the way in which detainees—no matter who they were or what crimes they were guilty of—were treated. We are better than that, and we need a CIA Director who will ensure in an ironclad way that we will never return to those days, that we will follow the law as enacted by Congress.

This is why I pushed Ms. Haspel, both in our hearings and in our private meetings, on this very point: What is her view now of the RDI program? And how will she react if she were asked, as Director, to undertake something similar in the future? In both our one-on-one meetings and in classified sessions before the committee, I found Acting Director Haspel to be forthcoming regarding her views on that program. However, I thought it was important that she say this in public, not just privately, which is why I asked her to memorialize those comments in writing.

Gina Haspel wrote: "With the benefit of hindsight and my experience as a senior Agency leader, the enhanced interrogation program is not one the CIA should have undertaken."

I believe this is a clear statement of growth as a leader and learning from mistakes of the past. While I also wish that she would have been more forceful, I also understand her reluctance to condemn the many men and women at the Agency who thought they were doing the right thing at that time.

I first met Gina at one of her overseas postings, but I didn't really get to work with her until this last year, when the former Director appointed her to be Deputy Director of the Agency. Over the last year, I have found her to be professional and forthright with our Intelligence Committee.

I have had the ability to have candid, unfiltered discussions with her. Whether the challenge we confront is North Korea, ISIS terrorists, or the long-term challenges of countries like China and Russia, I will feel safer knowing that the CIA has Ms. Haspel at the helm.

Most importantly, I believe she is someone who can and will stand up to

the President and who will speak truth to power. If this President orders her to do something illegal or immoral, such as return to torture, she will refuse. I believe this not just because she has told me so or because she wrote it in a letter or even because she said it in front of the committee under oath; I believe it, as well, because I have heard it from people who have worked with her for years, people who know and trust her—John Brennan, Jim Clapper, Leon Panetta, Jim Mattis, and many, many others who have served Presidents of both parties. Every one of them has said that they trust her to push back on actions that might be inappropriate coming from this President.

I furthermore believe that she is someone who will push back—and push back strongly—against any attempts by this President to undercut, denigrate, or ignore the professional men and women of the CIA and their responsibility, again—first and foremost—to speak truth to power, whatever the political implications may be.

It is for these reasons that I am supporting Gina Haspel's nomination to be the Director of the CIA. I respect my colleagues who made a different decision. This is not an easy choice. I, too, have spent weeks working through it, but at the end of the day and as we vote, hopefully, later this afternoon, I believe Gina Haspel should be confirmed. I look forward to supporting her. I look forward to her being a good Director of the CIA. I look forward to her performance, convincing those who could not support her today that her long-term value to our country will make our Nation safer and that she will act in accordance with the principles and values of our country.

I yield the floor and 30 seconds to my colleague, the chairman of the committee.

I want to thank him, as well, for continuing to push not only Ms. Haspel but the Agency, the Department of Justice, and others to make sure that members of the committee and, to another extent, Members of the Senate had as much access to information as ever before with any CIA Director. I value our working relationship with the committee. Sometimes the chairman and I don't always agree, but we always deal with things in a straightforward manner.

I yield the floor to my dear friend, the chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I thank the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, and I would also reiterate what he said. This is one of the last bipartisan committees on the Hill. It should be. It is because we are entrusted with seeing things and hearing things that nobody else can and verifying that we live within the letter of the law and the Presidential directives for the rest of the 85 Members of the Senate and the American people. We take that very seriously.

I rise today in support of Gina Haspel, the President's nominee to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Ms. Haspel has been asked to lead one of our Nation's most treasured assets, an Agency that works in the shadows. It requires a leader with unwavering integrity who will ensure that the organization operates lawfully, ethically, and morally.

Gina was born in Kentucky. She was the oldest of five children. Her father was in the Air Force. She traveled from place to place. She told her dad one day that she wanted to go to West Point, only to hear her dad very gently remind her that West Point did not invite women. That did not delude her sense of service. After graduating from the University of Kentucky, Gina went on to work as a contractor with the 10th Special Forces Group. It was at Fort Devens that Gina learned about the CIA, a place where she could serve her country along with other women doing clandestine work around the world. This excited her.

In 1985 Gina swore an oath to defend the Constitution and began a 30-plus year career of service at the Agency. Since that day, Gina Haspel has developed extensive overseas experience and served as Chief of Station in several locations around the world that we can't mention. But I can tell my colleagues that every time I traveled abroad to a location where Gina was the Chief of Station, I received the most thorough brief from the most organized station that I have had the opportunity to see.

In Washington she has consistently proven herself a strong leader, rising to the role of Deputy Director of the National Clandestine Service and then Deputy Director of the entire Central Intelligence Agency. Those who saw her approach to that role say she served as a peacemaker, a general, a tough advocate for people, and a clear, steady guide for an Agency dealing with a complex web of world crisis.

I believe Ms. Haspel's experience, her dedication to service, and her judgment make her a natural fit to lead the CIA as it enters a period of profound change and uncertainty. She is, by many accounts, the most qualified person the President could have chosen to lead the CIA and the most prepared individual in the 70-year history of this Agency. She is intimately familiar with the threats facing our Nation. Where others can discuss world events, Gina Haspel has lived those events. She has no learning curve.

She has acted morally, ethically, and legally over a distinguished 30-year career. She has earned the respect of the Agency workforce, of her peers, of Republicans and Democrats, of military officers, and of civilian security leaders, evidenced by the number of letters received in support of her nomination—too numerous to read.

Gina has also the courage to speak truth to power, and she has demonstrated that courage time and again. She has a clear-eyed vision for the

Agency and its future, informed by her career and her past experiences. Previous outside leaders of the CIA have worked hard to understand the Agency they were asked to run. But when a case officer, just back from a war zone, describes to Gina the credibility of a newly recruited asset and the challenges of dodging check points to get to a meeting with a source, she knows all the right questions to ask because she has been there and she has done that.

For all these reasons, I support Gina Haspel to be the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. I am also mindful of the historic nature of Gina Haspel's nomination and what it means for those first-tour case officers and junior analysts who will join the Agency this year and in the years to come.

As I said at Ms. Haspel's nomination hearing, outside the Agency workforce, not many Americans get an opportunity to walk the halls of the old headquarters building. Those who do, after entering, encounter a series of portraits depicting former Directors of the OSS, Central Intelligence, and the Central Intelligence Agency, as its name has morphed. Some of these Directors were loved. Some were controversial. Some little understood the Agency they were asked to lead. Some made disastrous decisions out of hubris or inexperience or both. But one thing is common: All the portraits are of men.

Many want to make Gina's nomination about one small piece of the Agency's past. If that were the standard that this institution applies, John Brennan would never have been confirmed as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency because when he was at the Agency, he was fourth in command, versus Gina Haspel, who was a GS-15. Most of us, though, are looking toward the Agency's future.

Avril Haines, Meroe Park, and many others who have served or are currently serving have cracked the glass ceiling at the Agency. Gina is poised to break it. It may be impossible to measure the importance of that breakthrough, but I do know that it will send a signal to the current workforce and to the workforce of the future that a lifetime of commitment to the Agency and its mission can and will be rewarded. To those walking for hours to get to a source meeting, to those officers who stay up all night preparing for the Presidential daily brief, to those making tough calls about putting their people in harm's way to secure the intelligence we need to keep our country safe, to those who find a needle in a haystack, catch the bad guys, find the weapon shipments, and come home and walk past a wall of stars at the Agency, know that we support you and we support the job you do. You deserve a Director who understands who you are, what you do, what you can do, and what you should do. You deserve a Director who understands your sacrifice and has a clear vision for the future of

the Agency and its mission. You deserve Gina Haspel.

I ask that we in this body this afternoon confirm Gina Haspel as Director of the Central Intelligence Agency without further delay.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

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

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

AMERICA EMBASSY IN JERUSALEM

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to give thanks and celebration for the United States' Embassy established in the city of Jerusalem and for the continued safety and security of the Jewish people in Israel and across the world.

Almost exactly 70 years ago, Israel's founding father, David Ben-Gurion, brought together members of the Jewish People's Council in a Tel Aviv museum to declare the founding of the modern State of Israel. Eleven minutes later, President Harry S. Truman courageously recognized the State of Israel over the objection of many of his advisers and the State Department, and the fates of our two countries have been intertwined ever since, until this week, when the U.S. Embassy was finally moved to Jerusalem, recognizing that it is the eternal capital of the Jewish people and the undivided capital of Israel.

I was proud to have traveled to Jerusalem along with my fellow Senators for the official opening of the new Embassy. It was an incredible honor to witness history unfolding. It was a joyous moment for Israelis, for Americans, and a moment of history.

I had the opportunity to visit with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu about the incredible significance of ending the 70 years of discrimination that Israel had faced. In no other country on Earth did America have our Embassy in a city other than its capital city. It was only Israel where our Embassy was not in the capital.

I would note that for many years Presidents of both parties, Democrats and Republicans, have campaigned promising that they would move the Embassy to Jerusalem, which is the capital of the nation. Yet Presidents of both parties have failed to do so. I commend President Trump for honoring that campaign commitment and for delivering on that campaign commitment.

Moving our Embassy to Jerusalem is an acknowledgement of undeniable truth that Jerusalem is, in fact, the capital of the nation of Israel. It is where we find the supreme court. It is where we find the Prime Minister, and it is where we find the President of Israel.

It is the capital city, and now our Embassy reflects that fact. But moving

the Embassy and recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel has significance beyond that. It has significance because it sends an unmistakable message to our friends and to our enemies that the United States stands with our friends and unshakably stands alongside the nation of Israel.

There was considerable debate within the administration about whether and when to move the Embassy. That has been true in prior administrations as well—considerable debate. The principal argument against moving the Embassy has always been that the enemies of Israel will not like it. I believe that is yet another reason this was the right thing to do.

There were some who made the case that moving the Embassy would diminish the chances of peace in the Middle East. I will confess, I am skeptical that peace will be attained anytime soon. I don't believe the impediment to peace in the Middle East is the nation of Israel. Israel wants peace. It is Israeli babies who are being murdered by the terrorists.

I don't believe we will see peace in the Middle East unless and until, No. 1, the Palestinian leadership acknowledges Israel's right to exist as a Jewish state, and No. 2, they renounce terrorists. As long as the Palestinian leaders are engaging in a unity government with Hamas—an avowed terrorist organization seeking to destroy the nation of Israel and murder innocent Israelis—peace will not be had.

But what I urge President Trump and the administration is that moving the Embassy increases, I believe, the chance for peace. Why is that? Because it demonstrates that America stands strong, stands by our friends, and is not shaken, is not buffeted by global media opinion. I suggested to the administration that our Arab allies in the region would publicly denounce the move. They would have to for domestic political concerns. However, I believe that privately, those allies—the Egyptians, the Jordanians, the Saudis—would be relieved that America moved our Embassy. Why is that? Because an American President and an administration strong enough to move the Embassy and stand up to the nattering nabobs and the press might well also be a President and an administration strong enough to stand up to Iran to end the catastrophic Obama Iranian nuclear deal and to do whatever is necessary to prevent the Ayatollah Khamenei from getting nuclear weapons. Indeed, we saw that assessment was true.

I think it is quite fitting that the opening of the new Embassy occurred just days apart from the President making the historic decision to pull out of the disastrous Obama Iran nuclear deal.

We are seeing the difference between strength and weakness. If history teaches anything, it is that weakness and appeasement do not work. Instead, I think America is far better when we pursue policies of peace through strength.

We all recognize there are those who rage against the existence of the State of Israel. There are the Ayatollahs of Iran who swear "death to Israel and death to America," indeed who refer to Israel as the "Little Satan" and America as the "Great Satan" and who finance terrorism at Israel's doorstep and across the world.

There are the terrorists of Hamas who seized control of the Gaza Strip over a decade ago, after Israel had already fully withdrawn from the territory. For the last several months, Hamas has been organizing civilian mobs with terrorist cells embedded throughout to attack Israel's border and the soldiers stationed there. They call the riots the march of return in reference to what they call their right of return, which is a euphemism for having millions of descendants of Palestinians flood into Israel and destroy the modern State of Israel and its existence as a Jewish state.

Hamas timed their weeks of riots to culminate this week during what they call Nakba Day. "Nakba" means "catastrophe." It is the word they use to reference the creation of Israel. We should understand that. Every year, they denounce what Israel celebrates—the creation of the modern State of Israel. Hamas mourns the catastrophe—to use their word—that Israel even exists. But inevitably, in these battles for survival that Israel faces daily, we can count on global media elite acting as little more than propaganda arms for Hamas and other terrorists, and no week has that been more evident than this week.

I direct you to the front page of the New York Times from this week. The New York Times's headline is "Israel Kills Dozens at Gaza Border as U.S. Embassy Opens in Jerusalem." Anyone reading this headline would say: Goodness gracious. Why are the Israelis murdering people? That is what the New York Times says. One takes from the coverage, apparently, that poor, innocent, unarmed people are being shot for no reason by Israel. That is certainly what the global media elite are portraying.

What are the actual facts? You remember facts—the things that used to be reported when journalists were actually being journalists and not propagandists. Let's talk about the facts. For several weeks, we have seen riots and violent attacks at Israel's border, terrorist attacks that culminated in the attacks that led to these shootings in self-defense. The rioters used massive tire fires to create smoke to cover their attacks. They used guns. They used pipe bombs. They used Molotov cocktails. They used grenades. They used mechanical catapults to attack the border and to attack Israeli troops. They tie petrol bombs to kites, and they launched them to set fire to Israeli fields and livestock.

Let's take a look at the kites. The kites that they used are painted with swastikas. Just so you are not confused

about their motivation, there were pictures taken a couple of weeks ago of kites, of images of swastikas by the Hamas terrorists, with gasoline bombs designed to commit murder and mayhem. The Palestinians in the riots don't hide their motives or intentions. It is not that the New York Times can't figure it out; it is that they don't care.

One 23-year-old rioter said: "We are excited to storm and get inside" and that if he got across the border, he would do "whatever is possible, to kill, throw stones."

I would note that a violent terrorist attacking the border, seeking to murder people, is not a peaceful protester, as the useful idiots in the media falsely portrayed it.

Another Hamas terrorist, who was flying a swastika kite, told NPR:

This is a kite that's going to go to the Jews. . . . The Jews go crazy for Hitler when they see it. . . . This is actually what we want them to know, that we want to burn them.

Let me remind you again of the New York Times headline. The New York Times headline says "Israel Kills Dozens at Gaza Border." Kills dozens of what, of whom? Do they say terrorists? Do they say Hamas terrorists who are flying swastika kites filled with gasoline, seeking to murder Israelis, and who say: "This is actually what we want them to know, that we want to burn them"?

When hearing about brave soldiers protecting innocent civilians from terrorists seeking to murder them, a rational person would say that it is a good thing when terrorists are stopped before they can carry out their acts of terror. But the New York Times can't be bothered to include those facts. There is a message to be conveyed. For anyone lacking nuance or subtly, their message is simple: Israel, bad. Israel, bad. That is their whole subtly. Mind you, the bodies of those poor, helpless, little terrorists—well, you know, when a terrorist seeks to commit murder, we do everything possible to prevent them from doing so.

So when you read the headline, understand that this is who the New York Times is celebrating.

I ask you, why wasn't the swastika on the cover of the New York Times? Might people understand it differently if they actually showed photographs of what was happening?

One of Hamas's Facebook pages posted maps with directions to nearby Israeli communities where thousands of Israelis live within 2 miles of the border. If you look at this map—this map is posted. So you need to understand that these protesters are not just there saying: Make love, man, not war. The New York Times wants to paint them as some happy little hippies with daisies in their ears. Just give peace a chance. You know, John and Yoko were among them. Well, why is Hamas posting this map saying: If you cross the border, here is where the Israeli com-

munities are to go and murder Israelis. Here is the map. They say: If you make it across the border, here is where you can find victims and kill as many of them as possible. They are not hiding their intentions. This is not subtle. If you get across the border, your target is wherever you can find Jews to kill.

These are the terrorists the New York Times celebrates—"Kills Dozens." Why is it that the New York Times doesn't mention the maps that they have to Israeli homes to murder innocent women and children, to kill as many Jews as possible?

Here is a partial list of what happened on the border over just a few hours on Monday:

At 12:53 p.m., there were five pipe-bomb detonations.

At 12:58, another explosive device was detonated.

At 1:15, a terror cell opened fire at Israeli soldiers who caught them trying to plant bombs.

At 1:30, there was another shooting attack on Israeli soldiers.

At 1:45, there was yet another shooting attack, this time by a terrorist cell of eight using the rioters as cover, as human shields.

At 2:09, there were three more bomb detonations.

At 2:13, there was a Molotov cocktail attack.

At 2:49, another one.

At 3:10, there was yet another bomb attack, and so on and so on and so on.

That is just 2 hours. Where in the New York Times headline—and, sadly, this is emblematic of much of the global media elite who are unified in their antagonism to the State of Israel—where is any acknowledgment of pipe bombs, Molotov cocktails, shootings? How would this headline read differently if it read: "Violent Hamas Terrorists Opened Fire on Israelis Who Defend Innocent Civilians Taking the Lives of the Terrorists?" That would actually be news. That would actually be factual. That would actually be describing what happened, instead of becoming a propagandist for the terrorists.

The strategy for these riots, for these terror attacks is a win-win for Hamas. If they breach Israel's fence, then their terrorists can rush into Israeli towns and try to kidnap and kill Israeli civilians. If they fail to reach the fence; if they attack the fence and Israeli soldiers defend Israel and if they are shot, then they know the media—the useful idiots—will provide endless photographs and stories denouncing Israel: How dare you kill terrorists before they are able to murder innocent civilians.

The media has been more than happy to oblige Hamas's propaganda needs. Reporters, celebrity talking heads, and members of our political establishment have faithfully and enthusiastically parroted the Hamas line. They say the riots are the fault of the United States for moving our Embassy and that the rioters are peaceful and unarmed pro-

testers. There is a word for that; it is called a "lie." When so-called journalists repeatedly and deliberately lie in the name of propaganda, well, they shouldn't be surprised to have earned the moniker "fake news."

The Hamas talking points, which are printed by our media, are aimed at whitewashing the terrorists' genocidal hatred of Israel. In fact, these attacks are waged because Hamas refuses to accept the existence of Israel. Mind you, Gaza, they control. Israel doesn't govern Gaza; Hamas governs Gaza. This is an attack on the border of Israel seeking to murder innocent civilians.

The New York Times has been unremitted in its dishonesty. They told their tens of thousands of Facebook followers that Israel "used tear gas and gunfire to keep Palestinian protesters from crossing the border fence with Gaza, killing at least 52, according to Palestinian officials. Forty miles away, officials celebrated the U.S. Embassy's relocation to Jerusalem."

Once again, this is the New York Times pretending to report: Israel "used tear gas and gunfire to keep Palestinian protesters from crossing the border fence with Gaza, killing at least 52." These are not protesters; these are terrorists seeking to murder people.

When you call a terrorist a peaceful and unarmed protester, directly contrary to the facts, you are not engaged in journalism; you are pursuing a political agenda on the pages of the "Old Gray Lady."

Their website's headline on Monday blared: "Israel kills 58 and Injures Over 1,300 by Gunfire at Gaza border. . . . A mass attempt by Palestinians to cross the border fence quickly turned violent, as Israeli soldiers responded with rifle fire."

Gosh, where in their headlines, where in their coverage is there any mention that these are terrorists with bombs and guns and Molotov cocktails and kites carrying gasoline? Oh, no, these were just protesters who, for no reason whatsoever, those bad, bad Israelis decided to shoot. They just got up and said: Let's just shoot a bunch of people. That is what the New York Times tells us. For no reason whatsoever, they just began firing into the crowd.

By the way, if you go into the fever swamps of social media and you see the left—the New York Times knows what its propaganda does. It is not hard to find people on Twitter suggesting that for no reason, Israel just began shooting people because it is fun. Remember, their message is not complicated: Israel, bad. So if Israel is bad, then you just start shooting people because that is how you approach a Monday morning. That is the message, and it is heard by social media. It is heard by anti-Semites across the globe. It plays into vicious blood libels that go back a millennium. It just happens to be a lie. It is not an accidental misstatement; it is a deliberate, calculated, repeated lie.

Undoubtedly, tragically, some of those killed have been Palestinian civilian human shields. This is by design.

Part of what Hamas does is it uses terrorists to commit acts of terror, and then it eyes innocent Palestinians as human shields trying to get them killed because that serves their propaganda purposes. Although I will say that consistently during these riots, it has turned out that the great many of the deaths are of the actual Hamas terrorists picked off while planting bombs and attacking Israeli soldiers. If the American military had been able to shoot the terrorists on 9/11—the terrorists who flew airplanes into the World Trade Center and who flew an airplane into the Pentagon—if the military had been able to stop those terrorists and shoot those terrorists, the New York Times headline would read: “American Military Shoots Peaceful Flying Passengers.”

When you stop a terrorist seeking to commit murder, it is not shooting a peaceful protester. During past riots, Hamas has acknowledged that up to 80 percent of those killed were terrorists. This time around, already, between one-third and one-half of those killed have been identified as terrorists.

Look, this is Hamas telling us this. The people being shot are avowed terrorists. There is no dispute that Hamas is a terrorist organization. There is no dispute. This photograph depicts their wall of martyrs. These are the terrorists we have sent who were killed. Where was the word “terrorist” in the coverage?

We saw on TV images of violence on the border juxtaposed with the image of the embassy unveiling, no doubt intended to put the blame for the attempted terrorism on the United States: How dare the United States of America actually stand with Israel. How dare America open an embassy in the capital of Israel.

The blame for the violence lies with the terrorists, not America for standing with our friend.

These terrorists hated Israel, they hated Jews, and they hated America before we moved our Embassy, and their compatriots hate America, hate Israel, and hate Jews after we have moved our Embassy. Their hatred—their murderous, religious zealotry—is the cause of the murder and of the violence.

A Hamas spokesman went further on TV and said that in the last round of confrontations, if 62 people were martyred, 50 of them were Hamas, but the New York Times just said a bunch of unarmed protesters were standing there when, for no reason, Israeli soldiers began shooting them. What complete mendacity. Hamas admits these are Hamas terrorists. Yet the media does all they can to hide that.

Imagine the outrage if, when the American Embassy in Benghazi was attacked by Ansar al-Sharia in 2012, a newspaper had printed: Americans kill dozens of Libyans. By the way, that is the exact same headline the New York Times used. Yes, protesters coming to commit murder; soldiers fight back to

stop them from committing murder. Fortunately, even the New York Times didn't quite have the gall to say that, but the facts are comparable.

The blame for all of the deaths, whether terrorists or human shields, is on Hamas and Hamas alone. Any implication otherwise is nothing less than shameful support for genocidal terrorism.

In 2014, I introduced in this body bipartisan legislation, along with New York Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, a Democrat, supporting Israel's right to self-defense and condemning Hamas's barbaric tactics, specifically condemning the use of human shields as a war crime. That resolution passed the U.S. Senate unanimously, and it passed the House of Representatives unanimously. Yet we see the tactic yet again, these terrorists using human shields, using innocent Palestinians as human shields, precisely because they want them to die, because they can trust the global media to carry their message.

A few years back, when Israel faced rocket attacks from Hamas, one after the other after the other, Hamas had its headquarters in the basement of a hospital. Indeed, some years ago, I wrote an op-ed entitled “A Tale of Two Hospitals.” It says that you can tell a lot about a society about how they treat their most vulnerable, and it compared two hospitals, one, the Ziv Hospital in northern Israel, which I visited. At the time, the Ziv Hospital had provided over \$8 million in free medical care to Syrians badly wounded in the horrific civil war playing out in Syria, freely caring for their neighbors being murdered by their own head of government. The op-ed contrasted that hospital to the hospital in Gaza in whose basement Hamas had their headquarters.

Now, for Hamas, it was a win-win scenario. Option A is that Israel refrains from hitting the headquarters because it is in the basement of a hospital. That is obviously a win because then the terrorist headquarters doesn't get targeted in a military conflict. That ultimately is what happened, and the Israeli forces did not hit Hamas's headquarters.

Option 2, from Hamas's perspective, is also a win. If Israel did strike at their headquarters—a military target that was launching military attacks trying to murder Israelis—then the result would be pictures of dead bodies on CNN and in the New York Times, pictures of patients at that hospital being used as human shields. It is Hamas desiring the death of little Palestinian babies—newborns in the maternity ward—because they knew if Israel actually took out Hamas's headquarters, they could take those babies, whom Hamas had used as human shields, and they could count on the New York Times.

Can you imagine the headline in the New York Times? “Israel Bombs Babies.” It is not markedly different from

their headline, “Israel Kills Dozens at Gaza Border.” It is propaganda.

As long as Hamas has leaders who manipulate them, who lie to the Palestinian people, who lie to the world, and who use human shields in their bloody terrorist campaign against Israel, there can never be hope for peace or prosperity.

Israel has the right to defend itself, and Israel is defending itself.

I only wish that our global media had some tiny passing qualm of guilt to at least pretend to report the news, to at least pretend to tell the truth, to not function as Hamas's propaganda agents, but instead to tell the truth when Hamas terrorists say, with their Nazi swastika kite bombs: We want the Israelis to know we want them to burn. These are the facts they need to report, even if it happens to disagree with their political agenda of undermining the State of Israel.

Fortunately, regardless of the partisan bias, regardless of the propaganda that the New York Times and other global media outlets put out, America—the American people—stand and will continue to stand unshakably—unshakably—alongside our friends and allies, the people of Israel, and we have reason to celebrate.

When I was in Jerusalem just a couple of days ago, I visited with person after person—Israeli and American—who were reduced to tears. Some were Holocaust survivors. The phrase I heard more often than anything else was this: “I thought I would never live to see the day.” Well, we did live to see the day.

America's Embassy should have been in Jerusalem 70 years ago. It should have been there 60 years ago. It should have been there 50 years ago, 20 years ago, 10 years ago, 1 year ago. But, fortunately, America's Embassy is where it belongs today—in Jerusalem, the once and eternal undivided capital of Israel.

Jerusalem was the capital of Israel 3,000 years ago. Jerusalem is the capital of Israel today, and the United States Government recognizes that, and just as Harry Truman did 70 years ago, is leading the rest of the world to follow suit.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). Will the Senator withhold the request?

Mr. CRUZ. I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I thank the journalists of this country, who are not enemies of the people and who do their jobs every day, explaining complicated issues and fighting every day to do things as straightforwardly and honestly as they can. So I start with that.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. President, each year, during National Police Week, we honor our law enforcement officials and the families

who support them. They all give so much in service to their communities, and too many make the ultimate sacrifice to keep us safe.

I mention the families for a very important reason. Whether it is families of soldiers, marines, deputy sheriffs, police officers, police chiefs, or FBI agents, they share the anxiety and fears and the anxiety and concerns for their loved ones, who are so important. We always honor them too.

This year, we will add the names of 360 officers to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, including the names of 10 Ohioans. We lost six of those Ohioans years or decades ago, and their sacrifice will now be recognized on the memorial.

We pause to honor Franklin Stone, Frank Morrison, Donald Orville McLaughlin, Martin Arnold Stanton, Bradley Thomas Scott, and Samuel John Mautz.

We also honor four Ohioans who laid down their lives last year: Officer David Fahey, of the Cleveland Police Department, the city in which I live; Chief Steven DiSario, of the Kirkersville Police Department; Patrolman Marvin Moyer, of the Lancaster Police Department; and Patrolman Justin Leo, of the Girard Police Department. Each of these losses is a tragedy for a family, for a community, and for fellow police officers.

Sadly, we know already two names that will be added to the Memorial next year from Ohio: Officer Eric Joering and Officer Anthony Morelli, both of the Westerville Division of Police, a Columbus suburb. They laid down their lives in service to their communities and their country just a few months ago, in February.

We cannot begin to repay the debt we owe them and we owe their families, but we can work to support their families and their fellow officers, as they work to keep our communities safe.

This year, as part of the bipartisan spending package, we passed into law the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act to increase access to educational scholarships for the children of public service officers killed in the line of duty. Helping their children get a quality education is the least we can do for these families.

This spring I led a bipartisan group of Senators in calling for full funding of the Bulletproof Vest Partnership. Last year we were able to secure \$21 million for the partnership, which gets officers the safety equipment they need. Bulletproof vests save lives.

I hope we can soon pass the bipartisan POWER Act. I am working with my colleagues Senators PORTMAN, SCHUMER, RUBIO, MARKEY, and CAPITO.

Deadly, illegal fentanyl has become too common, especially in my State. Our local law enforcement must deal with it on a nearly daily basis. That is why we worked on together and the President signed the bipartisan INTER-DICT Act. It is why we need to build on that and give our local and State law

enforcement the same access to high-tech devices to screen for fentanyl, carfentanil, and other dangerous opioids.

On Tuesday, Ohio law enforcement gathered in my office for a demonstration showing how they can use these screening devices to enhance their ability to investigate drug crimes, while protecting themselves and the Ohioans they serve. They serve us. They protect us. We should do all we can in this body to serve them and to protect them, making a very dangerous job—jobs that police officers do every day—a little safer.

Some Ohio cities use these devices already. One officer at the demonstration, from the Twinsburg Police Department, said his office could use this equipment right now. Our law enforcement officers put their lives on the line to protect us every single day.

This National Police Week, we owe them more than gratitude. Let's do all we can to support the selfless men and women who serve our communities and our country every single day.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, in December 2012, the legendary Senator from Hawaii, Daniel Inouye, passed away. He was the longtime chairman and vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

By a twist of fate, I succeeded him in that role, and one of the most notable surprises to me was how much of the funding for the intelligence community came with that responsibility.

Together with my earlier service on the Senate Intelligence Committee, I have learned that oversight of the secret agencies of our government is one of the most challenging and important roles of Congress.

It is a difficult task. Many of the issues involved in overseeing the CIA and other agencies are highly technical. Some issues present extraordinary challenges, where the security of our Nation must be balanced with the best interests of the American people. All of these matters are blanketed by the highest degree of secrecy.

Despite all of these oversight challenges, there are issues that are simply black and white. The starkest of these issues in the last two decades was the CIA's program to torture detainees at black sites throughout the world after 9/11.

After 9/11, many Americans thought long and hard about whether to torture terrorists to gain information to stop the next catastrophic attack. Implicit in that moral question is the assumption that we would capture the right people who might have essential intelligence to save American lives.

Last week, the New York Times published an article by a Libyan woman who says she was detained at a black site in Thailand.

Her story details how she and her husband were taken by masked men to a windowless room in Thailand. When moved, she was bound to a stretcher. She was deprived of sleep. She was struck in the abdomen.

The Bush administration used the euphemism "enhanced interrogation techniques" to describe this kind of abuse. Despite their words, this was torture, plain and simple.

The Libyan woman was halfway through a pregnancy at the time. She was then sent to Libya, where she spent weeks in another prison, with a crib in the room, as though she was being mocked for being with child. Her baby was born just after her release.

Last week, the highest levels of the British Government formally apologized for its role in the detention and treatment of her and her husband. No such apology has been forthcoming from the United States.

To understand the full dimensions of the CIA's so-called enhanced interrogation techniques is a difficult task. I commend Senator FEINSTEIN and her staff for an exhaustive report, years in the making, that explains this torture program in great detail. The stress positions, the sleep deprivation, the "walling," the slapping, and the waterboarding, it is all in there, unclassified, for the public to see.

Simply informing the public about what happened is not sufficient. These sad chapters in American history cannot be closed until there is accountability.

The nominee for the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, Gina Haspel, exercised a series of leadership positions that involved the CIA's use of these torture techniques. She was in a position to do something about it, had she believed this torture was wrong.

I note that many of her current and former colleagues have endorsed her nomination. They have spoken about her capabilities and effectiveness in positive terms. I do not know how many of them have a detailed understanding of her role in the CIA's torture program.

I met with Ms. Haspel at length and read documents that detailed her role in the torture program. She stated to me that, as a CIA officer, she had been advised by all the appropriate legal authorities that she could carry out her assigned duties and remain within the law.

That may be the case, but that does not explain how a person can see an individual be subjected to waterboarding, and the excruciating feeling that they are going to drown, and not question whether that legal guidance is just. Simply labelling conduct "legal" doesn't make it right.

In fact, we now know that the Bush administration twisted the law in its infamous torture report to justify the use of torture. The Justice Department's legal analysis was informed by false information from the CIA that techniques like waterboarding helped obtain lifesaving information that was otherwise unavailable.

But the decisive issue as to this nominee is much simpler.

The destruction of videotapes of those interrogation sessions remains

an act that is impossible to justify or ignore.

The CIA has provided documents for the review of all Senators that attempt to exonerate Ms. Haspel in the destruction of those tapes.

On December 7, 2007, the day after the destruction of these tapes was first reported, I asked then-Attorney General Michael Mukasey to open a criminal investigation into the destruction of the tapes. This led to the so-called Durham investigation, led by Federal prosecutor John Durham.

Approximately 2 weeks ago, the Department of Justice for the first time provided only certain Members of the Senate with the results of that investigation, called the Durham Report. Few Senators even know that this report exists.

I am the vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, which funds the CIA, and a senior member of the Judiciary Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Justice Department. I have asked to review the Durham Report, but the Trump administration has refused.

What does this report conclude? Does it have information that was not available during other reviews? The vast majority of Senators and the American public will never know before the vote is called on this nomination.

We have seen the CIA, which is tasked with providing intelligence, take a strong stand in favor of this nomination. I do not question the right of the administration to push for their appointees. But I do question whether our intelligence community is compromising its objectivity in lobbying the public in favor of the nomination. Given the secrecy over the Durham Report, I can only wonder if we are being told just one side of the story.

I continue to believe that the best interest of our Nation, our Government, and the CIA is to make a clean break from the odious history of torture.

In my time overseeing the CIA, I know that there are many experienced professionals, both inside the intelligence community and outside of it, that are able to lead this agency with great skill and without the history of association with waterboarding.

It is impossible to consider this nomination without thinking of our friend and colleague Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

Senator MCCAIN is an American hero. He survived horrific torture as a POW in Vietnam and since then has spent almost five decades in honorable public service to the country he loves dearly.

While Gina Haspel was accommodating and covering up the torture program, Senator MCCAIN was the first prominent Republican to speak out against this program, which was created by an administration of his own political party.

I was proud to work closely with Senator MCCAIN on what has rightly become known as the McCain torture amendment, which made it clear that torture and cruel, inhuman, and de-

grading treatment are absolutely prohibited in America—no exceptions.

That amendment passed this body on an overwhelming 90-9 vote, despite a veto threat from the Bush administration.

Now, in the twilight of a great American life, Senator MCCAIN has again spoken out against an administration of his own political party, urging us to oppose this nomination because of the nominee's complicity in torture. For that principled stand, Senator MCCAIN has been subjected to crass insults by an administration that doesn't have the decency to properly and publicly apologize to the McCain family.

Ultimately, America's strength and influence abroad rests not just with its military might, but also with the power of its ideas and values, of which torture is the ultimate betrayal.

For these reasons, I oppose the nomination of Gina Haspel.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of Gina Haspel to become the next Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Ms. Haspel is an accomplished intelligence professional who will bring 33 years of experience to her new role. She has dedicated her entire life to the service of our country and has performed extraordinarily well in a number of challenging positions—often, in some of the most dangerous places in the world.

Ms. Haspel has widespread support among the national security community. More than 50 leaders signed a bipartisan letter endorsing her nomination. The list includes eight former CIA Directors and Acting CIA Directors who were appointed by both Republican and Democratic Presidents, ranging from Ronald Reagan to Barack Obama. Michael Morell, a former CIA Acting Director under President Obama, describes her as a person of “deep integrity,” and John Brennan, another former CIA Director under President Obama, said she will provide “unvarnished, apolitical, objective intelligence input to Donald Trump and others.”

At Ms. Haspel's hearing before the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I questioned Ms. Haspel regarding the enhanced interrogation program that was started after the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. I have long believed and have consistently stated that this program was completely unacceptable and that waterboarding is tantamount to torture. In fact, in 2015, I cosponsored the McCain-Feinstein amendment to the defense authorization bill to ensure that techniques such as waterboarding are never used again and that the Army Field Manual governs interrogations of detainees.

In response to my questions, Ms. Haspel, who was not a high-ranking CIA official at the time, indicated that she played no role in the creation of the interrogation program and that she wasn't even aware of its existence until

more a year after it began. Furthermore, she said that she supported the 2015 law changes and made clear that she does not believe that the CIA should be in the “interrogation business.” She testified that, under her leadership, the CIA would follow the law and would not resume enhanced interrogations and that she would not seek to repeal the law.

Moreover, in a letter to the vice chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, Senator MARK WARNER, Ms. Haspel said that she would “refuse to undertake any proposed activity” that is contrary to her moral and ethical values, CIA's mission and expertise, or the law. “The United States,” she said, “must be an example to the rest of the world” and “the enhanced interrogation program is not one the CIA should have undertaken.”

Another issue I closely examined was Ms. Haspel's role in the Agency's decision to destroy tapes involving one detainee who was subjected to enhanced interrogation. The accountability review from then-Acting Director Morell exonerated Ms. Haspel and stated conclusively that it was the CIA's then-Director of the National Clandestine Service who ordered the destruction of the tapes. As Mr. Morell, an Obama administration appointee, stated: “Ms. Haspel did not destroy the tapes, she did not oversee the destruction of the tapes, and she did not order the destruction of the tapes.”

I will conclude by saying that it speaks very well of Ms. Haspel's nomination that she was reported favorably by a bipartisan majority of members on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, earning the support of both the chairman and vice chairman. I hope that Ms. Haspel will be confirmed quickly to be the next Director of the CIA, and I look forward to working with her in this new capacity to counter the wide range of national security challenges facing our country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as the Senate moves to vote on the nomination to head the CIA, here is the bottom line. While the American people have been told that Gina Haspel likes Johnny Cash and talked to Mother Teresa, Ms. Haspel has been exercising the unprecedented power to personally censor any facts about her that might get in the way of her nomination.

When the Senate votes on a nomination when all the relevant information is, by design, kept secret, how is this any different than a coverup? I regret to have to say that the surrender of the Senate's responsibility to conduct real

oversight of this nominee means that Gina Haspel has been given a pass on all the most important and the most relevant issues.

I am going to start with three.

The first is this: What was her opinion about the CIA's torture program when it was happening?

The Washington Post newspaper reported that unnamed officials were pushing back against accusations that she has supported torture.

Now, Ms. Haspel said she learned about the program in 2002. I believe it is especially important to know what her views were later, between 2005 and 2007, when the CIA itself was winding the program down. At that time, did Ms. Haspel call for the program to be continued or expanded? I asked her that in an open intelligence meeting. She did not come close to answering that crucial question.

No. 2, what was her role in the destruction of the torture tapes? The nominee's story here is riddled with holes, and key facts have been covered up.

One matter that we know about is that her boss at the time, Mr. Jose Rodriguez, has publicly contradicted her account of the handling of the destruction of the torture tapes to a Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist.

No. 3, how can the Senate possibly take seriously Ms. Haspel's confirmation conversion on torture that was submitted on the eve of a crucial vote?

There has been a lot of reporting in the press saying that she personally played a role in the CIA torture program. The American people deserve to know whether those reports are true. Every single material question to her about them has been met with stonewalling and evasion. Instead of real responses, Ms. Haspel offered possibly the latest confirmation conversion in history, 16 years after she first learned about the torture program and only just before a vote on her confirmation.

Over and over again, I and other Senators have insisted that Ms. Haspel declassify information about her background that would not in any way compromise the safety of the American people. This is information that is directly relevant to her nomination. In the language of the Intelligence Community—I have read it—the overwhelming bulk of this information can be declassified without compromising sources and methods. Yet every single time a Senator pushed for declassification, Gina Haspel said no. Despite our repeated requests, she decided she would not allow the American people to know who she is and what she has done.

This has been—and, again, it is painful to have to say this—a stark failure of Senate oversight, and it is about as flagrant an example as I have ever seen. The Senate should have stood up to this self-serving abuse of power, but it did not.

For me, it is democracy 101 that confirmations are not supposed to take

place in secret. Nominees don't get to decide what is known about them. Yet this core principle—core principle of our democracy has just been chucked in the trash. Instead of standing up for the Constitution and for the American people, the Senate could be rewarding Gina Haspel and the CIA for this extraordinary and self-serving abuse of power.

With respect to other issues, it is important to note that the Agency—again, under the direction of Ms. Haspel—has also conducted an unprecedented influence campaign to promote her confirmation. This, too, is wrong. The CIA, like every government agency, works for the American people. It is not supposed to use its enormous power to serve the personal interests of whoever is running it. The classification rules are there for national security. They are not there for the political security of an individual. They are there to protect the dedicated women and men who undertake dangerous missions undercover. They are not there to shield a nominee for a Senate-confirmed job from scrutiny.

I and a number of my colleagues have looked at the classified information about Ms. Haspel and have concluded it can be released to the public without compromising sources and methods. We asked how she could justify keeping it secret. Her answer almost always is, that is how “we always protect our officers.”

I want people to understand what is wrong with that statement. Of course, the CIA must protect undercover CIA officers. I don't take a backseat to anybody in this Chamber for protecting those people who are undercover. In fact, I wrote a law, along with Senator Bond, our former colleague, increasing the penalty for outing people who are undercover. Gina Haspel is not undercover. She is asking the U.S. Senate to be vested with a position that would make her one of the most public and visible intelligence leaders in the world.

This is not an undercover job. It is one of the most visible national security positions, not just in our country but in the world. It ought to be accompanied by accountability, and hiding behind the protections that are rightly given undercover officers to advance her career I find absurd.

I wish to also note that her classification decisions are in violation of Executive Order No. 13526. For decades, the intelligence community has been barred from keeping information classified to prevent embarrassment or conceal violations of law or administrative error. It is pretty clear those rules are not high up on Ms. Haspel's priority list.

What I am especially worried about—I am going to go into this—is that if you can violate the classification rules to get confirmed, the Senate says: Oh, no big deal, it is going to get done again and again.

Last time I looked, most Americans believed this country needs more ac-

countability, more transparency, and less unnecessary secrecy.

Much of the attention on the nomination has been about the press reports of Ms. Haspel's role in the CIA torture program. Throughout the process, she has flatout refused to confirm or deny if she had any connection to it. How can this possibly be classified? Three years ago, the Senate Intelligence Committee released a 500-page executive summary of the torture report. The CIA released a long and detailed response. What the CIA did to all those detainees is now officially declassified. Former CIA officers have written whole books about it. How in the world can you say Ms. Haspel's reported involvement in the program is classified? You can do it because she says so, and she is the boss.

At one point, I asked Ms. Haspel whether opinions about the CIA torture program expressed by CIA officers were classified. I wasn't even asking then about anyone's involvement in the program, just what people might have thought about it. Ms. Haspel wouldn't answer that question either. She said that even the matter of whether those opinions are classified is itself classified—downright Orwellian, in my view.

In a democracy, there have to be some basic rules about what is and what isn't classified. We are seeing a replacement of those rules with essentially the whims of leaders who aren't accountable. Secret law—the classification of legal interpretations rather than sources and methods—is a serious problem, including at Ms. Haspel's CIA. Information that doesn't need to be classified to protect national security is being covered up for political purposes.

Speaking of Orwell, the classification rules themselves are going to be classified. I have been concerned about this tendency for years. I want to emphasize, I have made this clear to political leaders of both political parties, and I continue to believe that. But if the CIA and Ms. Haspel can get away with all this, the worst is yet to come.

As I have been saying since she was nominated, I have a host of concerns about all of these issues. I hope Senators will exercise independent judgment. There is a classified Intelligence Committee minority memo about Ms. Haspel, and I hope every Senator will read it and ask themselves publicly, “If the American people actually knew about all this, how would I vote?”

What I can say is, her classified comments about her background have been as troubling as her public testimony. What I can say is, when I did get unclassified responses to my questions, they certainly were not assuring. Public discussions about the CIA have generally been about overseas operations affecting foreigners. It has been decades since the public really focused on the danger that the CIA could violate the privacy of Americans, but the danger is there, and hard questions ought to be asked.

One example is section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, recently reauthorized by the Congress. The CIA has the authority, under that law, to identify foreign targets and then to search through the communications of those targets for particular Americans. The CIA can conduct these backdoor searches of Americans without a warrant. That creates a danger of reverse targeting, which is when the government, in this case the CIA, targets a foreigner to find out what an American is saying.

One way to help prevent reverse targeting is to recognize that when the government is conducting lots of backdoor searches on Americans and then sending around reports on those Americans, maybe it is the Americans whom the government is really interested in. By the way, the privacy board agrees with it, and so does the current Assistant Attorney General for National Security.

Given all that—the prospect of what it would mean for Americans—I asked Ms. Haspel about it. Again, what I got back were plenty of words but nothing that provided any assurance that the CIA has any system at all for guarding against reverse targeting of Americans under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act.

Also, the Agency collects a lot of intelligence under an Executive Order known as 12333. I wanted to know if the Agency was conducting backdoor searches on Americans through that data. The current Director of the National Security Agency told me that when the NSA conducts searches of Americans, those searches have to be approved on a case-by-case basis, with probable cause, by the Attorney General. The NSA doesn't actually have to go to court, which is a concern. But those requirements create meaningful hurdles to abuse. I thought it was important to ask about the CIA: When can the CIA conduct backdoor searches of Americans?

The response I got from Ms. Haspel is that the searches are authorized if they are designed to get information related to the CIA's activities. That means there is no standard at all on backdoor searches of Americans.

I have mentioned these two unclassified examples because they show how vague the rules are and how easily the CIA could violate the privacy of Americans. That is why it is important to have leaders at the Agency who believe in the privacy of the American people and who are committed to protecting it, protecting Americans—protecting Americans even if sometimes a lawyer says something might be technically legal. I don't believe Gina Haspel will be that kind of leader.

Before I wrap up, there are a couple of other matters with respect to the torture program. I mentioned that since the torture program has been largely declassified, it can be discussed openly. Senator MCCAIN, whom we admire so much, said last week that Ms.

Haspel's refusal to acknowledge torture's immorality is disqualifying. I am going to talk a bit more about Senator MCCAIN before I wrap up. I have always been a JOHN MCCAIN guy on a lot of issues. I came to the Senate and joined the Commerce Committee that he chaired, and I will talk a little about that, but he sure sums it up right on torture. He says: It is wrong. It harms America because of the statement it makes about American values around the world. Then he points out it is not effective.

Since the program has been largely declassified, it can be discussed openly. The CIA captured innocent people. It tortured dozens of detainees. It didn't just waterboard people. The CIA played detainees in ice water. It kept them awake for a week. It stuffed detainees in small boxes. The list goes on and on. They were always worse than how they were described to Congress or the Department of Justice.

Through it all, it seemed that the CIA and the government had not really held anybody accountable. The CIA also provided numerous false claims to the Department of Justice, to Congress, and to everybody else about torture.

Now, I have never been a big believer in confirmation conversions. My general take is that nominees will say about anything to get confirmed, but Ms. Haspel's statement with respect to torture has to be the most delayed and the most grudging confirmation conversion in history. She said she learned about the torture program in 2002. It took 16 years before she was willing to say anything critical about it.

I mentioned asking her about her views when the program was winding down. That was not something that was a debatable proposition, as it was in public source materials. The CIA was winding down the program. It was capturing fewer people and no longer using the waterboarding.

So what were her views on the program? I asked her specifically because it was in public sources. When the Agency was winding down the program, was she for continuing it or even expanding it? I asked her twice—in the hearing and in a written question. Her quote was that she was "committed." Figure out what that means. To me, that is about as clear an evasion of a very important issue as I can find.

Apropos of the present, usually nominees offer their confirmation conversions before the eve of the key vote. I had mentioned that this was awfully grudging. The Agency shouldn't have undertaken a torture program, she said, because it did damage our officers and our standing in the world.

That is true, but at no time did she ever express regret or anything that reflected that this was just plain wrong. She offered up the classic Washington, almost nonapology. She was not sorry for what the Agency did. She was just not happy with how it was perceived.

Worse still are some of the justifications for the torture program that she

is still providing. For example, she is still arguing that the program produced valuable intelligence. She says it is unknowable whether the torture techniques produced valuable intelligence.

Yet it is knowable. The intelligence that the CIA attributed to torture came from other sources. When the committee looked at the CIA's own records, it found that key intelligence was provided by detainees before the CIA engaged in the torture. It is these kinds of documented facts that have made Ms. Haspel's statements so troubling.

Why are her equivocations about the effectiveness of torture so important? I think we all remember the campaign in the fall of 2016, when then-Candidate Trump said: "Torture works." It seems to me that it is not in America's interest to have a CIA Director who responds with: Well, there are a lot of aspects to the issue, and I am not happy about how the Agency was perceived in terms of what it did.

With regard to JOHN MCCAIN, like a lot of Senators, I am thinking now about some of the big battles and tough fights that we had a chance to work on together. I became Oregon's first new Senator in almost 30 years. Oregon has always been about wood products, and it always will be. I said I would go to the Senate and fight like crazy to get more jobs to those rural areas and try to get Oregon and our country into some new fields.

It is not generally known, but in those days, JOHN MCCAIN had just become the chairman of the Commerce Committee.

I went to him, and I asked: Mr. Chairman, why don't you and Chairman LEAHY, who has been a stalwart on these issues, lead an effort to try to write the rules of the road for the internet?

By and large, there were not any.

He kind of smiled at me—that quintessential JOHN MCCAIN smile—and basically said: Why don't you go out and figure out how to do it, and we will have a hell of a good time in making the case.

Under JOHN MCCAIN's leadership, what we did was to, in fact, write the rules of the road for 10,000 taxing jurisdictions in America. As a result of those early days, you can't discriminate against electronic commerce, which would have clobbered the internet with thousands of discriminatory decisions. There were digital signatures. We wrote the regulatory rules for social media that are often cited as creating \$1 trillion worth of wealth in the private economy.

To a great extent, JOHN MCCAIN brought his typical passion to those new areas that he would be the first to say he didn't know everything about, but he said: Hey, look, we ought to do something that is in America's interest.

We didn't care about Democrats, and we didn't care about Republicans.

As Senators proceed to this vote in a half hour—a historic vote, in my opinion—I hope they will reflect on what JOHN MCCAIN has had to say about torture. He has said Ms. Haspel's refusal to acknowledge torture's immorality is disqualifying. JOHN MCCAIN has urged the Senate to reject her nomination.

JOHN MCCAIN has been a towering authority on this issue and has been a guiding light for the Senate on national security policy. I also just mentioned something I don't think anybody knew, which is about writing the rules of the road for the internet.

It is my hope that JOHN MCCAIN's powerful and unimpeachable views on the issue of torture and this nominee will continue to be heard today and well into the future. There is no greater voice on this subject than JOHN MCCAIN's.

I want him to know how grateful I am for his leadership on this and how, in the days ahead, I look forward to, hopefully, being able to tell my grandchildren what a man of stature and public service really brought to the Senate. I hope Senators will reflect on that before they vote.

Throughout this nomination process, there were not a whole lot of topics that were declassified. So I am just going to share a story about Ms. Haspel and the destruction of the videotapes.

There is important information in the report by U.S. Attorney John Durham that most Senators were not allowed to see. Like everything else about her career, the information that reflects poorly on Ms. Haspel gets covered up, but we did learn some things about Ms. Haspel and the destruction of the torture videotapes. For one, she wrote the cable that authorized the destruction. Second, she was an advocate for destroying the tapes and was involved in what former Acting Director Mike Morell called "efforts to press for and facilitate a resolution of the matter." That is a lot more than drafting a cable.

Especially problematic for Ms. Haspel and her boss, Jose Rodriguez, is that there were reservations or there was even outright opposition from the White House, the head of national intelligence, the CIA, and the Congress to the destruction of the tapes. So Mr. Rodriguez decided to go it alone and sent the cable Ms. Haspel had drafted without telling the lawyers, the CIA Director, or anyone else.

Here is where Ms. Haspel's story about the destruction of the tapes really runs into trouble. Jose Rodriguez, her boss, gave an interview in which he told Ms. Haspel in advance that he was planning on sending the cable without seeking authorization. So I asked her about that story. She denied it. I don't know who is telling the truth. Yet here we are, voting on this nominee without our having this direct contradiction in any way resolved.

Then there is the question of what happened after the cable was sent but before the tapes were actually de-

stroyed. Ms. Haspel has said that she was at her desk and could see her computer screen. So it was shortly after the cable was sent that she became aware of it. She said it was at that point that she walked over to discuss it with Mr. Rodriguez.

So what did she do? She knew that the destruction of evidence had been ordered over everyone's objections. Did she intervene to stop the destruction before it happened? Did she tell the lawyers in time for them to intervene? Did she tell the White House? Did she tell the head of national intelligence? Did she just let it happen?

These are central questions because they tell us what kind of leader Ms. Haspel is. In order to get confirmed, she has made all kinds of promises about standing up for what is right and rejecting inappropriate orders. But what did she do when she knew an order had been sent to destroy evidence over the objections of lawyers and everybody else? There is no record of her doing anything to stop it.

I offer this small window into her background because, I think, we all ought to be asking how might she react when confronted with an illegal, immoral, or inappropriate direction.

I mentioned what the President said earlier in the campaign—that he would bring back a hell of a lot worse than waterboarding. He has praised Ms. Haspel for being tough on terror. You don't have to be Picasso to connect the dots about what the dangers are here. Other than a few belated promises that were made to get confirmed, what evidence is there, actually, to suggest that Ms. Haspel would really push back?

I close, simply, with this. I have an enormous amount of respect for the good work being done by those at the CIA. The nature of the secret, risk-taking work that they do is an extraordinary service to the American people. My concern is that when something goes off the rails, it is going to be because of a variety of scenarios that will not have a lot to do with their good work. For example, it could be because there is a CIA Director who sees every lawyer's approval as a green light and every lawyer's warning as an annoyance. It could be because CIA leadership decides to hide from public scrutiny information that need not be classified.

My concerns about Ms. Haspel are not a matter of history. I have concerns about what she is saying today, both about her background and about current programs. I am concerned that after we have heard from JOHN MCCAIN and each of us has reflected, as I have briefly, on our extraordinary experiences with this unique public servant, we will still have to make a judgment here. I hope that colleagues, when they vote in a little bit, will recognize that there is much more that the full Senate and the American people have a right to know. I believe that if they did, they would join Senator MCCAIN and me in opposing this nomination.

I regret to have to say, as I did in the beginning, that I believe the Senate has surrendered its responsibility to do real oversight here. This process has been a disservice to our constitutional duty. I believe the American people deserve to know more than that Gina Haspel likes Johnny Cash while she is simultaneously exercising the power to censor the facts about her background. I urge colleagues to reject this nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency is not as old an office as some others in the President's Cabinet, but it is no less important. The Director's job is to provide the critical information on which the President's national security decisions are based. For this reason, Presidents of both parties have chosen seasoned statesmen to serve this post, men like Allen Dulles, George H.W. Bush, Bob Gates, and Mike Pompeo. Out of respect for the CIA's integrity and professionalism, they often kept in office Directors who had been appointed by their predecessors. That is because partisanship has no place at the CIA.

The national interest must be uppermost in our minds, which is why I will be voting to confirm Gina Haspel as our next CIA Director. Secretary Pompeo left the Agency in good shape, and Ms. Haspel was his very capable Deputy. Moreover, few people have contributed as much to the CIA's recent successes as Ms. Haspel. She has 33 years of experience working for the Agency, serving first on the frontlines of the Cold War and later on the frontlines of the War on Terror. If confirmed, she would also be the first woman to lead the Agency.

Given her many accomplishments, her diligence, dedication, and her fierce love of country, I am astonished and disappointed at the controversy over the nomination of this great American. After all, Ms. Haspel is a career professional whose record of achievement speaks for itself.

She joined the Agency in 1985, working as a case officer for several years in both Africa and Europe. Over time, she rose up the ranks, serving first as Chief of Staff and then as Deputy Director of the Directorate of Operations. She served as Chief of Station—the officer responsible for overseeing all of the CIA's work in a foreign country—four different times.

Having served under six different Presidents from both parties, Ms. Haspel has never been a partisan. She is a professional whose many years of work command respect throughout the CIA. She has never avoided controversy to protect her own career.

Time and again, Ms. Haspel sought out danger. She raised her right hand and volunteered for some of the Agency's most dangerous assignments.

It was on September 11, 2001, after seeing the first plane hit the World

Trade Center on television, that she walked into the CIA's Counterterrorism Center and said: Put me on the job. She didn't have to do that. As she said, she could have hidden out on the Swiss desk, but she didn't. She took on what she knew would be a tough and controversial job. That is the kind of woman Gina Haspel is.

It is true that because of her willingness to take on a tough job, she was present for some of the most difficult decisions about how to protect America in the days after 9/11. Yes, she was around when the Agency was responsible for the detention and interrogation of notorious terrorists, but there has been so much misinformation spread about what she did that I want to set the record straight.

Ms. Haspel didn't start this program. She didn't even know it existed until a year after it began. In fact, NANCY PELOSI learned about this program before Gina Haspel did.

She did not "cheerlead" the program, as some Senators have wrongly claimed based on a book—the author of which later issued a correction on this very point.

Other Senators claim they are worried about the message that would be sent by confirming Ms. Haspel. I confess, I am amazed that these Democrats say they can't in good conscience vote on the confirmation of Ms. Haspel, who was a midlevel employee when the program was active, yet they voted in 2013 to confirm John Brennan, who was the No. 4 ranking official at that time.

While I am at it, let me also say that she did not destroy any tapes of those interrogations; she simply wrote the draft cable for her boss, the Director of Operations, which authorized their destruction. He released the cable, he has acknowledged, without her advance knowledge. In fact, the former Acting Director of the CIA, Mike Morrell, later conducted an investigation and cleared Ms. Haspel of any wrongdoing, and the special counsel who reviewed the matter closed the case without filing any charges.

Would holding her responsible for drafting a cable at her boss's direction make any more sense than holding Senate staffers responsible for the boring speeches their bosses give on the Senate floor?

Yes, I know there are political officials in the government who had expressed reservations about destroying those tapes, but no lawyer at any time, anywhere in the government, said there was a legal prohibition against their destruction. Moreover, there is a clear, written record of those very events.

On these matters, it is not enough to express reservations. CIA officers in the field deserve a clear answer, yes or no.

If anyone was to blame, it wasn't Ms. Haspel or her boss; it was politicians who didn't want to take the heat for a controversial decision either way.

So what is really at issue here? What message will we send if we reject her

nomination? Not that we oppose torture. That is silly. We all oppose torture. The United States does not torture, and it has never tortured, despite overwrought claims to the contrary.

In fact, I would ask what message we will be sending to the men and women of the CIA if we don't confirm her or, for that matter, what message the overwhelming Democratic opposition to her nomination sends them. Does anyone doubt that if President Obama or a President Hillary Clinton had nominated Ms. Haspel, she would easily have received 80 or 90 votes?

The message, I would submit, is this: Be careful. If you participate in a program that the Commander in Chief has approved, that the Congress has been fully briefed on, that the Attorney General has legally authorized, and that the CIA Director supports, you still may land in the dock when a new President comes along with new lawyers. So maybe it is better to hide out at the Swiss desk.

That is a recipe for a timid, hesitant intelligence community, and that is a risk to us all.

I can tell you, Gina Haspel's skill and expertise are widely known and respected on both sides of the aisle. President Obama's former CIA Director, Leon Panetta, said that he was glad the President nominated Ms. Haspel because she "knows the CIA inside-out." Another one of President Obama's CIA Directors, John Brennan, said that Ms. Haspel "has the experience—the breadth and depth—on intelligence issues." And former CIA Director Michael Hayden, who served under both Presidents Bill Clinton and George W. Bush, has called Gina Haspel a "great choice" and "highly regarded." These are just three of more than 50 former national security officials who signed a letter to the Senate Intelligence Committee supporting her nomination.

As a member of that committee, I worked with Gina Haspel during her time overseas and as Deputy CIA Director, and I can attest to her professionalism, her work ethic and, most important, her character. This is a skilled, brave, patriotic woman who will serve our country with distinction in this most critical post. Her dedication to our country throughout her life is complete, and that is why I will be proud to cast my vote for the confirmation of Gina Haspel, and I urge all Senators to do the same.

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate Intelligence Committee voted Gina Haspel's nomination out fa-

vorably by a vote of 10 to 5. It was a strong bipartisan vote. Of course, in just a few minutes, we will vote on her confirmation.

Last week, during her confirmation hearing, she said repeatedly what those of us who had supported her for weeks already knew: She believes that U.S. Government actions must be held to a strict moral standard. If confirmed, she would not obey an order she believed to be unlawful, and in her new role, she pledged not to restart the interrogation programs inside the CIA. Of course, that could not happen without consultation and approval of Congress because the standard has literally changed since the immediate post-9/11 era.

Based on her testimony, her record of service, and her exemplary character, it is clear that the only real option for the Intelligence Committee was to report her out favorably.

Our colleagues on the other side who have objected to this nomination have an opportunity to join a couple of their Members who have already come on over and acknowledged that she is the best qualified nominee in the Agency's history.

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Virginia and vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, Mr. WARNER, voted yesterday on Ms. Haspel's behalf. He praised her as an independent voice and found it noteworthy that she would be the first operations officer in more than five decades to lead the Agency.

Generally speaking, you have analysts and you have the case officers who actually handle the cases and do the important intelligence-gathering work from a human intelligence perspective at the Agency, and that is the work she has been involved in for more than 30 years. She would be the first officer in more than five decades to have that sort of experience and the credibility that goes along with it.

The senior Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, is joined by the senior Senator from West Virginia, Mr. MANCHIN, who also sits on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, as well as the junior Senator from North Dakota and others. In other words, there are a number of Democrats now who have decided that it is not in the Nation's best interest to oppose President Trump's nominees just because they happen to be President Trump's nominees.

Now I want to talk about some of the stated objections and why I don't believe they hold any water, but I am glad for this movement in the right direction, which will allow us to confirm her today.

I appreciate all of our colleagues carefully examining Ms. Haspel's records. A number of people I have talked to about the nomination said they wanted to do their due diligence. Well, that is our job, and I don't believe any nominee should be rubberstamped. I know they have reviewed her record, and they have met

with her in person and drawn the only reasonable conclusion, I believe, which is that she is well qualified; that she loves the CIA, where she has worked for more than three decades; and that she will provide the Agency's objective, unbiased, and unvarnished intelligence to the President and other policymakers in the Federal Government.

Her loyalty, of course, is not to a political party, after all, because she is nonpartisan, but she owes her loyalty to the American people, whose safety and security she has made her life's work.

Comparisons have rightfully been drawn between the upcoming confirmation vote for Ms. Haspel and the 2013 confirmation vote of John Brennan, former Director of the CIA under President Obama. The vast majority of Democrats had no problem voting for Mr. Brennan, and so I believe they should have no problem voting for Ms. Haspel because, first of all, Mr. Brennan supports her. Of course, he was the No. 4 person at the CIA during this period post-9/11 when the rendition, detention, and interrogation programs were carried out in full compliance with then-stated law from the highest legal authority available, the Office of Legal Counsel. We have also seen others in the Obama administration support Ms. Haspel as well.

I have said it before, and I will say it again: Those people who know Ms. Haspel best, who have worked alongside of her on a daily basis in undisclosed locations around the world, doing the Nation's important work, like this woman, admire her, respect her, and think she is the best of the best.

I speak for many when I say that we appreciate Ms. Haspel's willingness and desire to serve in this new and never-easy capacity. I hope we can confirm her in short order so she can get back to work and continue to do the work that she loves and that our Nation needs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the Senate has often been called the world's greatest deliberative body, where we can thoroughly and respectfully debate weighty matters, regardless of pressures imposed by any given moment. While we do not always live up to this ideal, it is one for which we should always strive. The Constitution entrusts us with the task of serving as a check against the executive branch, providing our advice and—if appropriate—our consent to the Executive's nominees to lead our government's most critical agencies. During my time here, at its best, the Senate can be and actually should be the conscience of the Nation.

So as we move to vote on the nomination of Gina Haspel, with very little debate and gaping holes in her record, I fear the Senate is failing to fulfill its basic duty to provide advice and informed consent to her nomination. Re-

member, we are supposed to advise and consent, and worse yet, we are failing in our duty to serve as the Nation's conscience.

Now much of what is publicly known about Ms. Haspel's role in the CIA is disturbing. To begin with—and I have listened to Senators on both sides—I do not question Ms. Haspel's commitment to our country or to our national security that, I think, she has established. But what I question is her judgment and her fidelity to a core value of our Nation: that all people have certain inalienable rights. Underlying these inalienable rights is our belief in the basic dignity of human beings, a dignity that is incompatible with inhumane practices like torture. Torture should never be part of America's way of leading the world.

During the height of the CIA's torture program, Ms. Haspel ran one of the Agency's most notorious "black sites" in Thailand. There, under her leadership, brutal torture techniques were employed. From available accounts, according to that which has been made public, this included waterboarding detainees, slamming them against walls, and confining them in coffin-shaped boxes for extended periods of time.

At the time, there was a benign euphemism for this treatment. It was called "enhanced interrogation techniques." But we know better. This wasn't "enhanced interrogation techniques." This was government-sanctioned torture, pure and simple. Torture is immoral. Torture is inhumane. Frankly, torture is un-American. I agree with our colleague Senator JOHN MCCAIN—he is one who speaks with a distinct moral clarity on this issue—that Ms. Haspel's refusal to condemn torture as immoral is disqualifying. For that reason alone, I cannot, in good conscience, support her nomination.

But it is worse than that. Ms. Haspel also reportedly advocated for destroying the videotapes of these torture sessions—now, that was against the advice of the CIA's own lawyers. More than that, it was in contravention of a Federal judicial order requiring that they be preserved. The CIA's former general counsel said Ms. Haspel was one of the "staunchest advocates . . . for destroying the tapes." Notwithstanding the advice of the CIA's lawyer, notwithstanding the federal judicial order, she claimed that destroying the tapes was necessary to protect the security of CIA officers conducting these interrogations.

But that explanation withers under even the slightest scrutiny. If that were really the concern, then the CIA could easily have copied the tapes with the officers' faces blacked out and only then destroyed the originals. All of us are used to seeing news items with the faces of certain witnesses and others blacked out. Nor do we have access to the only independent account of Ms. Haspel's role in the destruction of the

tapes—the Justice Department's Durham Report. I joined nine Senators on the Judiciary Committee in a request for access to the Durham Report, but our request has not been accommodated. As a result, we will not know the full story of the tapes' destruction before we are asked to vote on Ms. Haspel's nomination today.

This is just what we know through public reports. There is much more the American people don't know about Ms. Haspel's actions because it remains classified. The American people have been kept in the dark in part because Ms. Haspel herself has been responsible for what information about her record is declassified. It is a brazen conflict of interest that Ms. Haspel can decide what to release and what to conceal about her past. The CIA has declassified glowing facts about Ms. Haspel's work with Mother Teresa, but refuses to disclose basic information that would shed light on her past actions and what values would guide her as CIA director. This process has been reduced to a farce.

I have reviewed classified materials on Ms. Haspel's long career at the CIA, and I find these materials to be deeply disturbing. I am not able to discuss any of the details revealed in these materials, again, because Ms. Haspel has decided to keep them cloaked by classification. Candidly, I do not believe a Senator can provide his or her informed consent to this nominee without first reviewing these materials.

Now, I recognize, and I must say I appreciate, that Ms. Haspel has committed to not allowing the CIA to resurrect the use of torture if she is confirmed. I also recognize that that commitment, while commendable, is not optional. Torture is illegal; that is simply what the law demands.

But what about the next immoral action that this President might ask her to commit? Should we trust that she will have the moral compass to stand up and say "no"? Based on what we have seen, I do not.

The world is watching closely today. Our allies and our enemies—and our own future generations—will view this vote as nothing less than a referendum on torture. If the Senate—this body that I cherish—gives its blessing to a nominee who is synonymous with the CIA's interrogation program, then the demons of our past—from Abu Ghraib to the CIA's black sites—may haunt us anew.

I do not believe that this blight on our history represents who we are or what we stand for. I really do not believe that this is the soul of America. But it is a terrible mistake. I believe we must clearly demonstrate that we are capable of learning from and moving beyond our darker chapters as a nation. If we make a mistake, we should admit it and take steps not to have it happen again. For that reason, I will vote no on Ms. Haspel's nomination.

Mr. President, I do not see another Senator seeking recognition.

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

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

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today—

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber.

The Sergeant at Arms will restore order in the Chamber.

(Disturbance in the Visitors' Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will restore order in the Chamber.

The Senator from Arizona.

ZTE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today disturbed by the President's recent decision to consider easing penalties placed on the Chinese telecommunications company ZTE.

Looking at ZTE's history of deception and dishonest business practices, it is deeply troubling to see these penalties cast aside so carelessly in pursuit of what appears to be a type of chaotic diplomatic improvisation that has become standard operating procedure with the administration.

Let me briefly outline ZTE's past actions in order to refresh everyone's memory on how the company came to face such serious punitive measures.

In 2016, the U.S. Department of Commerce concluded an exhaustive investigation, finding that ZTE had knowingly sold products made with American technology to Iran, North Korea, and other countries banned from receiving such technologies. ZTE violated these sanctions and engaged in a deliberate attempt to cover it up.

Once ZTE's deception was uncovered, the Obama administration announced imminent implementation of export restrictions that would deprive ZTE of American technology crucial to the manufacturing of its products.

The threat of sanctions brought ZTE to agree to settle the matter, and one year later, ZTE signed a settlement, which included more than \$1 billion in fines, the creation of audit and compliance requirements to avoid future violations, and a promise to punish those individuals involved in past violations.

Last month, after ZTE was found to have violated the terms of the settlement and to have then sought to deceive the U.S. Government about those violations, the Commerce Department announced a 7-year ban on the export of U.S. components to ZTE.

In essence, ZTE has repeatedly engaged in malign activity by deliberately misleading the government for years, all while attempting to deliver American technologies into the hands of State sponsors of terrorism. The in-

stinct to punish ZTE for this behavior was the right one.

So it was puzzling to hear, as we did this past Sunday, that the President instructed the Commerce Department to find a way to ease that punishment. First the President tweeted that the restrictions needed to be eased because they would cost China too many jobs.

It now appears that this concession is part of a deal that, if reached, would have the Chinese Government agree to remove tariffs on U.S. agricultural products. It must be noted that these are the same tariffs that China levied in retaliation for the steel and aluminum tariffs announced, and now being haphazardly applied, by this administration.

Make no mistake, what we are witnessing here is a nascent trade war—tariffs leading to tariffs leading to ill-advised concessions, haphazard exemptions, and so on and so on. Meanwhile, businesses suffer from increased uncertainty, our national security is threatened, and international allies find themselves dealing with an American foreign policy characterized only by chaos and unpredictability.

Punitive measures like sanctions work only when they are consistently executed. How is any other nation meant to take threats of U.S. sanctions seriously when we enforce them some of the time and toss them aside other times when we feel like it? What does such unpredictability say to our allies about our ability to lead on global issues and our reliability as a partner in the future?

We are making a mockery of the rules-based international order that we helped establish. Our foreign policy, whether it relates to trade or security, must be characterized by stability and predictability, not confusion and chaos.

We are at our best when our allies and our adversaries know where we stand. Let us return to that standard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Haspel nomination occur at this time; further, that if cloture is invoked, all postcloture time be yielded back and the Senate immediately vote on the nomination; and 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. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, James Lankford, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, John Hoeven, David Perdue, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E. Risch, John Thune, Todd Young, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Gina Haspel, of Kentucky, to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) would have voted "yea."

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 100 Ex.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—2

McCain Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

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

Mr. ROUNDS. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Ex.]

YEAS—54

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—1

McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 608.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2017.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Dana Baiocco, of Ohio, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2017.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Roy Blunt, Ron Johnson, Mike Rounds, Lindsey Graham, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E. Risch, John Thune, Todd Young, John Hoeven, Cory Gardner, David Perdue.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

VETERANS CEMETERY BENEFIT CORRECTION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany S. 2372.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 2372.

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

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 2372) entitled "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 2372.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to concur in the House amendment to S. 2372, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, John Cornyn, Richard Burr, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Jerry Moran, Joni Ernst, David Perdue, Roy Blunt, John Hoeven, Bill Cassidy, Dan Sullivan.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2246

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 2372, with a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to concur in the House amendment to S. 2372 with an amendment numbered 2246.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.
"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2247 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2246

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2247 to amendment No. 2246.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2248

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to refer the House message on S. 2372 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message to accompany S. 2372 to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2248.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.
 "This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2249

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2249 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "3 days" and insert "4 days"

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2250 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2249

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2250 to amendment No. 2249.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "4" and insert "5"

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 670.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be Chairperson of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of five years.

Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, Michael B. Enzi, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds, Richard Burr, John Cornyn, Tim Scott, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 672.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jelena McWilliams, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for a term of six years.

Mike Crapo, John Thune, Pat Roberts, David Perdue, Michael B. Enzi, Lamar Alexander, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, Tim Scott, James M. Inhofe, John Hoeven, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 618.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of James Randolph Evans, of Georgia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Luxembourg.

Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, John Thune, Roy Blunt, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner, Lindsey Graham, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Todd Young, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

VETERANS CEMETERY BENEFIT CORRECTION ACT—Continued

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls with respect to the cloture motions filed in executive session today be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, as we observe National Police Week, I rise today to honor our fallen law enforcement officers and to discuss some of the ways we are working to make it safer for officers to do their jobs and protect our communities.

Together, we honor and remember the lives of the law enforcement officers we have lost in the line of duty. These men and women put their lives on the line to protect our neighborhoods so that a Hoosier senior can safely sit on his porch and watch his grandkids play in the front yard or to ensure that working families can go to and from their jobs in peace. They are on the frontlines battling the devastating opioid epidemic that has plagued our State. Our police are the ones who work with our communities and local leaders to help stem violence and to help fight crime in our neighborhoods. They are the ones putting themselves in harm's way every single day.

These officers are heroes. To their families, they are even more. They are moms and dads, sisters and brothers, wives and husbands, and their families pray that they come home safely at the end of every shift. Sadly, as we know, that doesn't happen every time.

When we lose an officer, that loss is felt deeply, particularly by their family and those who know them and love them. It is a grief that is also shared throughout the entire law enforcement community and throughout our State.

Since I began serving in the U.S. Senate in 2013, the Hoosier State has lost nine officers in the line of duty. I want to take a moment to pay tribute to these fallen heroes.

In September of 2013, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department officer Rod Bradway was shot and killed while responding to a domestic dispute call in a northwest Indianapolis apartment complex. A veteran officer, he had served with the Wayne Township Fire Department for 10 years before working for 5 years on the IMPD force. Officer Bradway is credited with saving the life of a domestic dispute victim and her baby before losing his life protecting them.

In June 2014, Tipton County deputy sheriff Jacob Calvin was killed in a car crash while responding to an accident. Deputy Calvin served his community and our country in more ways than one. He was with the department for 2½ years and had previously served his country in Iraq in the U.S. Air Force and volunteered at the Kempton Fire Department as a firefighter and EMT.

In July 2014, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Department officer Perry Renn was responding to reports of gunfire when he was shot and killed. Officer Renn served more than two decades in the force. He was a two-time recipient of the IMPD's Medal of Bravery Award, and he was awarded the Medal of Honor and Purple Heart posthumously. Officer Renn was also a U.S. Army veteran.

Also, in July of 2014, Patrolman Jeffrey Westerfield of the Gary Police Department was found fatally shot while on duty in his patrol car. He was killed on his 47th birthday. Patrolman Westerfield had served the Gary Police Department for 19 years and, prior to that, in the U.S. Army.

In September of 2014, Merrillville Police Department patrolman Nickolaus Schultz was shot when investigating reports concerning an evicted tenant. Patrolman Schultz passed away 2 days later due to his wounds. Patrolman Schultz was only 24 years old and had been on the Merrillville police force for 13 months.

In March of 2016, we lost Howard County sheriff's deputy Carl Koontz, who was shot and killed while serving arrest and search warrants in Russiaville in connection with a narcotics case. Deputy Koontz was just 26 years old. He had served more than 2 years with the Howard County Sheriff's Department.

In July of 2017, Lieutenant Aaron Allen of the Southport Police Department was shot while responding to a crash involving an overturned vehicle. Hours before he was killed—and there is a picture of this which tears your heart out—he walked his 5-year-old son to the bus for his first day of kindergarten. He was a 6-year veteran with the Southport Police Department and had previously been named the Officer of the Year for saving two Hoosiers' lives. He also previously served in the U.S. Air Force.

Tragically, this year we have lost two Hoosier police officers in the line of duty. Boone County deputy sheriff Jacob Pickett was shot and killed in March during a vehicle pursuit in Lebanon, IN. As the suspect fled on foot, Deputy Pickett and Brick, his K-9 partner, followed in pursuit. Deputy Pickett was shot as he rounded the corner of a building. He served with the Boone County Sheriff's Office for 3 years and previously with the Tipton County Sheriff's Office and the Marion County Sheriff's Office.

Earlier this month, just a few weeks ago, Terra Haute police officer Rob Pitts was shot and killed while investigating a homicide. As Officer Pitts and other detectives approached the suspect's apartment, the suspect opened fire, fatally injuring Officer Pitts. Officer Pitts had served with the department for 16 years and with the Sullivan Police Department for 6 years prior to that.

These nine brave officers embodied values that should make their loved ones, their fellow officers, and every Hoosier incredibly proud. We remember their sacrifice and their courageous service, and we are thinking of their families, not only today, not only this week, but year round.

As we pay our respects to those we have lost, we also have a solemn duty to support the family members of those officers who never had the chance to return home. We also must work to ensure that our officers and law enforcement agencies have the resources needed to do their jobs and keep our communities safe. Over the last few years, I have been honored to introduce and to get signed into law bipartisan legislation to help support law enforcement agencies and officers and to help with

grant efforts to provide our officers with necessary tools.

When officers and first responders are killed in the line of duty, they often leave behind beloved families, including school-age children. These families and children endure grief and trauma that we can't even begin to imagine. We must do all we can to help the families of our fallen officers and first responders, and this includes ensuring that their children get a good education. That is why I helped to introduce the bipartisan Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act. This allows the children of fallen first responders who pursue a college education to have access to the maximum level of Federal Pell grants authorized by law.

I was pleased to support the government funding bill that passed in March, which included a provision based on the Children of Fallen Heroes Scholarship Act.

Another critically important area we must continue to focus on is helping to equip officers with lifesaving equipment. It is no secret that our officers may face dangerous situations at any moment as they respond to calls and do their job. That is why I supported the bipartisan Bulletproof Vest Partnership Grant Program Reauthorization Act. It was signed into law in May of 2016. It helps law enforcement agencies purchase bulletproof vests. Having those vests can prevent injuries for our law enforcement officers and can save lives.

We experienced this firsthand in 2014, when IMPD officer Greg Milburn was shot in the line of duty. He credits his vest with his survival. In the past 3 years, police departments across Indiana have received a total of more than \$1 million to help purchase bulletproof vests for officers so they can all go home at the end of their shift every day.

Another essential role law enforcement officers play is working with our community leaders, elected leaders, and law enforcement agencies to tackle persistent crime and to improve neighborhood safety. I, along with many of my colleagues, have long supported robust funding for the Byrne Memorial JAG Program. This supports State and local law enforcement agencies in their efforts to address the specific public safety and criminal justice challenges facing our communities. This program also supports information sharing on terror and criminal threats, drug and human trafficking organizations, and sexual predators.

Lastly, as officers go to work every day, they can encounter horrific scenes and experience traumatic situations that are just impossible to leave behind once the day is done. Last year, I authored and introduced the bipartisan Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act with my friend and colleague from Indiana, Senator TODD YOUNG. Our bill was signed into law by President Trump in January. It helps law enforcement agencies enhance or

establish mental health services for officers. It provides tools to help officers deal with mental health challenges and to combat the stigma associated with addressing those issues. This legislation also includes funding that the Department of Justice can use to initiate peer-mentoring pilot program grants for local law enforcement agencies.

Our law enforcement officers deserve our support. They deserve it to ensure they can do their job safely and effectively. I will continue to work on bipartisan efforts to help our officers and their families.

In the meantime, this National Police Week—this special week we have here every year—let's take a moment to pray for those fallen heroes, for their families, and for their fellow officers. They own our hearts for all they do for us. They protect our families, our children, and our communities, and they put their lives on the line every day for us, not knowing if they are going to come home safely or not. But still they go forward. Still they go out. Still our officers who are our friends and who protect us keep us safe every day.

They earned and have always kept all of our respect and of everyone in our communities. They have our love. They have our devotion and our deepest appreciation for everything they do every day.

May God bless all of these officers. May God bless Indiana, and may God bless the United States of America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MCCAIN MISSION ACT

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, many of us this afternoon had the opportunity to see a screening of the HBO documentary "For Whom the Bell Tolls," a tribute to Senator McCain. It is clearly a tribute, but it is also the story of his life and an expose of his sacrifice for his country. It is a moving story of Senator McCain's life and an inspiration to me and, I assume, to my colleagues for the commitment that he has made to always try to do right—putting his country above self.

I have had the honor of working with Senator McCain for the last several years in regard to legislation trying to improve the circumstances that our Nation's veterans face as they access healthcare within the Department of Veterans Affairs.

Senator McCain and I introduced legislation to accomplish a number of things related to this, particularly the Veterans Choice Program. Choice was passed back about 2014, at a time in which the VA was in a crisis and a time in which the veterans they were created to serve were harmed by decisions made at the Department of Veterans Affairs. The problems were highlighted in Senator McCain's home city of Phoenix at the Phoenix VA, in which a number of veterans may have died as a result of the inability to access healthcare in a timely fashion.

The solution to the problems exhibited in other places across the country—which included false waiting lists, in which the VA had determined a list that was not real but demonstrated that veterans who had no idea they had an appointment to see someone at the VA had an appointment, to camouflage the failures and the slowness of the Department of Veterans Affairs—resulted in a unanimous decision by the Senate to create a program called Choice.

Choice creates the opportunity for a veteran, under certain circumstances, to access healthcare in their home community at the veteran's discretion. This program, in my view, has significant potential to alter the opportunities that a veteran has to be cared for.

Those who served our country deserve the very best, and we want to make certain that happens both inside the VA and with a program that allows veterans to choose healthcare outside the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The Veterans Choice Program has expired since 2014. We have reauthorized it in a number of instances. I think three, perhaps four times. It needed funding, and we reauthorized the funding. Choice was a limited program in which for the veteran to qualify to receive Choice care in the community at their discretion and at their option was determined by whether or not that veteran lived within 40 miles of a VA facility or whether the VA could provide the services within 30 days of the time the veteran needed that care.

The committee here in the Senate has worked for a long time trying to reauthorize the Veterans Choice Program. It has been my position, with Senator McCain, that just to reauthorize Choice would be a significant error on our part and that in the authorization process, we should make community care work better for veterans.

I judge whether or not the VA is providing the care and services that our veterans need by what you would call casework—what we do on behalf of our constituents who have a challenge or a problem with a Federal agency or department. Our casework regarding veterans who are attempting to access care in the community has been exponential.

I checked the other day. At the moment, we have 80 cases for veterans in Kansas—not all related to this particular program but 80 veterans who contacted me and my staff and said: I need your help. Since I have been a Senator, that number is 2,650 veterans who have contacted me or my staff saying: I need your help. So when it came time for the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee to begin the legislative process of determining how to alter the program, how to reform it, and, particularly, how to extend the program, I wanted to make certain that my input was based upon what veterans were telling me about how the program did and didn't work.

Our committee passed a bill out of the Veterans' Affairs Committee

months ago. That bill was passed by our committee on a vote of 14 to 1. I was the one opponent. I say that for my colleagues today—some of whom have asked my view, some of whom I hope were interested in my view, and even those who may not care. I want them to know that the bill now in front of the Senate—and the majority leader just filed the proceedings for us to have a cloture vote next week on this legislation—is legislation I support. It does do something more than just extend Choice. It creates opportunities for that program to work much better. Most importantly to me was the issue of who decides whether or not a veteran has the option of choosing community care.

The legislation that we will consider next week allows for the Department of Veterans Affairs—in a sense, the Secretary of the Department of Veterans Affairs—to remain the gatekeeper. The VA has the opportunity to make the decision about who gets to have community care, but different than today, when the only criteria is 40 miles or 30 days. We create access standards in this legislation that the VA must abide by in determining whether or not a veteran can have care in the community, and that is a significant difference.

We had all kinds of challenges with the 40 miles and 30 days. We changed the definition of what a facility was in order to get the VA to allow individuals to have access to care at home. People may recall that the VA wanted to count the 40 miles as the crow flies. In addition to other challenges that the VA put in front of veterans, we have eliminated those and created a standard by which the VA must abide. So while the gatekeeper remains the Department of Veterans Affairs, it is not in the total discretion of the Department of Veterans Affairs. They must abide by criteria, and if the veteran believes he or she is denied care in the community, that veteran has the opportunity to appeal based upon a number of standards, including best medical interest of the veteran.

We are changing a program in which the VA made decisions that often denied veterans the access to care in their community that veteran asked for, and we are saying: You now asked the VA for permission. The VA has to make a decision to grant or deny that permission, but they can't do it solely at the discretion of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. They must abide by criteria. That is a significant improvement.

Secondly, if you feel like you have received the wrong decision, you can appeal that decision.

Today—and we have plenty of examples of this in Kansas—when a veteran is denied community care by the Department of Veterans Affairs, their only appeal is to their Senator or their Member of Congress, in which we then have a new case to once again try to work our way through the Department

of Veterans Affairs: Why did you deny this veteran his or her choice to have community care?

This bill is a significant improvement. It satisfies the concerns I had; my view that early on, we were mostly just trying to extend Choice as it was—as it is, and now this replaces it with really a circumstance in which veterans have rights, have standards the Department of Veterans Affairs must comply with.

In addition to the issues of who can access care, who is the gatekeeper, and determining the standards, this bill merges and modernizes all community care programs and puts them all in one category at the Department of Veterans Affairs instead of multiple programs. It simplifies it.

We have had too many instances in which, if you didn't access care under one program, you might be able to apply for another. This changes the circumstances that so many of my veterans have complained to me about, in which they get an authorization from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and they are allowed to see a physician in their home community, but then when they need lab work or an x ray—something that should be related to that visit—they have to go back to the Department of Veterans Affairs to get additional consent. This is more in the line of necessary procedures that should follow: one authorization that includes the things that are medically necessary for that appointment with the physician or that admission to a hospital. It just makes sense that these other things would be necessary if that physician whom the VA referred you to believes them to be necessary. It establishes a framework for the VA to build a high-performing healthcare network, and it implements new coordination so the veteran and the VA work together to determine what is in the best interest of that veteran.

It is something I have cared about a lot. We required that in the original Choice Act; that the healthcare provider be paid Medicare rates. Those of us who come from rural States recognize there are various rates under Medicare, and for our smallest hospitals, they are entitled to cost-based reimbursement. That is not happening under the current legislation, the law today. This legislation corrects the problem, keeping the circumstance more likely in which our hospitals and doctors would be financially able to see a veteran and provide that care.

This is not privatizing the VA. The VA serves a valuable and useful role. Many veterans choose to have care at the Department of Veterans Affairs, at their hospitals, and at their clinics. Again, it is the veterans' choice where he or she wants to go.

For those of us who come from rural places, the distances in which a veteran must travel, in many instances, have eliminated the ability for that veteran to ever access care from the VA. The VA has programs that are im-

portant to veterans—traumatic brain injury, amputation, things that may not ever be as available or as desirable in the community.

This legislation is supported by every veterans service organization I know of. We have come to the point in which it is time for us to pass this legislation. Memorial Day is approaching. The President has asked this legislation be approved prior to Memorial Day. We think it is appropriate to honor those who served our country at this point in May, where Memorial Day is around the corner, to provide the care they are asking for.

The other aspect of why it is important for us to move on the legislation now is that the funding for Choice and community care has diminished. I serve on the Appropriations Committee that funds the Department of Veterans Affairs, and it is necessary for us to get the money in place. The VA is already rationing care for those veterans who use Choice today, and this legislation puts the necessary dollars in place for Choice to continue in its new reformed and improved status.

It would be a shame for us to miss this opportunity. It would be wrong for our veterans. It would diminish the number of people who access care at the Department of Veterans Affairs and do so at a time in which the needs are great for those who have served our Nation.

Again, referring to my colleague from Arizona, Senator MCCAIN, we would honor him if we answer this call to do our duty to see that our veterans are cared for, that promises are kept.

I appreciate the response that was given when the bill was suggested to be named in honor of Senator MCCAIN. Both the House chairman and the House committee, along with Senator ISAKSON, the chairman here, and Senator TESTER, the ranking member, have agreed to do that. This legislation is now known as the McCain Mission Act. Our colleague, for whom there are so many reasons to pay honor and tribute to, would receive another honor for his service to our Nation but of equal importance, his service to other veterans.

For so many reasons, it is time for us to act, to pass the McCain Mission Act, and do so with the promptness that has followed long deliberations to try to get it right.

In my view, too often the U.S. Senate, the Congress, politics, and government, in general, just put a bandaid on to get by. This legislation is significantly different than doing something to get by. It would improve the quality of life for those who serve our Nation. We should honor them, as we honor Senator MCCAIN, prior to Memorial Day, at the end of next week.

I thank you for the opportunity to address the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I want to first commend my colleague

from Kansas for his passion for our veterans and for his hard work on legislation that is really going to help in Ohio and around the country to ensure they have the care they deserve and also for his mention of Senator MCCAIN, who is a true national hero. He now has a documentary about him on HBO, as some of us saw earlier today. It will soon be available for everyone to see. It is very powerful.

STOP ACT

Madam President, we heard earlier from one of my colleagues from Indiana who talked about the fact that this is National Police Week. A number of us have come to the floor to talk about our incredible men and women in uniform back home who protect us every day through their dedication, their public service, and it is appropriate to commend them.

I will say, as I have talked to police officers from Ohio this week, one issue came up again and again that doesn't get the attention it deserves; that is, the influx of synthetic opioids, like fentanyl, and the effect it is having on our law enforcement community, our first responders, in general, and, for that matter, all of our citizens. What they told me is, this is the issue that is creating so much crime in our communities. This is the issue that is filling our courtrooms and our jails.

One police officer I met with this week is a corrections officer at a jail in one of our urban areas in Ohio. I asked him to just give me an estimate. What percentage of the inmates in this jail are there because of the drug crisis and specifically the opioid issue?

He thought for a minute, and he said: Probably 90 percent—90 percent. Some are there because of selling drugs, some of them are there, though, because they have committed a crime while they were trying to get the money to be able to pay for their habit—so it is shoplifting; it is fraud; it is burglary. This issue is now everywhere.

The last year for which we have good information would be 2016. We have a lot of information nationally on that, and 2016 was the worst year on record in terms of overdose deaths attributable to these synthetic drugs coming into our country. Guess what. Almost certainly, 2017 is worse.

As one example, the coroner for Franklin County, OH—that is the Columbus area in Ohio, our fastest growing city—recently released their 2017 overdose report for the county. Franklin County had 520 overdose deaths in 2017. That is a 47-percent increase from 2016. So 2016 was the worst year on record; 2017, almost a 50-percent increase in overdose deaths. By the way, sadly, those overdose deaths are on track again this year to reach a record.

Two-thirds of those overdose deaths in Columbus, OH, Franklin County, involve fentanyl, which is this synthetic opioid that is overtaking our communities in Ohio. Think about that. Two-thirds of those overdose deaths last year in Columbus, OH, were due to fentanyl.

Just last week, a Cleveland man was sentenced to more than 11 years in Federal prison for selling fentanyl that resulted in a 46-year-old Ohio man's death. Earlier this month, a man in Lorain, OH, was convicted of selling fentanyl, resulting in a 23-year-old's death.

This drug and the opioid crisis knows no bounds. It is in every age group. It is in every ZIP Code. It is everywhere.

Unbelievably, this fentanyl drug—a synthetic form of heroin, a synthetic form of opioids—we are told by the experts is coming into our country through the U.S. mail system. This is shocking to me, and it should be something we can do something about. This is a Federal agency, after all.

Unlike other drugs—let's say heroin or even crystal meth, which tend to come over land, mostly from Mexico—this drug primarily is coming through the U.S. mail system from one country primarily—China. It is coming from laboratories in China, where some evil scientist is mixing this deadly brew and then sending it through the U.S. mail into our communities. It is being shipped directly into your community in small packages. These are the deadliest drugs we have ever experienced, and they are being shipped directly through a Federal agency.

What is fentanyl? It is 50 times more powerful than heroin. It is inexpensive. It is readily available now in many communities. It is the new scourge, killing more people in my State of Ohio last year than any other drug. We need to do all we can to stop more of these poisons from entering our communities. At the very least, if we can't stop it all, let's raise the price because the cost of this drug, being so inexpensive and it being so powerful, is one of the things that is driving these overdoses and these deaths.

It is not just overdoses. It is people whose lives are getting off track, families breaking apart, community dysfunction, people leaving work. It is the babies who are being born with this neonatal absence syndrome, so they have to go through withdrawal as little babies whom you can hold in your two hands. It is affecting our communities in so many ways.

There is a new study out showing that of the men who are out of the workforce altogether—probably 8½ million men—roughly half of them are taking pain medication on a daily basis. When pushed, two-thirds say it is prescriptions. What does that mean? This means it is affecting one of the big issues we are all hearing about back home, which is lack of a workforce. Well, here you have millions of Americans who are off track because of this issue. So, yes, it is tragic and unbelievable that over 60,000 Americans a year are dying from overdoses, but it is even worse than that. That is the tip of the iceberg, in a way. There are so many other aspects of this that are affecting the communities we represent in the Chamber.

With regard to fentanyl, this new scourge, we conducted an 18-month investigation in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, which I chair. We did this because we are hearing more and more about fentanyl. We wanted to look into how fentanyl is being shipped into the United States and what can be done at the Federal level to stop it. The investigation revealed just how easy it is to purchase fentanyl online and have it shipped to the United States. It is so easy, in fact, we found that most of the overseas providers essentially guaranteed delivery if you use the U.S. mail system.

Through a simple Google search, our staff found hundreds of websites, many affiliated with Chinese labs openly advertising fentanyl for sale.

We went undercover, using an investigator from the Department of Homeland Security to help us find some of these websites. We found that in several cases—seven different cases—individuals who receive fentanyl through some of these websites had died from an overdose shortly after receiving their fentanyl. We were able to find that the sellers would tell you to ship the drugs through the Postal Service, not a private carrier like FedEx or DHL or UPS or any other private carrier. As we have learned in our investigation, this is because the Postal Service, unlike these private carriers, is not required to have what is called advanced electronic data as part of the package. In other words, law enforcement is not given information on these packages.

The data that is in this advance electronic information is the name and address of the sender, the name and address of the person who is receiving the package, and what the contents of the package are. How does this help? Well, this gives law enforcement the ability to use big data to find out what region it is coming from—again, if there is a region in China that is sending a lot of this poison, they will know that; where it is going; if it is going to a particular post office box where they have reason to believe that it might be suspect, or perhaps it is going to an abandoned warehouse.

The information about what is in the package obviously is very interesting to Customs and Border Protection. They need this help. Why? Because they can't otherwise identify suspicious packages. There are 900 million packages a year now coming into the United States through the mail system—900 million packages. It is like finding a needle in a haystack.

Yes, we need better detection equipment, and we have actually passed legislation recently do to that. We have additional legislation to be able to hire more individuals to help detect whether these packages have opioids contained within them. But this advance information that you can have on the package is so incredibly important, and it is the reason the traffickers are saying: Don't send it through a private

carrier; send it through our own government agency because we think we can guarantee delivery there. It is a glaring loophole in our screening process, and it is a national security threat. It is a clear example of where Congress ought to come together on a bipartisan basis and enact Federal policies to fix this flaw.

Shortly after the tragic events of 9/11—September 11, 2001—Congress did pass a law in this regard, and the law did require all private carriers to obtain advance electronic data on all international packages entering the United States and did require them to share that data with law enforcement. The concern was not just contraband or opioids; it was also explosives. They passed that legislation here in Congress because they knew it was important to have law enforcement get that information.

With regard to the post office, they made it optional. Congress required the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury to determine whether the post office should also collect such data. This was 17 years ago. That determination was never made. They did not follow the law. From one administration to the next, to the next, to the next, there was no determination, which, of course, has resulted in no data requirements for the Postal Service. Again, that was in 2002.

For about 14 years, the Postal Service sat by and did nothing on this issue, knowing that this was a loophole, that this was an opening in the law for traffickers and others to be able to send things into our country. To me, that is unacceptable.

In the last couple of years, after pressure from Congress and, frankly, our investigation that I talked about earlier and the hearings we held talking about this issue in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, the Postal Service did actually start to do what, in my view, they should have done starting 16 years ago, but unfortunately what they are doing is not nearly enough. They have begun getting some data on some international packages, but the efforts are inadequate. One hundred percent of private carriers' packages have to have it, and do, and they provide it to law enforcement.

The U.S. Postal Service last year began an effort to get more of this advance electronic data, but they received it, based on testimony they provided to us, on only about 36 percent of the international packages. This means that the United States received more than 318 million packages last year that had no screening on them, no information for law enforcement to be able to identify the package.

We also found that the quality of the data that was provided by the Postal Service was inadequate in many cases and therefore not helpful to law enforcement. That is again based on testimony before our committee.

Even when the Postal Service conducted a pilot program to screen for

drugs, they only presented 80 percent of the packages targeted by Customs and Border Protection for inspection. So even when they did have information on it and law enforcement said “I want that package”—again, using big data in figuring out what might be a suspicious package—only 80 percent of them were even delivered to law enforcement out of the 36 percent that had electronic data. So the other 20 percent of those suspicious packages were allowed to go into circulation, into our communities, without having any screening.

Frankly, it has been a challenge to get the post office to address this problem on their own. We are talking about 900 million packages a year. And they have funding problems. I get that. But, folks, this is a crisis. It is a true epidemic. It is the No. 1 killer in my State.

It is time for Congress to act. People are dying every day because of these synthetic drugs. How many more of our people have to die before our own Postal Service takes the measures that we know can be taken to stop these poisons?

The STOP Act is a bipartisan bill I introduced with Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR, a Democrat from Minnesota, that will close this loophole and therefore help stop these deadly drugs from entering our communities. Senator KLOBUCHAR was on the floor earlier this afternoon and wanted to speak at this time about the legislation. She had to catch a plane to get back to her home State of Minnesota, but I appreciate her partnership on this issue and her promotion of our dealing with this issue here on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

The STOP Act is very simple, and it is common sense. It is going to hold the U.S. Postal Service to the same standard as these private mail carriers that we talked about and require that they get advance electronic data not on 36 percent but on 100 percent of packages entering the United States—and good data—and then present that to law enforcement.

We are not punishing the Postal Service or forcing them to jump through unnecessary hoops. We are simply saying that, given the crisis we face, the U.S. Postal Service, a Federal agency, should require the same types of advance electronic data from foreign countries that private mail carriers do, and we give the Postal Service a year to do it.

By the way, when I talked to mail carriers about this issue, when I talked to postal inspectors about this issue, certainly when I talked to Customs and Border Protection individuals about this issue, they all agreed. Who wouldn't? They have families too. They understand. This issue needs to be addressed, and it needs to be addressed urgently.

The United States of America provides this advance electronic data on 90 percent of our packages that we send

to other countries, so we are not asking for something that we are not doing. It makes sense all around the world. It makes sense here, and it will help save lives.

Thirty-three of my Senate colleagues—20 Republicans, 12 Democrats, and 1 Independent—have signed on as cosponsors of this legislation. The Presiding Officer today, who is from West Virginia—her State has been getting hit really hard like Ohio. She has a passion for this issue. She knows that we need to do all we can do to stop this poison from coming in.

The legislation has the support of a broad cross-section of this body. It has also been endorsed by President Trump's opioid commission. This is a commission that he formed to look at answers, and this is one of their specific recommendations: The STOP Act—pass it.

Just this week, the Secretary of Homeland Security, Kirstjen Nielsen, reaffirmed her support for this measure.

The House companion bill has 271 cosponsors—more than half of the U.S. House of Representatives.

By the way, asking every country for this kind of information, this advance electronic data, is not just common sense, it is also reasonable. The United States provides that data on nearly all of our packages that go into China, as an example, so why shouldn't China do that for us? At least one country—Sweden—recently returned packages from China that did not comply with Swedish postal rules on providing this information. So the Postal Service's argument that they have to accept and deliver packages from foreign posts under treaty obligations is simply not the case. If a country doesn't play by our rules, we can simply choose to return their packages. By the way, threatening to do so is all we need to do because these countries then will comply. We have the largest market in the world. We are the biggest economy in the world. We just have to insist on it.

China is already starting to recognize the importance of providing this data for access to U.S. markets. For example, as of early this year, when we published our report from the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, we had information that China had already provided electronic data on roughly 50 percent of the packages headed to the United States. So this notion that somehow China can't do it—of course they can.

Yesterday, instead of marking up this bipartisan STOP Act I talked about, the STOP Act legislation, the House Ways and Means Committee considered a weaker alternative to our bill. Apparently, they were hearing from some at the Postal Service who don't want Congress to require them to get this electronic data within 1 year, which we think is not just doable but reasonable. They don't want Congress to put in place penalties if they don't get that data, and our legislation, yes, has penalties.

The Postal Service doesn't mind if Congress simply recommends that they get the data, but remember, Congress recommended that way back in 2002. That was 16 years ago. And until very recently, just the last couple of years, the Postal Service did nothing to provide that crucial information.

Unfortunately, the weaker alternative approved by the committee yesterday would eliminate the real, enforceable, and immediate requirement that the Postal Service provide law enforcement with the information they need to identify and stop the shipment of deadly synthetic drugs into our communities.

In particular, the STOP Act requires that within 1 year, the Postal Service secure advance electronic data on 100 percent of packages here in the United States and transmit that data to law enforcement, to Customs and Border Protection. The version reported out yesterday gives the Postal Service 4 years—4 years. Remember the No. 1 killer in my State and in many States. Last year, there was an increase from the year before, and this year looks worse again. We can't wait 4 years. We don't have to.

The version they reported out also requires only 95 percent of the packages to have that data.

In addition, this alternative to the STOP Act that was reported out yesterday actually gives the Federal Government the authority to waive the requirements in the STOP Act that would get advance electronic data if it is in the “national security interest of the United States.” They can waive it altogether. I am struggling to think of a time when knowing less about what is coming into our country is in our national security interest.

As the permanent subcommittee investigation's report from January makes clear, there are hundreds of millions of packages coming into this country through the Postal Service every year with little or no screening at all. That is frightening. This loophole is allowing drug traffickers to exploit our own Federal Government, and we can't allow this status quo to continue.

The organization Americans for Securing All Packages—ASAP—issued a statement last week urging the Ways and Means Committee to “reject this weakened alternative, and pass the STOP Act, a bill with 271 bipartisan cosponsors.”

Just yesterday, Shatterproof—another addiction advocacy group fighting against the opioid addiction issue—issued a similar statement calling on Congress to pass the STOP Act, not the watered-down version.

I want to say today on the floor that I very much appreciate the fact that Ways and Means Committee Chairman KEVIN BRADY has acknowledged these concerns and has committed to working with us to resolve these differences during the legislative process. I know him. I know he is a passionate advocate of addressing this issue. He wants

to reverse the opioid epidemic, and he wants this to work, so I look forward to working with him.

I particularly appreciate the House coauthors of the STOP Act, including Representatives MIKE BISHOP and BILL PASCRELL. I talked to Mr. BISHOP today, and I know his passion to deal with this issue as well.

The coalition of support for the STOP Act, by the way, also includes the Fraternal Order of Police. I talked about the fact that police officers understand the dangers of this. By the way, to give an example of how dangerous this is to them, it is not just the overcrowding of our prison system and the courts and the crime that is being committed, it is a personal danger to them as law enforcement officers.

In East Liverpool, OH, a police officer pulled over two men for a traffic violation, and he noticed there was a powdery substance in the car. Being alert, he put on his mask and his gloves and arrested those two gentlemen because the powdery substance was fentanyl. They had stupidly tried to spread it around the car. He took them down to the station and booked them.

After he booked them, he was talking to his fellow officers, and he looked down on his shirt and noticed a few white flecks. So, as anyone would do, he took his hand and flicked the pieces of something white off of his shoulder. It was fentanyl. That exposure to his fingers caused him to drop, unconscious, on the floor. This is a big guy, 6 feet 2 inches, over 200 pounds, and in good shape. He overdosed and nearly died.

As his police chief said, if we had not been there to apply Narcan—not once, twice, or three times but five and six times, having taken him to the emergency room—if we hadn't been there, he didn't think he would have made it. Think if he would have gone home to hug his kid without brushing those flecks off his shoulder.

Our police officers are subject to this all the time, as are other first responders. It is appropriate that police organizations around the country are strongly in support of the STOP Act. So are the National Association of State EMS Officials, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and anti-opioid groups like Shatterproof, which I talked about, but also groups like SAFE, or Stop Addiction Fatality Epidemic, and other groups which have said: This is crazy; we have to stop this stuff from coming into our communities and, again, at a minimum, get the price up, because part of the reason it is spreading so much is that it is not just deadly and powerful, but it is inexpensive.

There is a strong bipartisan consensus that this bill, the Senate STOP Act, is absolutely needed to help combat the wave of opioid addiction and overdose deaths on the front end, by keeping some of these more deadly drugs from ever entering our communities in the first place.

This is a step we can take in the Senate to make accessing these deadly and inexpensive synthetic drugs more difficult.

The STOP Act will make life a little easier for the people of Ohio and across the country who are increasingly fatally overdosing or being unknowingly exposed to these deadly drugs.

Of course, this is only one part of combating the opioid epidemic. We understand that. We passed legislation here, which I coauthored, that increases treatment options, does more in terms of prevention, provides longer term recovery, and helps to provide our police officers and other first responders with the Narcan that is needed to reverse the effects of overdoses.

But, to my colleagues, this one is common sense. Stopping more of these deadly drugs from ever entering the country in the first place and raising the price of these drugs will make a difference and will save lives.

Let's pass this legislation. Let's work with the House to be sure it is legislation that will be effective immediately to be able to stop the increasing danger these opioids are causing in our communities all around the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BLUNT). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to executive session for consideration of the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 593. I ask consent that there be 4 hours of debate, 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 relating to the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant informa-

tion is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17-37, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Bahrain for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$45 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,
GREGORY M. KAUSNER
(for Charles W. Hooper, Lieutenant
General, USA, Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17-37

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Bahrain

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment * \$38 million.
Other \$7 million.

Total \$45 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One thousand five hundred (1,500) MK-82 (500lbs) General Purpose (GP) Bomb Bodies.

Six hundred (600) MK-83 (1,000lbs) GP Bomb Bodies.

Six hundred (600) MK-84 (2,000lbs) GP Bomb Bodies.

Five hundred (500) BLU-109 (2,000lbs) Penetrator Warhead Bomb Bodies.

Non-MDE includes: Also included are spares, and repair parts, support equipment, personnel training and training equipment, shipping and logistics services, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor technical support services, containers, munitions components, test equipment, and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (X7-D-AAN).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: None.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: May 17, 2018.

* As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Government of Bahrain—Munitions

The Government of Bahrain has requested three thousand two hundred (3,200) General Purpose (GP) and Penetrator Warhead bomb bodies to include: one thousand five hundred (1,500) MK-82 (500lbs) GP bomb bodies, six hundred (600) MK-83 (1,000lbs) GP bomb bodies, six hundred (600) MK-84 (2,000lbs) GP

bomb bodies, and five hundred (500) BLU-109 (2,000lbs) Penetrator Warhead bomb bodies. Also included are spares and repair parts, support equipment, personnel training and training equipment, shipping and logistics services, publications and technical documentation, U.S. Government and contractor technical support services, containers, munitions components, test equipment, and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is \$45 million.

This proposed sale will enhance the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a major non-NATO ally which is an important security partner in the region. The purchase of these munitions will bolster the Royal Bahraini Air Force's ability to conduct and sustain air operations with its F-16 combat aircraft. Our mutual defense interests anchor our relationship and the Royal Bahraini Air Force plays a significant role in Bahrain's defense.

The proposed sale will improve Bahrain's capability to meet current and future security threats. Bahrain will use these munitions as a deterrent to regional threats, strengthen its homeland defense, and execute counter-terrorism operations. The GP bomb bodies would also better equip Bahrain to operate with U.S.-led and U.S.-supported coalition operations. Bahrain will have no difficulty absorbing these munitions into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

There is no prime contractor planned for this effort; the munitions will be provided by the U.S. Government out of stock. There are no offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. or contractor representatives to Bahrain.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the votes on S. Con. Res. 36, 5-year balanced budget. Had I been present, I would have voted nay on S. Con. Res. 36, 5-year balanced budget.

S. CON. RES. 36

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Budget Committee, I am disappointed that Republican leaders have not even begun the process of debating a budget for the upcoming year in our committee. The United States needs a budget that addresses our national debt, which is increasing significantly faster due to a Republican tax plan that delivers huge windfalls to millionaires, billionaires, and multinational corporations.

Unfortunately, the budget proposal we considered today would take health coverage from tens of millions of Americans because its massive spending cuts would almost certainly mean huge reductions in Medicare and Medicaid. This budget would also make it harder for struggling families to afford food, housing, and childcare, and it

would slash vital economic investments in infrastructure, education, and scientific research.

At the same time, this budget does not achieve even one penny of deficit reduction from reducing the tax cuts that Republicans just provided to those at the top. I will not support a budget that is balanced on the backs of working families and the middle class.

We need a budget that invests in our future, supports a basic standard of living for all Americans, and safeguards our health and safety. This budget proposal fails to do so, which is why I voted against the motion to proceed to its consideration.

NATIONAL POLICE WEEK

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I would like to take the opportunity to honor the life and memory of Sergeant Sean Gannon of the Yarmouth Police Department, who was killed in the line of duty on April 12, 2018.

This week is National Police Week, a time to honor the brave law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty. Last month, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts suffered a terrible loss when Sergeant Sean Gannon was killed while serving an arrest warrant in Barnstable. He was only 32 years old.

A native of New Bedford, MA, Sergeant Gannon graduated from Bishop Stang High School in North Dartmouth and then earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from Westfield State University and a master's in emergency management from the Massachusetts Maritime Academy.

After college, Sergeant Gannon jumped head first into public service, first serving as a public safety officer and later becoming a police officer with the Yarmouth Police Department, where he served for 8 years. Sergeant Gannon loved working with police dogs and was the first full-time K-9 narcotics officer at Yarmouth PD. His loyal patrol dog, Nero, was seriously injured in the incident that claimed Sergeant Gannon's life, but is expected to recover and return to the Gannon family.

Sergeant Gannon had a huge heart and spent his free time volunteering with Big Brothers, Big Sisters, traveling, enjoying the outdoors, and working with his hands.

Thousands of mourners, including law enforcement officers from across the country, gathered to pay their respects at Sergeant Gannon's wake, a testament to the high esteem with which his community held him and to the power of his sacrifice. Yarmouth Police Chief Frank Frederickson called Sergeant Gannon the "Tom Brady of our department" and posthumously promoted him to the rank of sergeant.

Our hearts are broken by the loss of Sergeant Gannon.

Today, we honor Sergeant Gannon's service, we honor his sacrifice, and most importantly, we honor the life he led and the legacy he leaves behind.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the men and women who keep our communities and our country safe as we celebrate National Police Week. This week, we recognize the sacrifices of those who have taken a pledge to continually serve and protect families in Nebraska and across this Nation. Every year, thousands of families, friends, and comrades of fallen officers gather in our Nation's Capital to offer a solemn tribute to law enforcement officers.

Today I wish to pay special tribute to the men and women who protect my home State of Nebraska. These officers risk their own safety for the safety of others. In times of crisis, they run toward danger, not away from it. We are forever indebted to them and so fortunate to have them.

I also would like to express a profound sense of gratitude for those who have fallen in the line of duty.

In 2017, we lost one of our own officers in Nebraska. Omaha Tribal Police Sergeant Curtis Blackbird was responding to a call when his car fatally struck construction equipment while driving through dense fog in the area. Sadly, traffic-related accidents are a leading cause of on-duty law enforcement deaths. Sergeant Blackbird served the Tribal communities in Macy, NE, for over 17 years as a law enforcement officer and earlier as an EMT. His comrades described him as someone special to the law enforcement community and the Tribe's own "personal warrior."

This month will also mark the 3-year anniversary of Officer Kerrie Orozco's death. On May 20, 2015, Officer Orozco was preparing to serve an arrest warrant as a member of the department's metro area fugitive task force. When her team arrived, the suspect opened fire and 29-year-old Kerrie was hit. Tragically, she was on her last day of duty before starting maternity leave to care for her newborn daughter, who had spent months in neonatal intensive care. Kerrie's legacy lives on through her husband, Hector, her daughter Olivia and her two stepchildren.

On National Police Week, we honor fallen officers across our Nation who share a similar story. Our police officers and first responders are a constant reminder of bravery and sacrifice in the face of peril. As we remember them, we also pray for the families of fallen officers who are faced with their own heroic burden.

I am proud to cosponsor the senior Senator from Iowa's Senate resolution commemorating National Police Week. This bipartisan resolution acknowledges the selfless acts of bravery undertaken by law enforcement officers and recognizes the need to ensure our law enforcement officers have the adequate equipment, training, and resources required to safeguard our democracy.

Our men and women in blue serve with valor, dignity, and integrity. For all of our officers who keep our communities safe: Thank you. We are

grateful for all that you do. We know that the weight of what you do every day is heavy, we thank you for your dedication, and we honor your service. May God bless you and your families.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today, during National Police Week, I wish to recognize and honor the men and women who serve as New Jersey's police officers and law enforcement officials. We owe a great debt of gratitude to the professionals working in law enforcement who risk their lives each and every day for the safety of all New Jerseyans. These American heroes answer the call when we need them the most, and we stand together as a grateful nation in saying thank you.

Established by a joint resolution of Congress, National Police Week devotes special appreciation to those members of law enforcement who have lost their lives in the line of duty for the safety and protection of the people they serve. In a proclamation issued 56 years ago, President John F. Kennedy recognized the national importance of honoring our law enforcement professionals by designating the 15th of May as Peace Officers Memorial Day and the week in which that date falls as National Police Week.

Today I want to pay special homage to New Jersey's fallen police officers. These heroes made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our State. Though they are no longer with us, we stand proud and united knowing that they continue to be commemorated by their fellow New Jerseyans and by their fellow brothers and sisters in blue. Their courage, spirit of service, and commitment has allowed the people of New Jersey to be safe and secure. For their service and their sacrifice, we are eternally grateful.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, as we observe National Police Week, I rise today to recognize Sean Matthew Suiter and Sander Benjamin Cohen, two Maryland law enforcement officers who lost their lives in the line of duty in 2017. It is important that we give thanks to all the men and women who put themselves at risk every day to protect our communities.

Sean Suiter was an 18-year veteran who was shot in west Baltimore while investigating a triple homicide. Relatives describe him as an anchor in his family, devoted to his wife and three children who "... was focused on trying to [...] raise them to be strong and good citizens."

Sander Cohen, who served as deputy chief in the Maryland Office of the State Fire Marshal was killed in December while assisting a disabled motorist. His friends and family describe him as funny with an infectious smile and as "an example of the good in people."

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I will continue to support programs that provide our law enforcement officers with the funding and training they need to protect themselves and our communities.

Police officers bear a unique burden. While we can never fully repay them for their sacrifices, we should all take the time to thank police officers who put their lives on the line every day to protect our safety. We must honor their sacrifice and support the families of those we have lost in the line of duty.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DR. AROL AUGSBURGER

• Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Dr. Arol Augsburger who will be retiring from his position as the president of the Illinois College of Optometry, ICO, on June 30, 2018. During his 16-year tenure at the ICO, which is located on the near southside of Chicago, the performance of the student body exceeded national averages. This achievement showcases Dr. Augsburger's positive impact on the college. In addition, ICO doubled its investable assets, and its on-campus clinic was able to grow to accommodate over 110,000 visits annually. This on-campus clinic, the Illinois Eye Institute, is the largest safety net provider of eye and vision care in Illinois, and it offers ICO students a unique opportunity for robust clinical training—something that is not available at other institutions.

Prior to Dr. Augsburger's appointment at ICO in 2002, he served for 30 years in a variety of leadership positions in higher education. He served as the interim provost of the University of Alabama at Birmingham, UAB, dean and professor of the UAB School of Optometry, and professor of clinical optometry at the Ohio State University College of Optometry. Dr. Augsburger has also served as president of Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry, the National Board of Examiners in Optometry and the Rotary Club of Chicago, Rotary 1, the world's first Rotary Club and as the immediate-past chairman of the ROTARY/One Foundation. Additionally, Dr. Augsburger served as the 2014-2015 chairman of the board of the Federation of Independent Illinois Colleges and Universities, on the Near South Planning Board of Chicago, and the Jackson Park Hospital Foundation Board. He was also on the Special Medical Advisory Group of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

In addition to being named Optometrist of the Year in three States, Dr. Augsburger was named National Doctor of Optometry of the Year and a Distinguished Service Award recipient by the American Optometric Association. In June of 2014, he was inducted into the National Optometry Hall of Fame.

I applaud Dr. Augsburger's commendable work as the president of ICO and in the field of optometry. Students, patients, and Illinois constituents have greatly benefited from his lifetime of commitment to education and optometry.●

REMEMBERING CHRISTOPHER P. STADELMAN

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I wish today to honor the life of a West Virginia son and selfless public servant, Christopher P. Stadelman.

After the news that Chris lost his hard-fought, 4-year battle with colon cancer on Friday, May 11, 2018, loved ones and friends from across West Virginia joined in a chorus of sadness for the loss of such a remarkable person, but also thankfulness for the inspiring life he lived.

Chris dedicated his life to serving the people of West Virginia as a journalist and editor at the Charleston Daily Mail, as the co-owner and operator of the Parsons Advocate with his incredible wife, Kelly, and as communications director and chief of staff for Governor Earl Ray Tomblin. Chris said these were his "dream jobs", and he certainly made an enduring impact through each one of them.

Chris and Kelly called two places home: Charleston and Thomas, WV. He is a member of the Marshall University Journalism Hall of Fame and was named a Distinguished West Virginian by Governor Tomblin and an Honorary Mountaineer Brigadier by MG James Hoyer of the West Virginia National Guard.

He loved the news and seemed to always know the latest news well before it broke. He loved debating politics and policy. He loved baseball, especially the Pittsburgh Pirates. He loved his dogs. Above all, he loved Kelly.

When they ran the Parsons Advocate together, Chris would often go to the scene of news and report back to Kelly in the newsroom. For 18 years, they were partners in every sense, and she was his rock as he fought colon cancer with fearless resolve.

During his 4-year battle, on most days, you wouldn't have known Chris was sick. In the Governor's office, he was often the first to arrive in the mornings and the last to leave. After the tragic flooding that took 23 lives in West Virginia in 2016, Chris was tireless in finding ways to help West Virginians recover, even leading the charge to establish a program that has helped people rebuild their homes.

It is because of all of this and so much more that Chris has been surrounded with a family of friends and supporters who proudly proclaim the name Team Stadelman.

I have always been moved by Chris's inspiring life, and my abiding thoughts and prayers are with Kelly; his mom, Nancy; his stepmom, Helen; his siblings, Matt, Jonathan, Philip, and Rachel; and all of Team Stadelman.

Last year, Chris's father, Paul, lost his own battle with cancer. When reflecting on his son's illness, Paul wrote, "So much has been shared. So much has been given. So much has been accomplished."

And for that, West Virginia is so much better.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM "PAT" PATTON GETTY III

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor William Patton Getty III for his decades of service to the people of my home State of West Virginia and the surrounding region.

A native of Pittsburgh, PA, Pat has always showcased a passion for giving back to the communities and the people of this special region, and my wife, Gayle, and I are so very proud to call him a dear friend. He has been a part of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation for more than 24 years, serving as president since 1998 and a trustee since 1994. The foundation serves the people of West Virginia, southwestern Pennsylvania, and the multistate economic region centered on Pittsburgh.

In addition to his role with the foundation, he serves on numerous boards and committees that range from efforts in economic and community development, to policy research, to attracting and retaining diverse talent, to the statewide economic development initiative in West Virginia, called Vision Shared. He was a founding member and past chair of the Fund for the Advancement of Minorities through Education, a past board member of the Boys and Girls Clubs of Western Pennsylvania, a past member of the West Virginia Jobs Cabinet, and served on the advisory board for the West Virginia Teacher Quality Initiative. He also serves on the implementation committee of the Tri-State Shale Coalition, which is a collaborative effort by the Governors of West Virginia, Ohio, and Pennsylvania seeking to optimize downstream economic development pertaining to shale gas and especially modern manufacturing. Since 2006, he has been a leader of Power of 32, a 32-county, four-State economic development project in the Pittsburgh region.

Prior to beginning his role as president of the foundation in 1999, Pat had practiced law with Pittsburgh's firm, Meyer, Unkovic, and Scott for nearly 30 years. In addition to his work at the foundation, Pat has had an unparalleled commitment to advancing educational opportunities for young people and enhancing the quality of life in the region. Countless families have felt the impact of his outstanding efforts and leadership, and he has had a hand in preparing the future leaders of our region to be well-prepared, inspired, and unafraid of creativity, no matter their circumstances.

The people of the region Pat and I share have an exceptional can-do spirit, a neighborly love that is unrelenting, and are grounded by the same core principle: to help others be the best they can be. That is Pat's legacy as a public servant and as a leader, and there is no greater achievement than to be in a position to give back to the communities you love.

While he is retiring and everyone is certain to miss his strong leadership, Pat's dedication and commitment to

excellence will leave a lasting legacy with the countless lives he has touched. Again, I congratulate Pat for his remarkable years of service, and I am honored to wish good health and much happiness to him and his family in the days and years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO KEILAN MCWHORTER

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Keilan McWhorter, the Franklin County Teacher of the Year from Franklin County School in Eastpoint, FL.

Keilan grew up in a small agricultural community in Albany, KY. After graduating from Clinton County High School in 1987, he started college at Gulf Coast Community College, later transferring to Florida State University, graduating in 1992. When at FSU, he completed his teacher training requirements while working on his plant physiology research. Shortly after, Keilan moved to Rickards High School in Tallahassee and completed his student teaching requirements.

Keilan began his first full-time teaching opportunity teaching biology and chemistry at Shanks High School in Quincy. He also served as department chair for 3 years and coached baseball for the Shanks Tigers.

Keilan then moved to Panama City and began a job at Rutherford High School, teaching higher level biology for the International Baccalaureate Program, where he later served as department chair. He taught within the IB program for 16 years before coming to the Franklin County School, where he has been a valued faculty member for nearly 4 years.

I extend my best wishes to Keilan for his dedication to teaching students. I look forward to hearing of his continued success in his future endeavors.●

TRIBUTE TO JOY PRESCOTT

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Joy Prescott, the Glades County Teacher of the Year from Pemayetv Emahakv Charter School in Okeechobee, FL.

Joy employs a simple teaching philosophy that creates a fun learning environment that is welcoming and, most importantly, safe. In her classroom, her students know it is okay to make mistakes.

Joy indeed has a record of excellence as demonstrated in 2005 when her students made the most writing gains in Florida and in 2006 when she was named New Endeavor High School's Teacher of the Year.

Joy is a lifelong resident of Okeechobee County and spent the first 13 years of her teaching career giving back to the students in her hometown. She has been with Pemayetv Emahakv Charter School for the past 4 years, where she and her colleagues work to help preserve the Seminole Tribe of Florida's cultures and traditions. She currently teaches fourth-grade math.

I offer my best wishes to Joy and I look forward to learning of her continued success in the years ahead.●

TRIBUTE TO ES SWIHART

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to honor Es Swihart, the Sarasota County Teacher of the Year from Riverview High School in Sarasota, FL.

After Es was presented with the Teacher of the Year award, she was asked what inspires her. She stated it was her fellow teachers that offer inspiration, through the long hours and their desire to teach lessons in new ways, plus the creative veracity with which educators make space for students as they learn to navigate the world and allow students to value their own voice serves as inspiration.

Es notes the desire for students to come to class each day while shouldering the weight of what they carry, sometimes gracefully and sometimes with awkward honesty, inspires her the most. Their optimistic view of the world and wanting others to see them for who they truly are serve as her motivation as their teacher.

As an English teacher, Es teaches her students to analyze everything, whether it be books or movies that are recent or decades old. She knows her students are understanding and experiencing educational growth when they realize books from the 1500s through 1600s can still be relevant today. Her colleagues note she opens up pathways to language with her content and is focused on the learning process for all of her students.

I am thankful to learn of Es's commitment to teaching. I extend my best wishes to her on receiving this important award and look forward to hearing of her continued success in her future endeavors.●

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EMBASSY THEATRE

• Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to rise today to formally recognize the 90th anniversary of the Embassy Theatre in Fort Wayne, IN. Since its founding on May 14 1928, the Embassy has remained Indiana's leading self-sustaining historic theatre, welcoming more than 130,000 patrons each year. Originally built as a movie palace and vaudeville house, the theatre featured regal entertainment with a complete Page theatre pipe organ. At the height of its popularity, the Embassy frequently hosted decorated artists, including musician Tony Bennett and comedian Victor Borge. It wasn't until the evolution of television that the theater's popularity began to fade.

In 1972, the Embassy was threatened to be demolished, but several Hoosiers in the Fort Wayne community formed the Embassy Theatre Foundation to preserve its historical significance. Now in its 90th year, the Embassy Theatre continues to feature national

Broadway productions and hold various concerts of all genres.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the Embassy Theatre for its famed entertainment and commitment to preserving one of Indiana's most historical sites. ●

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.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

SOCIAL SECURITY TOTALIZATION AGREEMENT WITH ICELAND, TITLED "AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ICELAND" AND THE ACCOMPANYING LEGALLY BINDING ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT TITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE COMPETENT AUTHORITIES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ICELAND FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND ICELAND"—PM 38

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Iceland, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland" and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed at Reykjavik, Iceland, on September 27, 2016.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security

totalization agreements already in force with other leading economic partners in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions of the Agreements and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration concluded that these Agreements are in the national interest of the United States.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland and the Administrative Arrangement between the Competent Authorities of the United States of America and Iceland for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and Iceland.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2018.

SOCIAL SECURITY TOTALIZATION AGREEMENT WITH SLOVENIA, TITLED "AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA" AND THE ACCOMPANYING LEGALLY BINDING ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT TITLED "ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE REPUBLIC OF SLOVENIA"—PM 39

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

Pursuant to section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act, as amended by the

Social Security Amendments of 1977 (Public Law 95-216, 42 U.S.C. 433(e)(1)), I transmit herewith a social security totalization agreement with Slovenia, titled "Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia" and the accompanying legally binding administrative arrangement, titled "Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia" (collectively the "Agreements"). The Agreements were signed in Ljubljana, Slovenia, on January 17, 2017.

The Agreements are similar in objective and content to the social security totalization agreements already in force with other leading economic partners in Europe and elsewhere, including Australia, Canada, Chile, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland. Such bilateral agreements provide for limited coordination between the United States and foreign social security systems to eliminate dual social security coverage and taxation and to help prevent the loss of benefit protection that can occur when workers divide their careers between two countries.

The Agreements contain all provisions mandated by section 233 of the Social Security Act and, pursuant to section 233(c)(4), other provisions which I deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of section 233.

I also transmit for the information of the Congress a report required by section 233(e)(1) of the Social Security Act on the estimated number of individuals who will be affected by the Agreements and the Agreements' estimated cost effect. Also included are a summary of the main provisions of the Agreements and an annotated version of the Agreements with descriptions of each article. The Department of State and the Social Security Administration concluded that these Agreements are in the national interest of the United States.

I commend to the Congress the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia and the Administrative Arrangement between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia for the Implementation of the Agreement on Social Security between the United States of America and the Republic of Slovenia.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 17, 2018.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:32 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, without amendment:

S. 35. An act to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for

inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes.

At 12:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2372. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5698. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 121. Concurrent resolution directing the Secretary of the Senate to make a correction in the enrollment of the bill S. 2372.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5698. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to punish criminal offenses targeting law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 2872. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reform the procedures provided under such Act for the initiation, investigation, and resolution of claims alleging that employing offices of the legislative branch have violated the rights and protections provided to their employees under such Act, including protections against sexual harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

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

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

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

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 Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. WARREN, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 2872. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to reform the procedures provided under such Act for the initiation, investigation, and resolution of claims alleging that employing offices of the legislative branch have violated the rights and protections provided to their employees under such Act, including protections against sexual harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes; read the first time.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2873. A bill to support businesses in Puerto Rico, extend child tax credits for families in Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 2874. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 with respect to land stewardship, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. NELSON, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2875. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain services furnished by opioid treatment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 2876. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to provide for the study of the Pike National Historic Trail; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2877. A bill to amend the Wilderness Act to allow local Federal officials to determine the manner in which nonmotorized uses may be permitted in wilderness areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. COONS):

S. 2878. A bill to improve the tracking of data on, and benefits paid to, public safety officers who are killed or disabled in the line of duty; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL:

S. 2879. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to promote behavioral health crisis response training among law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKKEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. HARRIS):

S. 2880. A bill to establish a pilot program for long-term rental assistance for families affected by major disasters in 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2881. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to seek to enter into an agreement with the city of Vallejo, California, for the transfer of Mare Island Naval Cemetery in Vallejo, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 2882. A bill to require a report on the United States strategy in Syria, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 2883. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to submit a plan to improve research and development on therapies for traumatic

brain injury and post-traumatic stress disorder, to document information on blast exposures in service records of military personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2884. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to develop a standard letter format to be provided to individuals who are indebted to the United States by virtue of their participation in benefits programs administered by the Secretary, to provide notice of debt by electronic means to such individuals when so elected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 2885. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require additional disclosure for pharmaceutical companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. COTTON:

S. Res. 515. A resolution honoring the 70th anniversary of the reactivation in 1948 of the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 516. A resolution designating the week of May 1 through May 7, 2018, as "National Physical Education and Sport Week"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) 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. 428

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 428, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to authorize States to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through enhanced pediatric health homes, and for other purposes.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive coinsurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 540

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to limit the authority of States to tax certain income

of employees for employment duties performed in other States.

S. 783

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services.

S. 808

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 808, a bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State.

S. 966

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 966, a bill to establish a program to accurately document vehicles that were significant in the history of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 980

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 980, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for payments for certain rural health clinic and Federally qualified health center services furnished to hospice patients under the Medicare program.

S. 1072

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

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1084, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that the Director of the Bureau of Prisons ensure that each chief executive officer of a Federal penal or correctional institution provides a secure storage area located outside of the secure perimeter of the Federal penal or correctional institution for firearms carried by certain employees of the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

S. 1086

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1086, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the prohibition on eligibility for TRICARE Reserve Select of members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible to enroll in a health benefits plan under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code.

S. 1278

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico

(Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1278, a bill to provide for the admission of the State of Washington, D.C. into the Union.

S. 1328

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1328, a bill to extend the protections of the Fair Housing Act to persons suffering discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity, and for other purposes.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to provide for rental assistance for homeless or at-risk Indian veterans.

S. 1524

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1524, a bill to improve the treatment of Federal prisoners who are primary caretaker parents, and for other purposes.

S. 1688

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1688, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to negotiate fair prescription drug prices under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 1879

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1879, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 2074

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2074, a bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, *supra*.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr.

PORTMAN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) 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. 2208

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

S. 2272

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2272, a bill to amend the Revised Statutes to grant State attorneys general the ability to issue subpoenas to investigate suspected violations of State laws that are applicable to national banks.

S. 2317

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2317, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for additional flexibility with respect to medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, and for other purposes.

S. 2361

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2361, a bill to amend the Federal Home Loan Bank Act to allow a captive insurance company that was a member of a Federal Home Loan Bank before January 19, 2016, to continue or restore the membership of the captive insurance company in the Federal Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes.

S. 2416

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

S. 2492

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2492, a bill to provide

for the reporting to State and local law enforcement authorities of cases in which the national instant criminal background check system indicates that a firearm has been sought to be acquired by a prohibited person, so that authorities may pursue criminal charges under State law, and to ensure that the Department of Justice reports to Congress on prosecutions secured against prohibited persons who attempt to acquire a firearm.

S. 2497

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2497, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions and to authorize the appropriations of funds to Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 2509

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2509, a bill to establish the National Park Restoration Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 2597

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2597, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2633

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2633, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil forfeitures relating to certain seized animals, and for other purposes.

S. 2652

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2652, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Stephen Michael Gleason.

S. 2667

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2667, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for State and Tribal regulation of hemp production, and for other purposes.

S. 2801

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2801, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to clarify the effective date of the promotion of com-

missioned officers of the Army National Guard and Air National Guard, to improve processes for Federal recognition of the promotions of such officers, and for other purposes.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2841

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2841, a bill to require policies and programs to research, prevent, and address the harmful consequences of gambling disorder among members of the Armed Forces and their dependents, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 154

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 154, a resolution promoting awareness of motorcycle profiling and encouraging collaboration and communication with the motorcycle community and law enforcement officials to prevent instances of profiling.

S. RES. 346

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 346, a resolution recognizing the importance and effectiveness of trauma-informed care.

S. RES. 460

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 460, a resolution condemning Boko Haram and calling on the Governments of the United States of America and Nigeria to swiftly implement measures to defeat the terrorist organization.

S. RES. 502

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 502, a resolution supporting robust relations with the State of Israel bilaterally and in multilateral fora upon seventy years of statehood, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 506

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 506, a resolution supporting the designation of May 15, 2018, as "National Senior Fraud Awareness Day" to raise awareness about the increasing number of fraudulent schemes targeted at older people of the United States, to encourage the implementation of policies to prevent these scams from happening, and to improve protections from these scams for seniors.

S. RES. 508

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

Res. 508, a resolution supporting the goals of Myalgic Encephalomyelitis/Chronic Fatigue Syndrome International Awareness Day.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 515—HONORING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REACTIVATION IN 1948 OF THE 3D INFANTRY REGIMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. COTTON submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 515

Whereas, the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army (commonly known as the "Old Guard") (referred to in this preamble as the "3d Infantry Regiment")—

(1) is the oldest active-duty infantry unit of the United States Army; and

(2) has served the United States since 1784; Whereas the 3d Infantry Regiment—

(1) is the escort to the President and official ceremonial unit of the United States Army; and

(2) provides security for Washington, District of Columbia, in times of national emergency and civil disturbance;

Whereas, in 1847, following the valorous performance of the 3d Infantry Regiment in the Mexican War, General Winfield Scott gave the unit the moniker of the "Old Guard" during a victory parade in Mexico City;

Whereas the 3d Infantry Regiment has a long history of service, which spans from the Battle of Fallen Timbers to World War II and the Global War on Terrorism;

Whereas, in its capacity as the official ceremonial unit of the United States Army, the 3d Infantry Regiment is responsible for conducting military ceremonies at the White House, the Pentagon, and national memorials, as well as elsewhere in the capital of the United States;

Whereas a battalion of the 3d Infantry Regiment is stationed at Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Tacoma, Washington, and has been deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan multiple times during the Global War on Terrorism; and

Whereas soldiers of 3d Infantry Regiment—

(1) maintain a 24-hour vigil at the Tomb of the Unknowns;

(2) provide military funeral escorts at Arlington National Cemetery;

(3) participate in parades at Fort Myer and Fort Lesley J. McNair; and

(4) train and are deployed for missions of the United States Army around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the 70th anniversary of the reactivation in 1948 of the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 516—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF MAY 1 THROUGH MAY 7, 2018, AS "NATIONAL PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT WEEK"

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 516

Whereas according to the President's Council on Sports, Fitness & Nutrition, overweight adolescents have a 70 percent chance

of becoming overweight adults, and are at an increased risk for chronic disease, disability, and death;

Whereas the Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans of the Department of Health and Human Services recommend that children and adolescents engage in at least 60 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity each day;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—

(1) only 27 percent of high school students engage in 60 minutes a day of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; and

(2) 14 percent of high school students do not engage in 60 or more minutes of any kind of physical activity;

Whereas the people of the United States can work together to provide a supportive and active learning environment to prepare children and adolescents to lead healthy and physically active lives; and

Whereas Congress strongly supports efforts to increase physical activity among youth and increase participation of youth in sports: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of May 1 through May 7, 2018, as “National Physical Education and Sport Week”;;

(2) recognizes the central role of physical education and sports in creating a healthy lifestyle for children and adolescents; and

(3) encourages school districts—

(A) to implement physical education programs and classes;

(B) to provide professional development to educators relating to physical health and wellness;

(C) to work with community partners to provide opportunities to children and adolescents for physical activities before and after school, and during the summer months; and

(D) to promote district-wide mental and physical health and wellness.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2246. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

SA 2247. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2246 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, *supra*.

SA 2248. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2372, *supra*.

SA 2249. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2248 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, *supra*.

SA 2250. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2249 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2248 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, *supra*.

SA 2251. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2842, to prohibit the marketing of bogus opioid treatment programs or products; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SA 2252. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 346, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2246. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2247. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2246 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

SA 2248. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2249. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2248 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “3 days” and insert “4 days”

SA 2250. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2249 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2248 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill S. 2372, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “4” and insert “5”

SA 2251. Mrs. CAPITO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 2842, to prohibit the marketing of bogus opioid treatment programs or products; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation; as follows:

In section 2(3), in the heading, strike “TREATMENT” and insert “USE”.

SA 2252. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 346, to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System; as follows:

On page 8, strike lines 18 through 21 and insert the following:

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$55,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I have 5 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 Sen-

ate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

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, May 17, 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, May 17, 2018, at 10:15 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 16, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on pending legislation and the following nominations: Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, Alan D. Albright, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas, Thomas S. Kleeh, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of West Virginia, Peter J. Phipps, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, Michael J. Truncale, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Texas, Wendy Vitter, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, and Erica H. MacDonald, to be United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota, Department of Justice.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 17, 2018, at 2:00 p.m. to conduct a closed hearing.

JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON SOLVENCY AND MULTI-EMPLOYER PENSION PLANS

The Joint Select Committee on Solvency and Multi-employer Pension Plans is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 17, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Structure and Financial Outlook of the Pension Outlook of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.”

NATIONAL VOLCANO EARLY WARNING AND MONITORING SYSTEM ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 150, S. 346.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 346) to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts of the bill intended to be inserted are shown in italic.)

S. 346

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 “National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

[Congress finds that—

[(1) the United States and the territories of the United States contain 169 hazardous volcanoes;

[(2) since 1980, eruptions have claimed many lives and cost billions of dollars in property damage in the United States;

[(3) ash eruptions pose a hazard to high-flying jet aircraft, including the more than 50,000 passengers who travel on jets over Alaska and the North Pacific every day;

[(4) in 1989, an eruption of Redoubt Volcano, Alaska, caused in-flight failure of all 4 engines of a passenger Boeing 747 aircraft;

[(5) international flights over the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the intense domestic air traffic of the Pacific Northwest also face potential engine failure in the event of an eruption;

[(6) mudflows from ice-clad Cascade volcanoes of the States of Washington, Oregon, and California pose a serious hazard to cities and transportation arteries in the Pacific Northwest;

[(7) lava flows, toxic gas emissions, and explosions impact residents and visitors to the State of Hawaii and have the potential to cause catastrophic property damage;

[(8) frequent seismic unrest requires careful monitoring in the Mammoth Lakes area of the State of California and Yellowstone National Park in the States of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho;

[(9) modern technology, in the form of geophysical monitoring networks on the ground and the use of near real-time satellite data, makes possible early warnings typically weeks or months before eruptions, giving emergency response agencies and the public time to prepare, which minimizes potential damage to property and loss of life;

[(10) the efficacy of monitoring is being demonstrated by—

[(A) the successful forecasts and warnings of Augustine Volcano in 1986 and 2006, Redoubt Volcano in 1989 through 1990 and 2009, and Mt. Spurr in 1992; and

[(B) warnings and forecasts of lava flow advancement in Hawaii during the ongoing eruption of Kilauea;

[(11) the United States Geological Survey and university and State partners of the United States Geological Survey operate—

[(A) the Alaska Volcano Observatory located in Anchorage and Fairbanks, Alaska;

[(B) the Cascades Volcano Observatory located in Vancouver, Washington;

[(C) the Hawaiian Volcano Observatory located in Hawai'i Volcanoes National Park, Hawaii;

[(D) the Yellowstone Volcano Observatory located in Yellowstone National Park in the States of Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho; and

[(E) the California Volcano Observatory, located in Menlo Park, California; and

[(12) a detailed survey of the volcanoes in the United States and the monitoring status of those volcanoes has revealed numerous serious monitoring gaps, leaving the United States exposed to preventable damage from large volcanic eruptions.]

SEC. [3]2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

(2) SYSTEM.—The term “System” means the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System established under section 4 3(a)(1).

SEC. [4]3. NATIONAL VOLCANO EARLY WARNING AND MONITORING SYSTEM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish within the United States Geological Survey a system, to be known as the “National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System”, to monitor, warn, and protect citizens of the United States from undue and avoidable harm from volcanic activity.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the System are—

(A) to organize, modernize, standardize, and stabilize the monitoring systems of the volcano observatories in the United States, which includes the Alaska Volcano Observatory, California Volcano Observatory, Cascades Volcano Observatory, Hawaiian Volcano Observatory, and Yellowstone Volcano Observatory; and

(B) to unify the monitoring systems of volcano observatories in the United States into a single interoperative system.

(3) OBJECTIVE.—The objective of the System is to monitor all the volcanoes in the United States at a level commensurate with the threat posed by the volcanoes by—

(A) upgrading existing networks on monitored volcanoes;

(B) installing new networks on unmonitored volcanoes; and

(C) employing geodetic and other components when applicable.

(b) SYSTEM COMPONENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The System shall include—

(A) a national volcano watch office that is operational 24 hours a day and 7 days a week;

(B) a national volcano data center; and

(C) an external grants program to support research in volcano monitoring science and technology.

(2) MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES.—Modernization activities under the System shall include the comprehensive application of emerging technologies, including digital broadband seismometers, real-time continuous Global Positioning System receivers, satellite and airborne radar interferometry, acoustic pressure sensors, and spectrometry to measure gas emissions.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a 5-year management plan for establishing and operating the System.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The management plan submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) annual cost estimates for modernization activities and operation of the System;

(ii) annual milestones, standards, and performance goals; and

(iii) recommendations for, and progress towards, establishing new, or enhancing existing, partnerships to leverage resources.

(2) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to assist the Secretary in implementing the System, to be comprised of representatives of relevant agencies and members of the scientific community, to be appointed by the Secretary.

(3) PARTNERSHIPS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with institutions of higher education and State agencies designating the institutions of

higher education and State agencies as volcano observatory partners for the System.

(4) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the activities under this Act with the heads of relevant Federal agencies, including—

(A) the Secretary of Transportation;

(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(C) the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(D) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Administration.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Annually, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes the activities carried out under this Act.

SEC. [5]4. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2027.

(b) EFFECT ON OTHER SOURCES OF FEDERAL FUNDING.—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement, and not supplant, Federal funds made available for other United States Geological Survey hazards activities and programs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the Murkowski amendment at the desk be agreed to, and the bill, as amended, be read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2252) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the authorization of appropriations)

On page 8, strike lines 18 through 21 and insert the following:

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$55,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 346), as amended, was passed, as follows:

S. 346

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 “National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey.

(2) SYSTEM.—The term “System” means the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System established under section 3(a)(1).

SEC. 3. NATIONAL VOLCANO EARLY WARNING AND MONITORING SYSTEM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish within the United States Geological Survey a system, to be known as the “National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System”, to monitor, warn, and protect citizens

of the United States from undue and avoidable harm from volcanic activity.

(2) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the System are—

(A) to organize, modernize, standardize, and stabilize the monitoring systems of the volcano observatories in the United States, which includes the Alaska Volcano Observatory, California Volcano Observatory, Cascades Volcano Observatory, Hawaiian Volcano Observatory, and Yellowstone Volcano Observatory; and

(B) to unify the monitoring systems of volcano observatories in the United States into a single interoperative system.

(3) OBJECTIVE.—The objective of the System is to monitor all the volcanoes in the United States at a level commensurate with the threat posed by the volcanoes by—

(A) upgrading existing networks on monitored volcanoes;

(B) installing new networks on unmonitored volcanoes; and

(C) employing geodetic and other components when applicable.

(b) SYSTEM COMPONENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The System shall include—

(A) a national volcano watch office that is operational 24 hours a day and 7 days a week;

(B) a national volcano data center; and

(C) an external grants program to support research in volcano monitoring science and technology.

(2) MODERNIZATION ACTIVITIES.—Modernization activities under the System shall include the comprehensive application of emerging technologies, including digital broadband seismometers, real-time continuous Global Positioning System receivers, satellite and airborne radar interferometry, acoustic pressure sensors, and spectrometry to measure gas emissions.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a 5-year management plan for establishing and operating the System.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The management plan submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include—

(i) annual cost estimates for modernization activities and operation of the System;

(ii) annual milestones, standards, and performance goals; and

(iii) recommendations for, and progress towards, establishing new, or enhancing existing, partnerships to leverage resources.

(2) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to assist the Secretary in implementing the System, to be comprised of representatives of relevant agencies and members of the scientific community, to be appointed by the Secretary.

(3) PARTNERSHIPS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with institutions of higher education and State agencies designating the institutions of higher education and State agencies as volcano observatory partners for the System.

(4) COORDINATION.—The Secretary shall coordinate the activities under this Act with the heads of relevant Federal agencies, including—

(A) the Secretary of Transportation;

(B) the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration;

(C) the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; and

(D) the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Administration.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Annually, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes the activities carried out under this Act.

SEC. 4. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act \$55,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2019 through 2023.

(b) EFFECT ON OTHER SOURCES OF FEDERAL FUNDING.—Amounts made available under this section shall supplement, and not supplant, Federal funds made available for other United States Geological Survey hazards activities and programs.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

PROVIDING FOR THE REAPPOINTMENT OF BARBARA M. BARRETT AS A CITIZEN REGENT OF THE BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S.J. Res. 60.

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

The clerk will report the joint resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) providing for the reappointment of Barbara M. Barrett as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 60) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 60

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Barbara M. Barrett of Arizona on January 10, 2019, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent. The reappointment is for a term of 6 years, beginning on the later of January 11, 2019, or the date of the enactment of this joint resolution.

HONORING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REACTIVATION IN 1948 OF THE 3D INFANTRY REGIMENT OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 515, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 515) honoring the 70th anniversary of the reactivation in 1948 of the 3d Infantry Regiment of the United States Army.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 515) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

NATIONAL PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 516, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 516) designating the week of May 1 through May 7, 2018, as "National Physical Education and Sport Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 516) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MAY 21, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m., Monday, May 21; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. I further ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Baiocco nomination; further, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session of the Senate ripen at 5:30 p.m., Monday; finally, that the filing deadline for first-degree

amendments to the House message to accompany S. 2372 be at 5 p.m., Monday.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MAY 21, 2018, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:10 p.m., adjourned until Monday, May 21, 2018, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. NARCISO CRUZ
COL. MARK K. MIERA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOSEPH F. JARRARD
BRIG. GEN. TRACY R. NORRIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. LAUREL J. HUMMEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. TOMMY H. BAKER
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY S. BOWEN
BRIG. GEN. SCOTT A. CAMPBELL
BRIG. GEN. JAMES D. CRAIG
BRIG. GEN. GORDON L. ELLIS
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. EPPERLY
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY E. GOWEN
BRIG. GEN. PAUL F. GRIFFIN
BRIG. GEN. KENNETH S. HARA
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER F. LAWSON
BRIG. GEN. JAMES E. PORTER, JR.
BRIG. GEN. RAFAEL A. RIBAS
BRIG. GEN. TIMOTHY J. SHERIFF
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS F. SPENCER
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL D. TURELLO
BRIG. GEN. SUZANNE P. VARES-LUM
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM J. WALKER
BRIG. GEN. RONALD A. WESTFALL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. MIGUEL AGUILAR
COL. EUGENE S. ALKIRE
COL. MARK J. BERGLUND
COL. RONALD W. BURKETT II
COL. ROBERT F. CHARLESWORTH
COL. NICK DUCICH
COL. ROBERT D. FERGUSON
COL. ADAM R. FLASCH
COL. KEVIN W. GALLAGHER
COL. JOHN T. GENTRY, JR.
COL. BRYAN J. GRENON
COL. JOHN D. HAAS
COL. EDWARD H. HALLENBECK
COL. JOE D. HARGETT
COL. ROBERT F. HEPNER, JR.
COL. CHARLES G. KEMPER IV
COL. STEVEN T. KING
COL. MICHAEL J. LEENEY
COL. ROY J. MACARAEO
COL. JOANNE E. MACGREGOR
COL. MARIE M. MAHONEY
COL. SHAWN P. MANKIE
COL. JAMES G. MCCORMACK
COL. MIGUEL A. MENDEZ
COL. NEAL S. MITSUYOSHI

COL. SHARON D. MOORE
COL. MICHAEL J. OSTER
COL. GREGORY C. PARKER
COL. SCOTT T. PETRIK
COL. JERRY F. PROCHASKA
COL. JAVIER A. REINA
COL. YESENIA R. ROQUE
COL. LEO A. RYAN
COL. MICHAEL J. SCHLORHOLTZ
COL. SCOTT M. SHERMAN
COL. TYLER B. SMITH
COL. WALTER B. STUREK, JR.
COL. JOHN F. TAYLOR, JR.
COL. THOMAS E. VERN, JR.
COL. DAMIAN K. WADDELL
COL. ROBERT F. WEIR
COL. KATHERINE E. WHITE
COL. JAMES C. WILKINS
COL. TIMOTHY J. WINSLOW

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 156:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CHRISTOPHER C. FRENCH

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CARL E. MUNDY III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. LORETTA E. REYNOLDS

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(D):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) MATTHEW T. BELL, JR.
REAR ADM. (LH) MELISSA BERT
REAR ADM. (LH) DAVID M. DERMANELIAN
REAR ADM. (LH) ROBERT P. HAYES
REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW J. TIONGSON
REAR ADM. (LH) ANTHONY J. VOGT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) ANDREW S. MCKINLEY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

KOURTNI L. STARKEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

HERMANN F. HINZE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

DIANE M. ARMBRUSTER
LELAND D. BLANCHARD II
BRADLEY K. BURNS
JOSEPH A. DINONNO
CARLOS L. HOPKINS
RICHARD M. MARCINKO
DONALD S. MITCHELL
LELAND T. SHEPHERD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

DONALD C. BREWER III
STEVE A. POSTER
CREGG M. PUCKETT
ALEJANDRO J. SANCHEZMUNOZ
CHARLES F. WALLACE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JAMES D. SPENCER II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER A. BASSETT
LAWRENCE T. BLEBOO
TIMOTHY A. BOHR
SCOTT E. BOYD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

JULIE A. CRAIG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be lieutenant colonel

CHARLES G. BLAKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

THOMAS A. URQUHART

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ROBERT L. ANDERSON II
KATHLEEN K. COOPERMAN
DARRYL E. GREEN
RONA D. GREEN
JAMES R. HAGEN
BRIAN C. HATCH
MARC D. HERWITZ
MATTHEW J. HOLCOMB
WILLIAM R. HOWARD
FRANCA R. JONES
LESLIE A. KINDLING
WILLIAM J. PLUMMER III
DONNA POULIN
JAMES C. QUICK III
MARGARET M. READ
JEFFREY J. REPASS
ARLENE R. SAITZYK
RONALD L. SCHOONOVER
THAD J. SHARP
DANIELLE M. WOOTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant commander

HAROLD C. BARNES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PAUL R. ALLEN
JESSICA S. BAIN
LAURIE E. BASABE
WILLIAM S. BYERS
LANA R. CLOUSER
DARREN J. COUTURE
JULIE A. DARLING
RONALD A. FANCHER
PATRICK J. FITZPATRICK
TRACEY R. GILES
STEPHEN L. GUIDRY
RHONDA O. HINDS
SHARON L. HOUSE
TRACY R. ISAAC
SHAWN B. KASE
RICHARD B. LAWRENCE
JEANNE M. LEWANDOWSKI
LAURA L. MCMULLEN
THOMAS OLIVERO
KIM P. SHAUGHNESSY
DARRYL B. SOL
ANDREW D. TARRANT
CRAIG T. VASS
MICHELE A. WAARA
WILLIAM W. WIEGMANN
FRANCISCO I. WONPAT
STEVEN T. YADEN
KIM T. ZABLAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JASON W. ADAMS
ARCANGELO P. DELLANNO
PAUL W. DEMEYER
JOHN H. HAMILTON IV
ALBERT L. HORNYAK
WESLEY P. JOHNSON
ANDREW J. LEWIS
RYAN D. LOOKABILL
ERIK R. NALEY
ERIK S. OBELLOS
CORY D. SCHEMM
JOHNETTA C. THOMAS
SHAWN M. TRIGGS

JASON C. WARNER
LAGENA K. G. YARBROUGH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PAUL C. CHAN
GARY W. DOSS
LANCE M. FLOOD
ANA I. FRANCO
LUKE B. GREENE
JOSEPH D. HARDER III
RANDALL E. HARMeyer
CHAD O. LORENZANA
THOMAS B. MCLEMORE
EDWARD B. MILLER IV
NATHANIEL R. STRAUB

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

PHILIP B. BAGROW
DAVID L. CLINE
MICHAEL E. FOSKETT
WAYNE M. HADDAD
ROY E. HOFFMAN
HENRY F. HOLCOMBE, JR.
PHILIP D. KING
HAGAN R. MCCLELLAN, JR.
RYAN R. RUPE
RICHARD H. RYAN, JR.
BETH A. STALLINGA
CLIFFORD A. STUART
DAVID B. THAMES
DAVID M. TODD
PAUL S. TREMBLAY
CHARLES E. VARSOGEA
BRIAN D. WEIGELT
TEDDY L. WILLIAMS, JR.
DAVID S. YANG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

HUGH BURKE
TANYA CRUZ
KATHLEEN A. ELKINS
ARTHUR L. GASTON III
JOAN M. MALIK
WAYNE A. MIANI, JR.
MEGAN K. SMITH
EDWARD K. WESTBROOK II
CHRISTOPHER M. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

ZACHARY M. ALEXANDER
JAY E. ALLARD
ALEX L. AUBIN
FRANK O. AXELSEN
DAVID A. BARROWS
RANDY S. BELL
JOHN C. BIERY
ANTHONY C. BOGANEY
CHAD BRADFORD
JORGE L. BRITO
LEO A. CARNEY
ROBERT J. CARPENTER III
JOHN B. CASON
SUSAN C. CLARK
JANINE R. DANKO
GRAY N. DAWSON
JOHN J. DEVLIN
ANDREW P. DOAN
HARLAN F. DOREY
JILL E. EMERICK
THOMAS Q. GALLAGHER
TODD A. GARDNER
TODD D. GLEESON
ELIZABETH A. GRASMUCK
JOY A. GREER
CATHERINE E. HAGAN
DANIEL B. HAWLEY
EWELL M. HOLLIS
CHADLEY R. HUEBNER
DANIEL R. JUBA
ANTHONY W. KELLER
CORY J. KUCIK
FERNANDO F. LEYVA
ANDREW H. LIN
ROBERT A. LIOTTA
MICHELLE F. LIU
NAM T. LY
WILLIAM MANN
DEBRA A. MANNING
JOEL T. MCFARLAND
PETER C. MCGOWAN
EDMUND A. MILDNER
JOE MILLER
JOHN R. MINARCIC
EMORI A. MOORE
CHRISTOPHER J. NEAL
KRISTIE A. ROBSON
CORBY D. ROPP
KRISTIAN E. SANCHACK
BETTINA M. SAUTER
JOEL M. SCHOFER
ANDREA N. SNITCHLER

LEAH K. SOLEY
DAVID M. STEVENS
SEAN P. STROUP
DANIELLE A. TAYSOM
JOHN P. TRAFELI
TRICIA E. VANWAGNER
ROBERT N. WALTER
RUSTIN C. WALTERS
NATALIE Y. WELLS
TIMOTHY M. WILKS
MARK L. WOODBRIDGE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

RENE J. ALOVA
PETER R. BARNDT
RAUL L. BARRIENTOS
THOMAS E. BERCHTOLD
JOHN E. BISSELL
PRESTON C. BRIGGS
TROY W. BROOKS
VINH D. DOAN
MARTIN E. EVERS
KELLY M. GOODIN
CHRISTOPHER M. HAMLIN
JOHN B. HOYOS
BRADLEY E. JONES
CHRISTOPHER J. KANE
NIMA A. KHORASSANI
THU N. LUU
MATTHEW B. B. MILLER
MICHAEL T. MOONEY
JOHVIN PERRY
MICHAEL E. RUDMANN
RODNEY V. SCOTT
ZHENGSHI SONG
JAMES M. THOMPSON, JR.
JOYCE Y. TURNER
HOWARD K. VANNESS
SABINA S. YUN
STEPHEN S. YUNE

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate May 17, 2018:

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
GINA HASPEL, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY.