



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 23, 2017

No. 89

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, the fountain of every blessing, we praise You for Your loving kindness and tender mercies. We are astounded by Your wonderful works to the children of humanity. Lord, we are incomplete without You. Fill our thirst for the knowledge of the sacred with Your Divine wisdom.

Today, inspire our lawmakers to do Your will. May they bring love where there is hate, light where there is darkness, and hope where there is despair. Lord, use them to transform dark yesterdays into bright tomorrows and to bring harmony from disharmony. May they rejoice because of the blessing of sins forgiven, striving to glorify You in all they do.

And Lord, stay close to those affected by the bombing in Manchester, England.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

MANCHESTER ATTACK

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, before I say anything else this morning, I

want to say this: What we saw in Manchester last night almost defies description. It was, in the words of Prime Minister May, a “callous terror attack” that stood out “for its appalling, sickening cowardice, deliberately targeting innocent, defenseless children and young people, who should have been enjoying one of the most memorable nights of their lives.”

Although we will continue to learn more about what happened, this much is very clear: Many have died, many more have been injured, and, as the Prime Minister told us, many of them were children. It is hard to imagine the pain the families of these victims must be feeling today. On behalf of the Senate and our country, let me express our heartfelt condolences to the victims, their families, and to the British people, who have been our friends and allies through many challenges.

The Senate also recognizes the many first responders, medical professionals, and citizens who stepped in to provide help.

As I speak, I know that the intelligence professionals from both of our countries are already working to discover whether this was the result of an individual attacker or directed by ISIL. In either case, the people of America will stand with our allies and provide any assistance we possibly can.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as colleagues know, it is once again the time of the year when Congress gets to work putting together the next budget. One of the initial steps in the process is typically for the President to send up a blueprint of his own laying out his priorities, as Members continue to work through conversations here as well.

The President's budget is being released this morning, and here are a few things we should know about it already: It builds on the progress made

earlier this month on defense, prioritizing more of the resources our servicemembers need. It builds on progress made earlier this month on border security, calling for investing in more of the infrastructure and technology our law enforcement officers actually need. And, unlike any of President Obama's budget blueprints, this one actually achieves balance.

The provisions I mentioned are encouraging to see. I am sure they will serve as guideposts for Chairman ENZI and the Budget Committee as they move forward on this matter.

I also appreciate the President's commitment to slowing the growth of mandatory spending, which, if left unaddressed, could eventually limit our ability to invest in nearly anything else as the debt—and the interest we have to pay on it—increases and crowds out spending on other major priorities.

This Thursday, Treasury Secretary Mnuchin will testify in front of the Finance Committee on the budget blueprint and, with it, the administration's interest in tax reform. I know we are all eager to learn more from him and look forward to working with the administration to make our Tax Code simpler and fairer for the American people and American businesses.

Over the years, our tax system has grown only more complex and more punitive, putting both individuals and employers at a disadvantage, while also inadvertently incentivizing American companies and jobs to leave this country to go overseas. It is evident that we need serious reforms to our Tax Code, the type that will help families keep more of their hard-earned money, while also helping businesses put more Americans to work.

By implementing tax reform, we can again encourage investment in our country, allowing American businesses to expand, hire more workers, improve wages, and offer better benefits. In turn, families will have access to more

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3075

opportunities and will be better positioned to actually get ahead.

It has been over three decades since we passed comprehensive tax reform, and it is past time we do something about it. Fortunately, we now have an administration that shares this interest in finally improving our tax system instead of making it even more convoluted and constricting—and without demanding \$1 trillion in new taxes for the government.

Easing the burden on the middle class and getting the economy moving again are top concerns here in the Republican Senate. We understand that for the past 8 years, too many families struggled under the weight of an economy that failed to reach its potential, too many took home wages that didn't meet their needs, and too many saw opportunity slip away. We understand that these families deserve a change in direction and expect each of us to do what we can to get the economy moving again soon. That is why we passed legislation to provide relief from Obama-era regulations that stifle growth, and it is why we will keep working to advance more legislative solutions to help hard-working Americans. Tax reform is one way we can do just that.

This is an area where Republicans and Democrats have been able to find some common ground in the past, and I am hopeful our friends across the aisle will join us in working toward comprehensive tax reform one more time. Either way, the Republican Senate remains committed to enacting tax reform so we can help encourage American investment, boost job creation, and promote wage growth all across our country.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume

consideration of the Sullivan nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

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. 54, Courtney Elwood to be General Counsel of the CIA.

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Courtney Elwood, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

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 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 Courtney Elwood, of Virginia, to be General Counsel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Mitch McConnell, John Barrasso, Mike Crapo, Jerry Moran, Michael B. Enzi, James M. Inhofe, Richard Burr, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, Shelley Moore Capito, Thom Tillis, Orrin G. Hatch, Marco Rubio, John Boozman, John Cornyn, John Hoeven, James E. Risch.

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

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the Sullivan nomination.

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

If no one yields time, the time will be charged equally to the two sides.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

MANCHESTER ATTACK

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, the Senate's thoughts and prayers go out to everyone in Manchester, England. Such violence is particularly heartbreaking when it happens, as it did in Manchester, at a concert with so many young people there to enjoy.

We mourn the families of the victims of last night's terrorist attack. We hope the perpetrators are quickly found and brought to justice. I saw on TV a mother waiting, trying to email and text her daughter. She got no answer. She was wondering where her daughter was. It brought back the horrible memories for me after 9/11, the day after, when I went up there and saw hundreds of people holding up signs: "Have you seen my wife Evelyn?" "Have you seen my son John," not knowing if they were alive or dead. Most of them ended up being dead.

We hope and pray that mother, and all the other mothers, fathers, brothers, and sisters who are waiting for news that maybe their child, their relative, is alive, will find them alive. Our prayers go out to them.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. President, now, on another matter completely, last night, it was reported in the Washington Post that President Trump attempted to enlist the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, and the Director of the National Security Agency, Admiral Rogers, in helping the administration push back against reports in the press about an investigation into the President's campaign and its potential ties to Russia.

According to the same reporting, White House staff may also have "sounded out top intelligence officials about the possibility of intervening directly" with the FBI and Mr. Comey to get them to drop the investigation into General Flynn.

If these reports are accurate, it is another piece of now-mounting evidence that this White House has no interest—no interest—in allowing the Russia investigation to proceed without partisan interference, and the White House seems to have little respect for the principles of the rule of law. We have not quite seen anything like it in a very long time.

Such allegations only reinforce the correctness of the decision to appoint Special Counsel Mueller to oversee the investigation and should strengthen our resolve to ensure that he is insulated from interference from this White House. Such allegations also strengthen, again, the need for an independent, nonpartisan FBI Director.

With all these reports of attempts to interfere with the investigation, we cannot have an FBI Director who has a political background, who doesn't seem right down the middle, who doesn't

seem to be a Director's Director, a prosecutor's prosecutor, an investigator's investigator. No politician or candidate with insufficient impartiality should be selected by the President or confirmed by the Senate. We Democrats will stand very strongly for that.

Given the almost daily reports about potential meddling and misconduct by this administration, Congress must exercise its oversight authority in order to keep this administration in check. Both the executive branch and the congressional investigations must proceed. This is not about politics or political advantage. When a foreign power, particularly an enemy of our country like Putin and Russia, tries to interfere in your elections—and will probably do it again in the future—we have to know everything that happened, who participated, and make sure it doesn't happen again.

If people who participated in it—if there are such people—get away with it this time, many more will do it next time. So this is an issue of national interest, national security, and even the future of our democracy. I remind colleagues that in our Constitution, the Founding Fathers worried about foreign interference in our government. When I read that in high school and again in college, I said: Well, that doesn't seem real. It is all too real today, showing both the wisdom of the Founding Fathers and the need for strong oversight.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. President, now, on the budget, today, the President will release his full budget for fiscal year 2018. From all indications, the Trump budget will seek deep cuts to programs that help the middle class and working America while providing more handouts to the rich. It will cut to the bone programs that help the elderly, the poor, while adding money for an unnecessary, ineffective border wall that continues to have bipartisan opposition.

To make all the math work, the Trump budget makes entirely unfounded assumptions about economic growth. In short, the Trump budget takes a sledgehammer to the middle class and the working poor, lavishes tax breaks on the wealthy, and imagines all of the deficit problems away with fantasy math. The Trump budget exists somewhere over the rainbow, where the dreams of Nick Mulvaney, PAUL RYAN, and the Koch brothers really do come true.

Of course, these dreams are a nightmare for the average working American. We expect the Trump budget will make deep cuts to the National Institutes of Health and Centers for Disease Control. Let me ask, How many people in America want to cut cancer research when it has done such good? Well, President Trump evidently does. It is his budget.

They kneecap research that develops new cures, damaging our ability to contain or prevent the outbreak of disease. We are all living longer and

healthier, in part because of this research. We want to stop it, cut it back, so we can give tax breaks to wealthy people who, God bless them, are doing great already?

We expect the Trump budget will gash programs like Meals on Wheels. I even read in the paper this morning that the head of the Freedom Caucus said that even for him some of these cuts were too great. The SNAP benefits, making sure no kid goes to bed hungry in America—this is America. We have always done this. The Children's Health Insurance Program, cruelly ripping away the lifelines from Americans who need it the most, the children, the working poor, the elderly.

We expect the Trump budget will cut transportation funding, education funding, and programs that help students repay their student loan debt. One of the great problems in America, the debt on the backs—the burden on average kids getting out of college, middle-class kids, we are going to make it harder? What is going on here? What is going on in the White House with this kind of budget?

Our college kids, when they get out, they need to be able to live real good lives and not have this burden of debt on their shoulders which they are struggling under now. We are going to make it worse. We also—it is amazing but true. The Trump budget will break President Trump's promise to protect Social Security and Medicaid from cuts, both of these. He promised over and over again he would not cut Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

Medicare was not cut here, but Medicaid is and Social Security is. On Social Security, the budget will cut Social Security disability benefits to many Americans who have earned them and paid for those benefits. You can say: Well, it doesn't cut old-age benefits for the elderly. Wait. If they get away with this, the elderly will be next on the chopping block because the goal, it seems, of this budget is to cut everything you can so you can give even more tax breaks to the wealthiest people—the Koch brothers type of thinking.

It will also seek hundreds of billions of dollars—additional cuts—in Medicaid. The budget cuts Medicaid on top of the cuts that were made in the House bill for TrumpCare. What will that do? Medicaid has become a middle-class program. For sixty percent of the people in nursing homes, Medicaid funds it.

What are we going to tell a couple with three kids? Say, they are 40 or 45. They have three kids. They are saving for college, they are struggling, but at least they know that mom or dad, who needs help, is in a nursing home. If this budget passes, that family is going to have a terrible choice: Take hundreds of dollars a month out of their own budget and give it to pay for the nursing home or find a place for mom and dad to live, maybe at home. Maybe there is no room in the house. It is awful. That is what they are doing.

What else will it hurt? Opioid addiction. Much of the progress we are trying to make on opioid addiction comes through Medicaid because they give treatment. We need law enforcement—I am a tough law enforcement guy; you know that—but we also need treatment. I have had fathers cry in my arms because their sons—in this case, it was both sons—were waiting online for treatment and died of an overdose. What a burden a parent has to live with. We should cut that and cut it to give more tax breaks to the rich? It is an America turned upside down—this budget.

How about rural areas? I represent New York State. It is known for its big city, New York City. We have other great cities upstate, but we also have the third largest rural population in America. So I am very familiar with rural America. In many of my counties in upstate New York—and this is true in rural counties throughout America—the largest employer is the rural hospital. That hospital is the only hospital around for miles and miles and miles if, God forbid, you have a stroke and you have to be rushed there to get better.

Well, go talk to our rural hospitals. These rural hospitals are the beating heart of our local economy, employing hundreds, sometimes even thousands, of people. Well, nearly one in three rural hospitals today is at risk of closure. It is more expensive to run a rural hospital. People in rural areas are entitled to the same healthcare, so that means buying all these fancy machines. In an urban area, those machines can run 24/7 and get the reimbursement back, but in a rural area they can't. There are not that many people, but they get some help.

The Trump cuts to Medicaid would cause a whole bunch of these rural hospitals to close and many more to lay off employees, hurting healthcare in rural America, and hurting jobs in rural America—places that need help.

The Trump budget on top of TrumpCare, which seeks more than \$800 billion in cuts to Medicaid, would decimate healthcare options for rural Americans and pull the plug on many of these rural hospitals. Some of my colleagues will be talking more about that this morning.

When you add all of it up, the Trump budget is comic-book-villain bad. Just like comic books, it relies on a fantasy to make all the numbers work. It is the kind of budget you might expect from someone who is openly rooting for a government shutdown. Haven't we heard the President say that? It is the latest example of the President breaking his promises to working Americans. This budget breaks promise after promise after promise that the President made to what he called the forgotten America, the working men and women of America. He said that he would help them, and this budget goes directly against them.

In his speech to Congress, for instance, earlier this year the President

called education “the civil rights issue of our time,” but his budget guts vital school programs, our future, our kids. He said: “Cures to illnesses that have always plagued us are not too much to hope,” but his budget slashes funding at the NIH and CDC where they do this research. And he said: “Save Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security without cuts. Have to do it,” but his budget cuts Social Security disability insurance and ends Medicaid as we know it.

The Trump budget is one giant, brazen, broken promise to the working men and women of America. It completely abandons them. Fundamentally, this is a deeply unserious proposal that should roundly be rejected by both parties here in Congress. I am optimistic that is what will happen.

We should follow the same blueprint we did in the 2017 budget: Both Democrats and Republicans, House and Senate, in a bipartisan way, everyone compromised. We should get together, negotiate a serious proposal that maintains our commitments to the middle class and actually sets up our economy to grow.

We cannot let the President turn America inside out with his budget. We have to stand together, Democrats and Republicans, and reject it for the sake of middle-class and working Americans. The Trump budget hopefully will not see the light of day.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it was quite edifying to be sitting here listening to the Democratic leader speak this morning during the morning remarks, expressing his concern for healthcare, rural hospitals, and talking about his concerns about delivering healthcare to the poor. It is indeed ironic because at a time when ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, is literally in meltdown with unaffordable premiums and deductibles, we are not seeing any help whatsoever from our Democratic colleagues. I would suggest, rather than rail against the President's budget, they ought to be engaged in a more constructive process of working with us to make sure we can deliver on the promise of affordable healthcare to all Americans.

Of course, there is the matter of the President's budget itself. I remember that President Obama's last budget got voted on here in the U.S. Senate. It got one vote—one vote. A President's budget is not binding on the Congress. The Congress passes a budget resolution, both houses, and we anticipate doing that again.

The President's budget is really a statement of the President's priorities. Frankly, there are some things in the President's proposed budget that I think are worthwhile—things like securing our border. At the end of the day, it is the job of Congress, though, to pass a budget that reflects the priorities of our country.

I think it is worth pointing out that several aspects of the President's bud-

get are encouraging and a welcome change from the previous administration. For one, it balances in 10 years. I would love to have our Democratic colleagues express some concern for the fact that we continue to spend money we don't have and impose the burden of repaying that money someday on future generations. To me, that is one of the most immoral things we do in this country; we spend the money today, and we leave the debt to our children and grandchildren to pay that back, which they must at some point. So when the President proposes a budget that actually balances in 10 years, I think that is a good thing. What a welcome relief from a White House budget anchored around overspending and growing the size of government, which we have seen for the last 8 years.

The other thing the President's budget does is reverse the defense sequester. This is the artificial cap we put on defense spending.

Of all the things the Federal Government does, national security is the No. 1 job. You can't outsource that to anyone. It is our No. 1 responsibility to keep the country safe and to keep America strong. Under the Obama administration, there was a cap put in place that prevented increased military spending, and indeed we saw cuts to the military of about 20 percent during the Obama years.

One thing that President Trump has done, which I find a welcome sign, is to properly resource our military so we can better defend against increasing threats around the world. It is simply irresponsible for us to allow our men and women in the military to operate on slashed budgets and outdated equipment. They can't even train and be ready for the next fight. The best deterrent to war and the best assurance of peace is a strong America. The President's budget reflects a better understanding of the threat environment ahead, and for that I am grateful.

So rather than railing against the President's budget, which he knows will not be passed into law—because no President's budget ever becomes law; it is a proposal of the President's priorities. As I said, there is much to like among the President's priorities—balancing the budget, emphasizing national security spending, and the like. Ultimately, we will have to come up with a budget ourselves. So I find the Democratic leader's railing against the President's budget, which he knows will not become law as written, somewhat ironic.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, on another matter, I have the privilege of serving as the chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration. It is a role I take seriously in light of the many challenges our Nation faces when it comes to security and trade along our southern border.

The Texas-Mexico border makes up more than 60 percent of the total U.S. southern border. That means Texas is

at the epicenter of the national security conversation when it comes to border security and protecting communities that thrive on cross-border trade, not to mention the U.S. economy that reaps 5 million jobs as a result of binational trade with Mexico alone.

Later today, the subcommittee will have a chance to examine this important topic and consider ways that Congress can help the Trump administration make America safer and our borders stronger. In particular, I look forward to hearing from Chief Ron Vitiello, who is currently Acting Deputy Commissioner for Customs and Border Protection. He actually is the head Border Patrol agent for the Federal Government, a man who has spent many years on the frontlines and knows from experience the challenges that exist in securing the border.

Customs and Border Protection agents and officers face a range of challenges every day, working in some of the most inhospitable environments and remote locations, often without adequate resources or equipment. They work tirelessly to combat drug trafficking, arms smuggling, illegal immigration, and human trafficking, while simultaneously working to facilitate legitimate trade and travel between Mexico and the United States.

I spoke a little bit about this yesterday in light of NAFTA's importance to the Texas and U.S. economy. Texas is a first port of entry for many goods and many people coming from all over the world, and it takes a solid team of Customs and Border Patrol professionals and good leadership to manage the border and the many ports of entry along it. I am grateful to Chief Vitiello for his hard work and look forward to his testimony this afternoon.

This administration has made clear that securing the border is a top priority, and I agree with that. I am confident that with topnotch leaders like Secretary Kelly of the Department of Homeland Security and Attorney General Jeff Sessions, we will finally make real progress toward getting it done.

The appropriations bill that was recently signed into law included the largest increase for border security technologies and infrastructure improvement in more than a decade. Fortunately, the President's budget supports increased investment in border security and immigration enforcement, as well, including new infrastructure and technologies to help us achieve operational control of the southern border. This focus on border security is a welcome change from the previous administration, and I am glad we now have leaders who will take the need to achieve true border security seriously.

I have always said that border security ultimately is a matter of political will. The Obama administration didn't have it; the Trump administration does. With the political will and with the guidance of experts like Chief Vitiello and others who tell us exactly

what the Border Patrol needs in order to secure the border, I am confident of our ability to get it done.

I will just relate the conversation I had with the Chief of the Rio Grande Border Patrol sector, Chief Manny Padilla. Chief Padilla long served in the Border Patrol in many different places along the border.

Of course, the border is very different in San Diego than it is in the Rio Grande Valley of Texas. For one thing, Texas has virtually all private property along the border and, of course, is separated by the Rio Grande River from Mexico.

What Chief Padilla has said to me, which I believe is absolutely the case, is that it takes three different things to secure the border. It takes infrastructure. You can call it fencing, like the Secure Fence Act that we passed a few years ago that almost all of our Democratic colleagues voted for. It takes things like levy walls, which we have in Hidalgo County and the Rio Grande Valley. But it also takes technology and personnel because we know that no piece of infrastructure alone is going to provide the security we need. But fundamentally we need to regain the people's trust and confidence that the Federal Government will carry out its primary responsibility to protect our citizens and defend our borders.

Border security is complex. It is multifaceted and requires an approach that includes air, sea, and land. That is why we need a multilayered approach to border security that includes infrastructure, like the President talks about frequently when he talks about the wall. It takes technology, and it takes the men and women in the Border Patrol who do the dangerous but important work of keeping our border secure and keeping our country safe.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, shortly we will be voting on cloture on the nomination of John Sullivan, the nominee to be Deputy Secretary of State, and as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I urge my colleagues to support the cloture motion and support the nomination of John Sullivan to be the next Deputy Secretary of State.

MANCHESTER ATTACK

Before I begin, I want to express that I strongly condemn yesterday's heart-breaking attack in Manchester. I want to express my sincere condolences to the families of those who lost loved ones, especially the innocent and defenseless children who were brutally killed. As a father and grandfather, I mourn with them, and I am praying for the recovery of the injured.

The United States stands in firm solidarity with our friends in the United Kingdom. The United States will provide the necessary assistance as British authorities work to bring those responsible to justice. I know I speak for all my colleagues in the Senate in our sol-

idarity with our friends in the United Kingdom.

Mr. President, in regard to Mr. Sullivan's nomination to be Deputy Secretary of State, he is well qualified for that position. He served in the Justice Department and in the private practice of law. He served as Deputy General Counsel at the Department of Defense. He also has been involved in the Department of Commerce, where he was General Counsel and Deputy Secretary. He is well familiar with government. He served in public positions and also brings private experience as a lawyer to the position of Deputy Secretary of State.

I do want to point out—as I pointed out to Mr. Sullivan and as most members of our committee did—that he will find himself home alone for a period of time, in that the Trump administration has not submitted to Congress nominees for important positions at the Department of State. Yes, I have confidence in the career people at the Department of State, but there are times that we have to have a confirmed person in control in order to advance policies. So it is important—from embassy security, to fighting terrorism, to helping with the humanitarian challenges we have around the world and the administration of our missions in all the countries around the world—that we have a team in place. The Trump administration has been slow in providing us with qualified individuals to fill these positions. Thus far, the administration has decided to treat the State Department as an inconvenience rather than as a critical national security asset.

Secondly, I want to express my concern about something that will make Mr. Sullivan's job a lot more difficult—the international affairs budget for fiscal year 2018 that the administration is unveiling today. Although we are still receiving details, as I look at the massive spending cuts to vital national security, it is impossible to conclude this is anything but an “America alone” budget—one that, if enacted, will have disastrous effects on our standing in the world.

Let me repeat one more time that the money we spend on development assistance, on diplomacy, and that we spend in regard to helping our allies around the world and countries around the world is part of our national security budget. It is part of our national security budget, and yet the President's fiscal year 2018 budget would compromise national security.

As Secretary Mattis has said—often quoted on this floor—if you don't give the Secretary of State and the State Department the resources they need, you better be prepared to give them more ammunition and more soldiers because it is going to be more costly for them to defend.

It is very disappointing that the budget slashes critical support to our allies in their efforts to defeat terrorism, including zeroing out counter-

insurgency support in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. It will slash funds to support the defense needs of countless foreign partner countries and offer them the unpalatable option of going into debt to the United States to get the defense equipment and support they need. This is certain to damage our security, counterterrorism, and security interests with these countries and prove a golden opportunity for Russia and China to take the place of the United States. This is serious business. If we don't help countries that are part of our coalition against terrorism, if we don't give them the resources to help us, then, quite clearly, our enemies will move in. As we know, Russia has done many things against U.S. interests. The voids will be quickly picked up by Russia and China.

This is a budget proposal that cuts support to European allies to counter Russia's aggression—precisely when Russia's assault on our democracy and the democracies of our European democracies has reached a fever pitch. At a time when the United States should be standing up for our allies and partners in Europe, this budget zeros out the Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia—AEECA—account and eliminates the European Reassurance Initiative altogether. This was an initiative that was set up to counter Russia's influence in Europe, and we are going to zero that out?

This is a budget proposal that walks away from the promotion of democratic values. It slashes funding for human rights and democracy programs abroad and hollows out the ideas, initiatives, and institutions on which U.S. leadership and international order rests, like the United Nations Peacekeeping.

In his remarks in Saudi Arabia this past weekend, President Trump applauded Jordan, Turkey, and Lebanon for their role in hosting refugees. Yet draconian humanitarian funding cuts would harm these very friends and allies who are hosting millions of refugees. What an inconsistent message. It also eliminates the U.N. emergency food aid program at a time of famine in Africa and the Middle East. If these budget cuts are implemented, many people around the world will die as a result of diminished resources and support that would result. We can't let that happen.

It is a budget proposal that undermines our ability to deal with pressing national security challenges, including development assistance, humanitarian aid, and climate change. The administration's budget proposal slashes more than 30 percent from our foreign assistance budget and dramatically cuts support for critical programs to save the lives of mothers in childbirth, feed hungry children, educate young people, train farmers, and the like. These programs exemplify U.S. values and promote the power of democracy and the importance of protecting human rights.

America's trademark is its values, what we stand for, our leadership globally, and this budget would compromise our ability to promote American values.

This is a penny wise, pound foolish budget, as the security challenges that will grow from these humanitarian catastrophes will dwarf the cost of helping to address the challenges before they metastasize into failed states and havens for extremism. If we don't help, we will have to pay on the other end.

When we fail to help countries provide the stability they need to take care of their population, they become a breeding ground for terrorists. We then have to respond with the use of our military, and it is much more costly. It costs people their lives.

Climate change—perhaps the most pressing national security challenge that faces the globe in the 21st century—receives less than just neglect; this is a budget that actively provides a catastrophic effect on climate-induced instability. We will not be able to respond to our international obligations in regard to climate change.

I understand that for Mr. Sullivan, if confirmed, this is the budget proposal he has to accept and defend; however, both he and Secretary Tillerson should be put on notice that I—and I think I speak for a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—consider this budget dead on arrival. I would call on him to consider how, if confirmed, he will work with the Senate to develop a more serious budget proposal over the coming months that safeguards and promotes American interests in the world, that deepens our partnerships and alliances, that is sufficient to meet the challenges of an increasingly aggressive Russia and increasingly assertive China on the world stage, that provides our Nation the tools it needs to address the pressing humanitarian crises and challenges, and that supports and defends our universal values in the best tradition of our Nation.

That is what we need to do as a Congress. We are the ones who will pass the budget. We are the ones who have the responsibility to make sure our budget speaks to our priorities, our values, and our national interests. Yet it is very disappointing to see the President of the United States submit a budget that is just the opposite of what it should be in regard to putting money toward American values and national security. We will be looking upon Mr. Sullivan, if he is confirmed, to work with us so we can develop a budget that really speaks to American values and American interests.

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. 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.

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 John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State.

Mitch McConnell, Cory Gardner, Tom Cotton, Roy Blunt, Jeff Flake, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Ron Johnson, James E. Risch, Joni Ernst, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, Bob Corker, David Perdue, John Hoeven, James M. Inhofe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). 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 John J. Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of State, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON).

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 134 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blumenthal	Grassley	Peters
Blunt	Hassan	Portman
Boozman	Hatch	Reed
Brown	Heinrich	Risch
Burr	Heitkamp	Roberts
Cantwell	Heller	Rounds
Capito	Hirono	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sasse
Carper	Inhofe	Schatz
Casey	Johnson	Schumer
Cassidy	Kaine	Scott
Cochran	Kennedy	Shaheen
Collins	King	Shelby
Coons	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Corker	Lankford	Strange
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Lee	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	Markey	Tillis
Cruz	McCain	Toomey
Daines	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	McConnell	Van Hollen
Durbin	Menendez	Warner
Enzi	Merkley	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden
Fischer	Murphy	Young

NAYS—6

Booker	Gillibrand	Sanders
Duckworth	Harris	Warren

NOT VOTING—1

Isakson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 93, the nays are 6.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Utah.

THE INTERNET

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Federal Communication Commission's welcome proposal to end utility-style regulation of the internet by reversing the 2015 open internet order.

Anyone who has followed the hyperbolic debate about net neutrality has likely heard that the FCC is moving to squelch competition, limit consumer choice, raise prices, and perhaps even destroy the internet. That is my favorite one. At least that is what some activists and crusading late-night comedians claim. But none of this is true—none of it.

Rather, the FCC is reviewing the light-touch regulatory environment that, from the outset, facilitated the kind of innovation that produced the internet and expanded internet access to millions of Americans over the course of many years.

In order to understand this complicated issue, we need to be honest about what led us to where we are today; that is, the FCC's 2015 open internet order. The Obama-era FCC claimed that its order implemented net neutrality, or the equal treatment of all data over the internet, but that isn't quite right. The actual change was far broader than that.

The FCC reclassified broadband internet access service as a title II telecommunication service, instead of a title I information service. That might sound like a small change, but this soundingly small—some might even say soundingly innocuous—change applied a whole host of New Deal era regulations that were meant to apply to monopolistic telephone companies, monopolistic utility companies, and they applied those to the internet.

It subjected 21st century technology to the same rules that governed rotary telephones in the 1930s. Why, then, did the FCC do this? It wasn't because a free and open internet was harming Americans. The activists and entertainers clamoring for more government control of the internet claimed that it was under attack by predatory internet service providers but, strangely enough, none of them actually provided evidence for that very serious assertion.

If you are going to make that claim, back it up, point to evidence. Instead, they speak about imaginary or hypothetical harms. The 400-page order uses words like “may,” “could,” “might,” or “potentially” not just here and there, not just a few times but several hundred times. Nor did the FCC issue the open internet order because Congress told it to.

On the contrary, nearly 20 years ago, our colleague Senator WYDEN, along with then-Senator John Kerry and others, expressly argued against the drastic action that would later be taken by the FCC in 2015. After passing the bipartisan Telecommunications Act in 1996, this group of Senators affirmed

the internet's status as a free and open information service, stating that "nothing in the 1996 Act or its legislative history suggests that Congress intended to alter the current classification of Internet and other information services or to expand traditional telephone regulation to new and advanced services."

Finally, the FCC did not intervene because it had evidence of market failure. When the FCC issued its order, the internet was still an explosive source of growth and innovation throughout America and throughout the world—as it had been for decades—when greater and greater numbers of Americans gained access to the internet for the first time. Perhaps, because of this inconvenient fact, the FCC hardly considered the possible economic effects of its regulations. The FCC's chief economist at the time went so far as to say the rules were an "economics-free zone."

What the internet does need is regulatory certainty, which is why I recently introduced the Restoring Internet Freedom Act, along with several of my colleagues. This bill would fully repeal the FCC's 2015 internet takeover. More importantly, it would prevent the FCC from interfering with the internet in the future unless such actions were specifically authorized by Congress.

We shouldn't stop there. Instead of waiting for regulators and activists to find new excuses to restrict the internet, we should open it further to extend more choices to American consumers. In other words, we should ensure that Federal policy promotes competition.

As we know from experience, heavy-handed regulations like the FCC's order tend to favor large, deep-pocketed companies over startups that can't afford an army of lobbyists in Washington. Removing these regulatory barriers will allow upstart entrepreneurs to compete with incumbents for consumers' loyalty. Those consumers—ordinary Americans and their families—will benefit from the improved service and lower prices that this kind of competition inevitably creates.

Most American households currently have access to at least one internet service provider. Many have access to two or more, which might look like a competitive market exists for those households, but regulations can keep these different options from being adequate substitutes for one another.

The government restricts access to valuable resources that could be used for high-quality internet services. According to a 2012 report by the Obama administration, the Federal Government is sitting on upwards of 60 percent of the best radio spectrum, so-called "beachfront" spectrum, which could be put to use for commercial internet services like 5G wireless broadband.

Meanwhile, excessive permitting, licensing, and environmental impact

regulations delayed broadband deployment over Federal and public lands, especially in the West.

Finally, the Office of Management and Budget found that private parties spend nearly \$800 million each year to comply with FCC paperwork requirements. The bill for this ends up being paid entirely by ordinary American families.

Thankfully, my colleagues in the Senate have already identified many of these problems and have done work to address them. Senators KLOBUCHAR and DAINES have spent considerable time on policies to streamline broadband internet deployment through their "dig-once" proposals. Senator HELLER is a champion for reducing barriers for deploying broadband throughout the West. Senators THUNE and NELSON, the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Commerce, have introduced measures in the past to free up radio spectrum held by Federal agencies and organizations.

These are just a few of the many thoughtful ideas to reduce barriers to entry and increase competition, which has the potential to improve quality and bring down prices. The bipartisan nature of these policies demonstrates a clear understanding that improvements can be made, and everyone should be able to agree that more competition is better for American consumers, especially those in rural or low-income housing.

Everyone should also be able to agree that consumers should be protected from unfair and deceptive business practices. Thankfully, the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission already enforce fair rules that protect Americans' enjoyment of a free and open internet.

The combination of competition and strong enforcement of antitrust and consumer protections provides the benefits of an innovative marketplace while avoiding problems that come from tired, anti-consumer, outdated regulations like title II and like the 2015 open internet order.

For the sake of American consumers and innovators—not for entrenched business interests—I hope to work with partners in the House, Senate, and the FCC to promote competition in the technology sector, including among internet service providers. If that means underperforming companies have to work a little harder for their customers, that is all the better, because the end result of lively competition is more investment and innovation by businesses, which translates into more choices and better service for consumers.

I encourage my colleagues, regardless of party or ideology, to work with me on this project. If they are truly interested in a better internet—not just government intrusion and control for its own sake—I am sure they can help me identify other barriers to entry to the information superhighway.

For now, a good start to ensure that American consumers and small busi-

nesses benefit from the internet is to repeal the FCC's 2015 internet takeover, enforce antitrust, unfair, and deceptive practice standards, and encourage competition among internet firms. Only then can we guarantee an internet that is free and open for everyone.

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

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

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

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

TRIBUTE TO BONNIE SEAMAN

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to commend Bonnie Seaman, who has loyally served the people of Pennsylvania for more than 40 years, more recently as the director of constituent services for my Senate office. Bonnie has not only been a trusted member of my staff but a very close family friend.

Bonnie was born and raised on a turkey farm in Leck Kill, PA. She is the youngest of four children. She first began her public service career in county government at what was then known as the Northumberland County Mental Health and Mental Retardation Department, where she touched the lives of people in her community.

In pursuit of a college degree, Bonnie attended Indiana University of Pennsylvania and graduated cum laude with a degree in education. After graduation, she worked as a special education teacher.

Bonnie's passion for helping others steered her career to the Pennsylvania State Senate. While working in the Pennsylvania Senate, she was asked by her supervisor if she was interested in working on my father's transition team after he was elected Governor of Pennsylvania in 1986. This transition job offer was supposed to be temporary, but Bonnie would spend the next 30 years working in State government for both then-Governor Casey and then me, when I got to State government years later.

She worked as the Governor's executive assistant for 8 years, and of course she wore many hats, managing the Governor's staff, scheduling events, and resolving constituent issues, but her most important role was providing support to the Governor. Her dedication and loyalty earned her the respect of her fellow employees in the Governor's office as well as those she worked with outside of the office.

After working in Governor Casey's administration, Bonnie worked as well with my father on his autobiography entitled "Fighting for Life." In his book he pays tribute to her as follows:

I could never have made it through this project without my executive assistant,

Bonnie Seaman. It's hard to think of any work I have done these past ten years without Bonnie. Another theme of this book is loyalty, and few people have taught me more about the trait than Bonnie. I am deeply indebted to her for the skill and good spirit she brings to our work right up to this day.

That was written more than 20 years ago—just about 22 years ago. Of course, I can say the same thing about Bonnie's work in the U.S. Senate. In 1996, when I was elected the State's auditor general, Bonnie was vital to, first, my transition team. Then she served as the director of the Office of the Auditor General for 8 years, where she oversaw day-to-day operations of my schedule and the management of staff. When I was elected State treasurer in 2004, Bonnie began work with the Treasury Department. Then, finally, when I was elected in 2006 to the Senate, I asked Bonnie to serve as director of constituent services. I knew that her dedication to public service and compassion for others would make her an excellent director. She led the office of constituent services for 10 years with distinction. With her gold standard professionalism, and unimpeachable ethics, she was a mentor to her staff and served as a shining example of quality public service. Through her work, Bonnie has touched the lives of over 60,000 Pennsylvania constituents.

On behalf of my family, as well as thousands of families across our Commonwealth, I express our gratitude to Bonnie Seaman for more than three decades of stellar public service. The building we worked in, in Harrisburg, has this inscription on the front of it, the finance building: "All public service is a trust, given in faith and accepted in honor." Bonnie accepted the trust that was placed in her. She kept faith with taxpayers and brought honor to her work. I wish Bonnie well in her retirement as she travels with her husband Tom, attends yoga classes, and enjoys time with her family and friends.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

(The remarks of Mr. COTTON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1202 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. COTTON. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STRANGE). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:31 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled

when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore, the Senator from Utah.

INTERNATIONAL DATA PRIVACY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss international data privacy. This is a critically important issue that has become all the more important over the years as we become more sophisticated. It has become all the more pressing in recent months as a result of court decisions impacting law enforcement's ability to access electronic communications overseas.

I don't think it would surprise anyone to hear me say that our privacy laws have not kept pace with technological developments. The primary statute that governs law enforcement's ability to access electronic data, the Electronic Communications Privacy Act, or ECPA, was enacted over 30 years ago—long before most people had even heard of email or the internet. ECPA was drafted in a world in which electronic data was stored on personal computers or on servers located in offices or homes. It presumes a world where data is in one location and where in order to access data, a person simply goes to the relevant location and retrieves it. But that is not the world we live in, at least not today. Nowadays, much of our data is stored not on home or office computers but in the cloud, a network of remote servers spread throughout the world that allows us to access data from literally anywhere.

The rise of cloud and remote network computing has transformed the way companies and individuals store data. No longer is data stored on sites or in one discrete location; rather, data pertaining to a single individual or even to a single document may be stored at multiple sites, spread across countries or even across continents. This has created all sorts of complications for our laws.

ECPA requires law enforcement to obtain a warrant before it can access many types of electronic communications. It also prohibits disclosure to foreign entities. Warrants, however, traditionally have stopped at the water's edge. A judge here in Washington can issue a warrant authorizing law enforcement to search an office here in Washington but cannot issue a warrant for searches in London or Paris.

So what is law enforcement to do in a world of cloud computing where pieces of the same electronic document might be stored in Washington, London, and Paris?

One possibility is to say that as long as the data is accessible from the United States—that is, so long as you can retrieve it by logging on to a computer somewhere in the United States—that is all that matters; law enforcement can order its disclosure.

This sort of maximalist approach, however, brings with it a whole host of problems. To begin with, it pays scant attention to the laws and interests of other countries, including our closest allies. Other countries, it turns out, have data privacy laws of their own, and just like ECPA, sometimes these laws prohibit disclosure to foreign entities, including foreign law enforcement. So to say U.S. law enforcement can compel disclosure and data stored anywhere in the world so long as that data is accessible in the United States is really to say that U.S. law enforcement can override the laws of other countries.

More particularly, it is to say U.S. law enforcement can order individuals or companies that store data overseas to violate the privacy laws of other countries. This is unfair to service providers who may find themselves on the wrong side of the law no matter which side they choose and does little to help international relations. It also undermines trust, drives customers to foreign competitors, and undermines the privacy of U.S. citizens by emboldening other countries with less robust privacy regimes that similarly seek unlimited extra territorial access to data.

Another possibility is to say that if the data is stored in the United States, then law enforcement may access it, but if it is stored outside our borders, it is off limits.

This is essentially the current state of affairs following a decision last summer by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit that ECPA warrants do not reach data stored abroad. Under the Second Circuit's decision, U.S. law enforcement can use compulsory process to access data stored in the United States but must work through diplomatic channels to obtain data stored overseas.

This sort of domestic storage regime has the benefit of avoiding the conflict-of-laws problems I have just described, but it also has very real drawbacks.

To begin with, it impedes law enforcement's ability to solve and prevent crime in cases where the needed data is stored outside the United States, even when the creator of the data is an American, the service provider storing the data is an American, and the crime being investigated took place here in the United States. The mere happenstance that the data is stored beyond our borders, even though it may constantly or instantly be accessed from within our borders, places it off limits. Service providers' varying business practices in moving and holding data determine whether an investigation moves forward.

This sort of domestic storage regime also forces U.S. law enforcement to work through diplomatic channels, which sometimes are slow and sometimes very cumbersome and in many instances less protective of privacy than U.S. criminal process, which requires a warrant from a neutral magistrate and a finding of probable cause.

The upshot is that neither of these regimes is satisfactory. A maximalist regime that extends U.S. law enforcement jurisdiction worldwide creates serious conflict-of-law problems and places U.S. service providers in impossible positions. A more modest domestic storage regime, by contrast, hinders law enforcement's ability to solve crime and protect us from harm, based solely on where a particular document or piece of data happens to be stored at a given moment in time.

What we need is a sensible regime with clear rules that determine access based on factors that actually matter to the person whose data is being sought. Privacy laws are meant to protect people, not abstractions. We ought not get bogged down with mindless formalism. Most people could care less whether their data is stored at site A or site B or country A or country B as long as it is easily accessible and has robust privacy protections.

At the same time, we need to take proper account of the laws and interests of other countries, especially our allies. We ought to avoid, where possible, trampling on other nations' sovereignty or ignoring their own citizens' legitimate claims to privacy, whether here in the United States or abroad.

For this reason, I believe the right approach to international data privacy is to ground the analysis on the location of the person whose data is being sought. It is, after all, the person who has rights and the person whose interests are devalued when data is obtained without proper process.

Accordingly, I have proposed legislation called the International Communications Privacy Act, or ICPA, that sets clear rules for when and how U.S. law enforcement can access electronic data based on the location and nationality of the person whose data is being sought. I intend to introduce an updated version of this legislation in the very near future.

Here is what the updated version of this legislation will say: If a person is a U.S. national or located in the United States, then law enforcement may compel disclosure no matter where the data is stored, provided the data is accessible from a U.S. computer and law enforcement uses proper criminal process. If a person is not a U.S. national, however, and is not located in the United States, then different rules apply.

These rules are founded on three principles: respect, comity, and reciprocity.

First, respect. If U.S. law enforcement wishes to access data belonging to a non-U.S. national located outside the United States, then law enforcement must notify the person's country of citizenship and provide that country an opportunity to object to the disclosure. This protocol shows respect to the other country and gives the country an opportunity to assert the privacy rights of its citizen.

Second, comity. If, after receiving notice, the other country lodges an ob-

jection, the U.S. court undertakes a comity analysis to determine whose interests should rightfully prevail—the U.S. interests in obtaining the data or the foreign interests in preventing disclosure. As part of this analysis, the court can consider such factors as the location of the crime, the seriousness of the crime, the importance of the data to the investigation, and the possibility of accessing the data through other means. This analysis prevents an obstinate foreign power from impeding investigations without good reason or where the U.S. interests in disclosure are particularly strong.

Third, reciprocity. In order to receive notice and an opportunity to object, the other country must provide reciprocal notice-and-objection rights to the United States. The country must also provide robust privacy protections within its own borders and satisfy international human rights standards. These requirements ensure that the U.S. provides its own citizens an equal or greater level of protection against foreign requests for data. They also offer incentives to foreign governments to properly safeguard the data of U.S. citizens within their jurisdiction.

Tomorrow, the Senate Judiciary Committee Subcommittee on Crime and Terrorism will hold a hearing on law enforcement access to data stored abroad. That hearing, I hope, will elucidate many of the principles I just described.

Soon after the hearing, I will reintroduce the International Communications Privacy Act. The bill as reintroduced will incorporate feedback from law enforcement and privacy groups. I intend to push very hard for this legislation and will seek every opportunity to do so. I want my colleagues to know that I will be pursuing any and all legislative vehicles to get it across the finish line.

In the words of Utah businessman Jeff Hadfield, writing in the *Deseret News*, "It's imperative that Congress quickly address the ambiguity within our current law. As every company becomes a software company, we need legislation that supports our companies' ability to store data overseas, protects our individual privacy rights, and helps U.S. law enforcement do its important job." I could not agree more.

The International Communications Privacy Act provides critical guidance to law enforcement, while respecting the laws and interests of our allies. It brings a set of simple, straightforward rules to a chaotic area of law and creates an example for other countries to follow. It is a balanced approach and a smart approach, and it deserves this body's full support.

Mr. President, on another matter, I wish to register my strong support today for the confirmation of John Sullivan to be Deputy Secretary of State.

The nomination of John Sullivan is another example of President Trump choosing the best and brightest for national security positions in his administration.

I have known John Sullivan since he was confirmed as Deputy Secretary of Commerce during the George Bush administration. He excelled in this position, which bears many similarities to the Deputy Secretary of State role to which he has been nominated.

For example, as Deputy Secretary of Commerce, John was responsible for the day-to-day operations and management of a major Federal agency. As Deputy Secretary of State, he will assume the same managerial duties, but for a different Federal agency.

In facilitating international trade agreements at the Department of Commerce, John Sullivan also honed his negotiating abilities, developing a diplomatic skill set that will be critical in his new role at the State Department.

As the chairman of the Finance Committee, I closely followed John's tenure at Commerce. I was consistently impressed with his ability to promote American interests abroad while maintaining constructive relations with our trading partners. I have no doubt that he will continue to serve our Nation well as the Deputy Secretary of State.

In addition to his management expertise, John Sullivan is a practicing attorney with the law firm of Mayer Brown LLP. There, too, he has developed a reputation for excellence, especially in the area of national security law.

In John Sullivan we have a proven manager, a seasoned diplomat, and a sharp policy mind who will bring strong leadership to the State Department. In John Sullivan, President Trump and Secretary Tillerson have made an inspired choice.

Secretary Tillerson is doing a tremendous job at the State Department. With John Sullivan as his Deputy, even more can be accomplished.

In addition, I would like to thank John Sullivan for his willingness to serve. Of course, I would be remiss if I did not also thank his family—especially his wife of 29 years, Grace Rodriguez, who has provided invaluable support to John throughout his public service. It is unlikely John would be here today without their consent and their constant support.

Few have the skills that John Sullivan possesses. Fewer still possess the patriotism, professionalism, and integrity he has displayed over a distinguished career. He is the best man for the job, which is why I urge my colleagues to confirm him without delay.

I appreciate this opportunity to make these points on the floor.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today many of my colleagues will come to the floor to speak about the devastating impact that TrumpCare will have on rural communities. I rise to join them in speaking on this topic and on the many other serious flaws in the Republicans' bill to replace ObamaCare.

When he was elected, President Trump promised he would provide healthcare for everyone, but President Trump and our Republican friends have turned their backs on that promise. The Republican healthcare proposal would put insurance companies back in the driver's seat, and that means less quality and more costs for all of us. Rural communities, working families, and people with medical conditions would be hit the hardest.

Today, we got a taste of how devastating TrumpCare would be. The President's budget proposal slashes billions of dollars for Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program. President Trump takes direct aim at bipartisan programs that have made historic progress for kids, for the disabled, and for the elderly.

Former Senator Hubert Humphrey once said: "The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; and those in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy and the handicapped."

When Senator Humphrey spoke those words, he had been diagnosed with terminal cancer. He died a few months later. His words are just as meaningful today.

TrumpCare fails Senator Humphrey's moral test. It doesn't cover more people or more services or improve healthcare. It raises costs and reduces quality. Compared to the ACA—or ObamaCare—TrumpCare would be a disaster for families in my home State.

In New Mexico, tens of thousands of people have healthcare, thanks to ObamaCare and the Medicaid expansion. Before the Affordable Care Act, New Mexico had one of the highest rates of uninsured in the country. It was almost 20 percent, at 19.6 percent. That rate has been cut in half to 8.9 percent.

Approximately 300,000 more New Mexicans now have healthcare. And each one of these 300,000 people has a story about how having healthcare has made a difference—even saved lives.

Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, hundreds of thousands of New Mexicans now have essential health benefits, including doctor visits, hospital care, prescription drugs, pregnancy and childbirth, and mental health services, and a range of preventive services, like mammograms and other cancer screenings, are available at no cost.

I am not saying that the ACA is perfect. Premiums are still too high, deductibles are increasing too much, and we still must bring down the cost of prescription drugs. We absolutely need to work to bring down costs. But, on balance, the Affordable Care Act passes all tests—many with flying colors. TrumpCare does not come close. TrumpCare gets an F.

Test No. 1: Does TrumpCare increase the number of Americans who will have healthcare? No, it decreases coverage and decreases it dramatically.

According to the most recent figures from the CBO, 24 million Americans will lose healthcare coverage under TrumpCare over the next decade. TrumpCare would dismantle the Medicaid expansion provisions that help so many working Americans, including 265,000 people in New Mexico, and TrumpCare would hit rural communities the hardest.

The National Rural Health Association has said that TrumpCare "does nothing to improve the health care crisis in rural America, and will lead to poorer rural health outcomes, more uninsured and an increase in the rural hospital closure crisis."

Rural areas like the ones we have in New Mexico have more elderly and disabled people, and fewer people have insurance through their jobs. TrumpCare is the hardest on these groups.

Rural hospitals are already struggling. They will have an even harder time keeping their doors open.

Many New Mexicans would have to drive an hour or more if their local hospital closed. And not only would closed hospitals mean less access to healthcare, it would also hurt the economy. In rural areas, hospitals are a big employer. If they close, the rural economy takes a hit too.

The administrator of the Guadalupe County Hospital in New Mexico, a fine woman by the name of Christina Campos, fears what might happen if TrumpCare becomes law. She is urging me to protect access to care in rural areas.

Guadalupe County is one of our smallest counties by population. The hospital's uninsured payer rate declined from 14 percent to 4 percent from 2014 to 2016, thanks to the Affordable Care Act, and its uncompensated care increased 23 percent in that same period.

I can tell my colleagues that I will fight tooth and nail to keep residents in our rural areas insured and to keep rural hospitals in New Mexico open.

Test No. 2: Does TrumpCare increase coverage of healthcare services? No, it fails this test too. Under the ACA, insurance companies must cover essential healthcare services, period. But under TrumpCare, starting in 2020, States can get a waiver and define their own essential benefits for individual and small group plans. So States would be able to cut the benefits that people count on—and that are making patients healthier.

Test No. 3: Does TrumpCare make healthcare more affordable? It doesn't. It takes aim at the most vulnerable working and low-income families and seniors—the people most in need of care—and it cuts access to healthcare out from under them. If you are older and poorer, you lose big under TrumpCare. If you are young and wealthy, you win.

What is wrong with this picture? What is wrong is that it is unjust. And it is bad for healthcare costs over the long run. Trump and the Republicans

are proposing drastic changes to our healthcare system—and they are changes for the worse. They want to go backward to a time when insurance companies could decide who gets healthcare and who doesn't.

Finally, TrumpCare would hurt anyone with a preexisting condition. One of the most popular provisions of ObamaCare is that it prohibits insurance companies from dropping you if you get sick and from refusing to cover you because of a preexisting condition. A preexisting condition could be something serious like cancer, but insurance companies have considered everything from childbirth to hand warts a preexisting condition.

Under TrumpCare, States would be able to decide whether to get a waiver from those patient protections. And then we would go back to that time when insurance companies decided who could get healthcare and who couldn't. States would have to set up high-risk pools to provide people with the option of insurance in catastrophic situations. But in the best cases, high-risk pools wouldn't protect many people from going bankrupt just to get healthcare, and TrumpCare wouldn't provide nearly enough funding for States to run them successfully.

Take Alexis from Albuquerque. Alexis is here in the photograph with her husband. Alexis had a stroke and brain surgeries when she was 28 years old. Even though she had no lingering effects, she was denied insurance in the private market and had to get insurance in New Mexico's high-risk pool. According to Alexis, "It broke us financially." Alexis now has affordable health insurance with the help of the Affordable Care Act subsidies. Like most people, she doesn't want to risk going broke just to get healthcare. She shouldn't have to.

Finally, I want to tell you about a 1-year-old from Albuquerque, NM, whose name is Rafe. Rafe was born with cortical visual impairment—a kind of legal blindness—and significant developmental delays. His parents—Jessica, his mom, and his father, Sam, a veteran—have been able to access the intensive medical care, early intervention services, medical equipment, and therapy he needs through a combination of the military's insurance and Medicaid. But TrumpCare jeopardizes Medicaid by turning it into a block grant for States, which will most certainly result in deep cuts to Medicaid. It threatens Rafe's chances of a better life.

The President promised he would keep protections for people with preexisting conditions—people who are sick. His broken promises can hurt tens of millions of Americans.

In the end, TrumpCare is not a real healthcare bill. It is a tax relief bill for the richest 1 percent. The CBO estimates that TrumpCare would cut taxes by \$346 billion over 10 years, at the expense of the healthcare of working families and seniors.

Our priorities for healthcare reform should be increasing coverage, increasing the services provided, making people healthier, and providing affordable healthcare. I strongly and unequivocally support all Americans having healthcare.

Let's get to that goal, and let's get to that goal now. Ninety-one percent of the American people are insured, thanks to the steps taken under the Affordable Care Act. Rather than repealing it, let's build on its strengths so 100 percent of people can afford to see a doctor when they are sick. We can do this. We can do better. Let's ensure that Americans in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the aged; and those in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the disabled, have the right to healthcare so that America meets the moral test of good governance.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. 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. THUNE. Mr. President, if there is one thing that has become clear, it is that the ObamaCare status quo is not sustainable.

Prices continue to soar while choices are rapidly dwindling. Between 2016 and 2017, the average premium for a midlevel ObamaCare plan on the Federal exchange went up 25 percent—25 percent for just 1 year. Let's remember that this is on top of years—year after year—of premium increases under ObamaCare.

How many families can easily absorb a 25-percent premium increase? I would submit that not many. Again, that is just for 1 year. ObamaCare rate hikes aren't going anywhere. Numbers for next year are starting to emerge, and they are not looking good. Connecticut's ObamaCare insurers are requesting average premium increases in the double digits. One Connecticut insurer has requested an average rate hike of 33.8 percent—33.8 percent. In Virginia, one insurer has requested an average rate increase of 38 percent. Another has requested an average 45-percent rate hike. In Maryland, average increases range anywhere from 18 percent to almost 59 percent. One insurer has requested a staggering 150-percent rate increase—150 percent.

Obviously, these kinds of price increases are unaffordable for most families, but ObamaCare isn't leaving them any options. Along with soaring prices, choices on the exchanges are rapidly dwindling. Roughly one-third of U.S. counties have just one choice of health insurer on their exchange for 2017. Several States—including Alabama, Oklahoma, Alaska, and Wyoming—have just one choice of insurer for their entire

State, and things are only getting worse.

In 2018, a number of counties may lack an ObamaCare insurer at all. In February, health insurer Humana announced its decision to completely withdraw from the ObamaCare exchanges for 2018, and 2 weeks ago, Aetna, which had already sharply reduced its participation in the exchanges for 2017, announced its decision to fully exit and completely get out of the market in 2018. That leaves the Nebraska and Delaware ObamaCare exchanges with just one insurer for 2018.

UnitedHealthcare is leaving Virginia, and Wellmark Blue Cross Blue Shield is withdrawing from Iowa. In the wake of Aetna and Wellmark's decision, Medica, the last ObamaCare insurer for most of Iowa, announced it will likely leave the State in 2018. That would leave 94 out of 99 counties in Iowa with no ObamaCare insurer next year—all but five counties in the State of Iowa with no ObamaCare insurer. Iowa families with ObamaCare subsidies would have no place to spend them. As my colleague Senator ALEXANDER likes to point out, that is like having a bus ticket in a town where there are no buses running.

Dwindling healthcare choices aren't limited to the ObamaCare exchanges, either. Aetna is not only withdrawing from the exchanges. It is also withdrawing from the non-ObamaCare individual health insurance markets in several States. More than one insurance CEO has suggested that ObamaCare is in a death spiral, and I would have to say it is pretty hard to disagree. Combine soaring premiums with a steady insurer exodus, and sooner or later you get a partial or complete exchange collapse.

Then there are the other ObamaCare problems—like deductibles which are sometimes so high people can't afford to actually use their healthcare plans; or, narrow plan networks with few provider choices.

ObamaCare may have been well-intentioned, but good intentions don't make up for a lack of good policy—and ObamaCare was not good policy. ObamaCare took a healthcare system with problems and it made things worse. It is time to repeal this fatally flawed law and replace it with real healthcare reform.

Three weeks ago, the House of Representatives passed an ObamaCare repeal and replacement bill. The House's legislation repeals ObamaCare's tax increases, penalties, and mandates, and starts the process of restoring control of healthcare to States and individuals. My colleagues in the House have made a good start, and I am looking forward to building on their bill here in the United States Senate. We have a lot of Members with good healthcare ideas, and we are going to work hard to produce a bill that will start the process of giving the American people real healthcare reform.

ObamaCare is failing, and it is failing rapidly. Our Democrat colleagues need to stop pretending this law is ever going to do what it was supposed to do and come to the table to work with us on real healthcare reform. There is no question our healthcare system has problems, but ObamaCare is not, and it never has been, the solution.

Real reform is possible, though, and that is what we are focused on now here in the United States Senate—the kind of reform that will actually drive down prices, that will put patients and their doctors—not the government—in charge of healthcare decisions, that will empower States to embrace the solutions that are right for the citizens in their States and will give Americans more choices and real healthcare freedom.

That is the kind of healthcare reform Republicans are committed to delivering for the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

MEDICAID

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to talk about the President's proposed budget as it relates to Medicaid and the fact that it is just a war on Medicaid; that is, it continues the wrongheaded ideas that have been proposed in the House bill on healthcare reform and takes that and continues to make cuts to Medicaid that are unsustainable for our healthcare system.

The President's budget would impose a block grant or per capita cap on States in 2020 in exchange for so-called flexibility. I haven't met one State administrator of healthcare in our State who says they need more flexibility. They have a lot of flexibility on Medicaid currently, but they know this is just a budget cap and a budget cut.

The budget would result in \$610 billion in cuts to States, in addition to what would happen if they were successful in passing the House bill in the Senate. As the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities put it, the Trump budget cuts Medicaid "considerably more deeply than the House bill's per capita cap proposal would do."

No doubt what the budget is proposing from the President today and what our House colleagues have proposed on healthcare means more damage for healthcare and more damage for Medicaid.

Let's be more specific. Medicaid for healthcare is about children. It is about seniors. It is about the disabled. It is about working families. It is about young people. Medicaid covers half of the births and the majority of long-term care stays.

What people may not realize is that the President's budget cut to Medicaid also cuts children's healthcare, as a new study reveals, by at least \$43 billion, according to Avalere Health. That is taking healthcare away from children, poor children, who need access to healthcare. Additionally, the budget impacts 1.75 million veterans who also get healthcare through Medicaid.

How can we possibly be standing here with a budget proposal by the President of the United States—after he promised not to cut Medicaid—that not only proposes to cut Medicaid but cuts children's and veterans' healthcare when they need it most?

Medicaid is a lifeline for people who can't get covered or can't get a fair deal. It is a highly cost-effective, dynamic, and innovative program that has worked well, and Medicaid is a winning economic strategy for how to help families get out of poverty. It is one of the most successful anti-poverty programs in the United States and the second largest program to combat extreme poverty.

Its expansion in Washington has helped create jobs indirectly and directly and has saved our State about \$353 million in our State budget. It injects billions into the economy and supports our high-wage, high-skill jobs throughout the healthcare economy.

As we know, our colleagues, in the House draconian healthcare act, would for the first time cut Medicaid's successful program by introducing a cap that would result in reductions every year to the Medicaid Program. Regardless of who needs access, regardless of those children, regardless of those veterans, it would continue to push down Medicaid funds by more each year.

I have said to my colleagues in the House that there are far more innovative ways to help our healthcare delivery system that are cost-effective, but simply cutting veterans or families or children off of Medicaid is not the way to do it.

The President's budget released today would reinforce this permanent cap. Currently, Medicaid is a needs-based partnership between the States and the Federal Government. During economic recessions, natural disasters, or public health emergencies, States know they can count on the Federal Government.

Under what has been proposed in the House, the per capita cap would give States only a fixed amount and start reducing the amount of money each year. It would leave a tsunami of seniors and others without new technologies, prescription drugs, or tools to address new healthcare threats.

There is nothing about it that is reform. It is not innovation. It is simply a budget mechanism to cut Medicaid. I don't know how the President, given that he promised before not to cut Medicaid could do this. He said: "I was the first & only potential GOP candidate to state there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare & Medicaid."

If that is what the President tweeted, if that is what he said he was going to do, why is he now proposing a budget that actually cuts Medicaid?

We do not want to throw 600,000 Medicaid beneficiaries off of coverage in my State—and 14 million across the country—and take \$1.4 billion out of Washington State's economy every year. These are numbers according to the Congressional Budget Office's most recent estimates and estimates by the State of Washington.

I think it is time to say no to the President's budget proposal. It is time to remind the President of his promise not to cut Medicaid, and it is time to stop talking about the silly idea of capping Medicaid and reducing funding to the States.

I mentioned the impact on children and veterans. I also want to mention the impact on those suffering from the opioid epidemic and what we have been trying to do to treat those individuals. Also, those facilities would be in great danger in continuing to treat that population if they don't have Medicaid.

So the notion that this is a smart healthcare strategy or a smart healthcare budget—it is not. It is a draconian measure that is going to leave many more Americans without healthcare. As I said, Medicaid is a successful program. The promise should be kept, and we should continue to improve the delivery system as a way to make it more cost-effective. I know we can't afford to leave sick children without access to healthcare, and now is not the time to leave veterans without the healthcare they deserve.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the healthcare bill the House of Representatives passed and is currently being considered behind closed doors by my Republican colleagues.

I travel around greater Minnesota all the time, and when the Republicans' healthcare plan first came out, I traveled to rural Minnesota to meet with rural hospitals, nursing home providers, and constituents to hear how this bill would impact their lives and communities. They are upset and they are frankly scared.

In Perham, MN, I heard from a woman who was in tears, not knowing where her mother would go if the Republican plan passed and she lost her nursing home coverage. This woman and her husband work full time, but together they cannot afford the around-the-clock care her mother needs.

Later, at a nursing home in Moorhead—that is in Minnesota across the river from Fargo—I also heard from a resident, Chrysann, who said this new plan wasn't about taking care of people but about "survival of the fittest." The hospitals and nursing home administrators I met with said the financial blow they would receive would cause them to cut services and in some cases even close their doors.

What I heard, and the real panic that I saw, is a far cry from what President Trump promised this past January when he said: "We're going to have insurance for everybody." He went on to say it would be "much less expensive and much better."

Versions of these promises keep coming from President Trump, his Cabinet, and from his allies in Congress—coverage for more people, at lower costs, with better quality. Those things all sound great, things that might help people like Chrysann, but the fact is, the Republican bill does the exact opposite. It takes coverage away from people, it drives up costs, and it makes coverage worse. In other words, the GOP is selling this healthcare bill on false pretenses.

Today I would like to explain how the Republican bill betrays each one of these three fundamental promises, and let's take them one by one. We can start by the number of people who will be covered. President Trump promised that everyone would have insurance, but an analysis of an earlier version of the healthcare bill—the first iteration of this, which is actually not as bad as this one—an earlier version analysis conducted by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office found that under current law the House Republican plan would leave 24 million fewer people with health insurance by 2026. That means by 2026, nearly 1 in 5 Americans under the age of 65 would be uninsured, compared to just over 1 in 10 today.

One particular way the Republican bill cuts coverage is by gutting Medicaid, a program that covers more than 60 percent of all nursing home residents nationwide, covers kids with disabilities, and benefits nearly 70 million Americans. The Republican plan ends Medicaid expansion. It fundamentally undermines the structure of the Medicaid Program and cuts the program's budget by as much as one-quarter over 10 years, a more than \$800 billion cut.

On May 7, journalist Jake Tapper of CNN asked Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price whether the hundreds of billions of proposed cuts would result in millions of Americans not getting Medicaid. Secretary Price responded: "Absolutely not." Well, that is absolutely false. When I say "absolutely," I mean that literally.

It doesn't take an expert to know that if you take funding away from this program, which provides health coverage for millions of Americans, the program will suffer, and the human beings who rely on Medicaid will suffer as well. Specifically, according to the

Congressional Budget Office, 14 million of those 24 million people who will lose coverage under the Republican bill would lose their health insurance because of cuts to Medicaid. “Absolutely not,” says the Secretary of HHS.

It is bad enough to push a bill that will take away care from millions who need it; it is extra galling to be so fundamentally dishonest about it in the process. Look, the Affordable Care Act is far from perfect and we have problems that need to be fixed, but let's step back and review how far we have come because of the ACA. Since it came into effect, about 20 million Americans have gained health insurance coverage, producing the lowest uninsured rate in the history of this country.

In Minnesota, the number of uninsured dropped by nearly half, with people in rural areas seeing the largest gain in coverage. As a result, we have eliminated the gap in coverage between rural and urban Minnesotans. These coverage gains have increased access to vital health services, including access to treatment for mental illness and substance use disorders, but the Republican healthcare plan throws all of these gains into jeopardy, which is particularly troubling given that the country is still in the midst of battling a devastating opioid and heroin epidemic. Researchers estimate that 2.8 million Americans with substance use disorders will lose some or all of their insurance coverage under the ACA repeal.

Let's be clear. People will lose coverage as a result of the proposed Medicaid cuts; people will lose coverage because of the proposed insurance reforms; and tens of millions of more people will be uninsured and without care in the Republican plan than under current law.

Let's move on to the second point; the assertion that is repeated constantly by President Trump and by others that their bill brings down costs. In his Rose Garden celebration after the Republican health care bill passed the House—not after signing it into law but sort of an unprecedented Rose Garden celebration after merely the House passed the bill—President Trump said: “As far as I am concerned your premiums they are going to start to come down.”

When Secretary Price was asked, again by Jake Tapper, if he stands by the President's statement, he responded: “Absolutely.”

On an earlier date, Secretary Price actually said: “Nobody will be worse off financially” under the Republican plan.

This is just blatantly wrong. Republicans are actively sabotaging the individual market, needlessly driving up premiums in the short term, and in the long term what they are doing will result in exorbitant premium hikes for older, sicker people—so much so that CBO estimates some will eventually drop out of the market altogether.

Let me explain. For years, Republicans have taken deliberate steps to sabotage the individual market. First, Senator RUBIO ran through a last-minute change to the 2015 spending bill that undercut the Risk Corridor Program. The Risk Corridor Program, which was modeled after a similar program in the Medicare Part D Program, was included as part of the ACA to offset high costs incurred by insurers as they took on new enrollees in the early years of the ACA.

Here is how it worked. The Federal Government would make payments to health plans that enrolled a group of people who were sicker than expected and had higher healthcare costs than the insurer predicted when it set its premiums. On the flip side, the Federal Government would receive payments from health plans that enrolled a group of people who were healthier than expected and needed less care. By limiting losses incurred by insurers, the Risk Corridor Program was designed to help make premiums more affordable for individuals and families who bought coverage on the exchange. Senator RUBIO's provision undercut all of this. It severely curtailed the payments that could be made under the Risk Corridor Program, which meant that premiums soared and health insurers left the market.

For example, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota lost about \$220 million between 2014 and 2016 under the weakened Risk Corridor Program, which the CEO told me in a meeting late last spring was a huge setback for the company. I was dismayed but not surprised when I heard, shortly after our meeting, that the company was leaving the individual market, which affected coverage for more than 100,000 Minnesotans and contributed to average premium increases of 36 to 67 percent in Minnesota's individual market in 2017.

Insurers across the country faced similar destabilizing losses, but that is not all. On top of that, for months, President Trump has been doing his part to sow uncertainty by repeatedly arguing that the individual market is in a death spiral. For example, on May 4, in response to Aetna's exit from the individual market in Virginia in 2018, President Trump shouted on Twitter: “Death spiral!” This is similar to his post on March 13 in which he said: “ObamaCare is imploding. It's a disaster and 2017 will be the worst year yet, by far!” But he is wrong.

Even the CBO noted in one of its scores that barring any significant changes, the individual market would probably be stable in most areas. This confirms what other research has found, which is that this year markets were starting to stabilize, which led Standard & Poor's to issue a report last December predicting that 2017 could see “continued improvement, with more insurers getting close to break-even or better.”

But this didn't faze President Trump or any of the Republicans. Instead,

they seem to have used these reports as a guidebook on what changes are necessary to actually cause the individual market to collapse. For example, President Trump has been playing games with payments that are due to insurance companies that reduce out-of-pocket costs for working families. On numerous occasions, he has threatened to stop these payments altogether, but in practice, he has been holding these payments hostage on a month-to-month basis to push forward other insidious reforms. Just yesterday, his administration announced that it would seek another short-term delay in the House's lawsuit, which aims to stop these payments permanently. These games are driving up the premiums for families and rattling health insurance markets.

Lastly, the administration has stopped enforcing the individual mandate. As a result, we are seeing enrollment in the individual markets stall for the first time since 2010, and if this results in younger, healthier people dropping their coverage, we could see prices rise dramatically for those left behind.

That is right. President Trump and the Republicans are actively attacking the insurance markets, causing premiums to go up. So if these markets falter and consumers suffer, it is because of what Republicans are doing right now and have been doing for years to undermine the individual market.

Still, you will often hear Republicans talk about the need to reduce costs. They even claim that their proposed healthcare plan would lower premiums in the long run. For millions of Americans, that is not true, but the reasons why it is untrue are slightly complicated. It goes to the CBO report for the Republican healthcare plan.

The March 13 CBO score says that average premiums for single people in the individual market would be 15 to 20 percent higher than under current law—than under the current ACA—in the first 2 years of its implementation. But it does say that they would be roughly 10 percent lower in 2026 under the House bill than they would be under current law.

At first blush, this sounds like prices would be coming down for people, right? That is certainly what the Republican leadership wants you to think. That day, House Speaker RYAN stated: “This report confirms that the American Health Care Act will lower premiums and improve access to quality, affordable care.” House Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY got more specific. He said: “After 10 years, premiums will be 10 percent lower than under ObamaCare.” But Speaker RYAN and Majority Leader MCCARTHY are being deliberately misleading. One of the reasons that average costs go down is that the price for some people would go up so much that they couldn't afford any insurance at all. If the people facing the most expensive insurance

simply dropped out of the market, sure, average costs go down.

Here is how this works: Under the Republican plan, insurers would be able to charge older enrollees five times more than younger ones, which would dramatically increase premiums for people aged 50 to 64 years old while decreasing premiums for younger people. Meanwhile, the tax credits that help older Americans afford their premiums would be drastically slashed. The result is that, especially for older people of modest means, coverage would become unaffordable, so they disappear from the market. If only younger, healthier people can buy insurance, average premiums go down, but you have actually made the system much worse and much more expensive for the people who really need it.

But that is not all. The Republican plan would also allow States to waive crucial protections for patients with preexisting conditions, which means that in those States, we could go back to something like the old days when insurance companies could charge people with preexisting conditions much more—potentially as much as \$25,000 more for their coverage, as estimated by the AARP.

Republicans are quick to point out that their bill maintains a requirement that insurance companies have to offer plans to everyone, but it abandons the principle that the plans must be affordable, and an unaffordable plan does people about as much good as no plan at all.

If you are young, if you have no preexisting condition, it might be true that your premiums will go down under the Republican plan. But for millions of Americans, though, if the Republican bill passes, insurance costs are going to go up. For many people, they will go up so high that they will be out of reach.

That brings me to the third claim the Republicans are peddling—that their plan will result in higher quality coverage. In fact, Republicans want to open the door to junk insurance.

In defending the House Republican plan, Secretary Price recently stated that the plan allows “for every single person to get the access to the kind of coverage that they want.” We have heard this before. This is a code for allowing insurers to offer garbage insurance plans that offer skimpy benefit packages and impose much higher deductibles and cost sharing on consumers.

Under the Affordable Care Act, you cannot sell junk plans on the insurance exchanges. Plans have to cover the essential health benefits. This is key. Under the ACA, plans have to cover the essential health benefits—10 key categories of benefits such as prescription drugs, maternity care, and mental health services. On top of that, the law prohibits insurers from imposing annual or lifetime limits on these essential health benefits. The goal is to make sure that when people get sick or

if they have a preexisting condition, they don't go broke getting the care they need because of fine print in their health insurance plan.

The Republican bill would allow States to eliminate these essential health benefits. Consumers would be left with plans that leave them up a creek if they actually get sick. And plans for people who are sick—the price of those plans will go sky high. No one would call that “better care,” which is why Republicans aren't really being straight about it. What they call “flexibility” is actually just the removal of consumer protections.

To review, the Republican plan covers fewer people, costs too many people more—in many cases, much, much more—and provides worse coverage, and it is being sold by misleading people on each of these points.

It is not as though there aren't ways to cover more people, reduce costs, and provide better coverage. You could do a public option, for example. You could reduce prescription drug costs—an issue on which I recently introduced a comprehensive bill. You could improve coverage by increasing the number of healthcare providers in rural areas, as I proposed last year in my rural health bill. But the Republican plan does none of these things, which raises the question: What does it do? Why would anyone take the time to propose such a terrible bill? The answer is this: It gives a giant tax cut to the wealthy. That is the real point of this bill. It is not a healthcare bill; it is a “take healthcare away from people who need it and use the money to give a tax break to the rich” bill.

As Chrysann in Moorhead, MN, said, it is about “survival of the fittest.”

The average tax savings for the 400 richest Americans under the Republican plan is \$7 million each—again, \$7 million each. For households earning \$1 million or more a year, it is more than \$50,000 apiece, each year. But for households earning \$50,000 a year, which is about the median income in the United States, the tax cut is next to nothing, or you could even face a tax increase. There are tax cuts specifically for insurance company CEOs. There are tax cuts specifically for drug companies. There is nothing comparable for the middle class. And all of those tax cuts are paid for by cutting healthcare programs that keep people alive, by cutting off funding that lets seniors age with dignity, and by cutting services for kids with disabilities.

This bill would take us back in time and roll back our progress. It is up to us here in the Senate to stop that from happening. This bill is literally sickening. It is vicious, it is cruel, and it should never be passed into law. I urge my Republican colleagues to walk away from this cruel effort and work with us to actually improve healthcare for Americans. And I urge everyone considering this bill to be straight with the American people about exactly what it is that this bill will do to them.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, obviously, a big problem before the country right now is, What do we do about rising healthcare premiums?

What we know under the Affordable Care Act—or the un-Affordable Care Act—or ObamaCare, as some call it, is that premiums are rising more and more. One of President Trump's campaign pledges was that premiums would come down and, actually, come down with, as he said in one place, beautiful coverage—that it is actually good coverage and premiums are lower. So let's kind of set the stage.

I just got a message on my Facebook page. I will read it. By the way, anybody can post on our Facebook page these sorts of stories, if they are interested in them.

Brian from Louisiana sent a message saying: My family plan is \$1700 a month for me, my wife, and two children—so roughly about \$20,000 a year. The ACA, or the Affordable Care Act, has brought me to my knees. I hope you can get something done as my credit cards are all maxed out. And 80 percent of my friends are in the same situation. The middle class is dwindling away. Can everyone just come together and figure this out?

Think about this: \$1,700 a month. He did not write this, but what would be standard for this sort of policy is a \$13,000 family deductible.

I say that because I have an acquaintance in San Francisco. San Francisco is so expensive for housing, transportation, and food, and the premium for their young family is \$20,000 a year, with each family member with their own separate \$6,000 deductible. This is under the un-Affordable Care Act, as I call it, or the Affordable Care Act, as others do.

A friend of mine back in Baton Rouge, whom I have quoted many times, put this on my Facebook page because people would not believe it: He and his wife, 60 and 61, their quote for their insurance last year was \$39,000. Their quote for their insurance was \$39,000.

Then I spoke to a fellow who is an insurance consultant here in Washington, DC—an insurance consultant. If anyone can get their premiums down, it would be he. For his family, their premium is \$24,000 a year with a \$13,000 family deductible. If they get in a car wreck, their family will be out \$37,000 before the insurance kicks in. Who can afford this? We must do something better.

When President Trump ran for office, President Trump clearly recognized this. On the campaign trail, he said over and over that he wished to lower premiums. It is the President's genius, if you will, that he knew how to do so. You do so by expanding the risk pool. He said he wanted to continue coverage for all.

He gets away from the ObamaCare mandates, which people hate. The American people don't like being told what to do.

He also said he would care for those with preexisting conditions. This is how it works. When you cover many, you have a bigger risk pool. Those with preexisting conditions have the cost of their illness spread out over the many. So premiums come down for all.

My hat is off to the President for coming up with that. In fact, 5 days before he was sworn in, he echoed this, because one way to lower premiums is to give poor coverage. One way to lower premiums is to give folks such terrible coverage that it doesn't cost anything. On the other hand, it doesn't cover anything. The President seems to know this.

Five days before he was inaugurated, he said to the Washington Post about people covered under his replacement for ObamaCare:

[They] can expect to have great healthcare. It will be in a much simplified form. Much less expensive and much better.

We're going to have insurance for everybody. There was a philosophy in some circles that if you can't pay for it, you don't get it. That's not going to happen with us.

I am a physician, a doctor. Again, I admire President Trump's insights. As a physician, I know that whoever wants healthcare gets healthcare. Twenty or so years ago, Congress said that if you walk into an emergency room, the emergency room has to take care of you. It doesn't matter if you are an American citizen. It doesn't matter how much it costs. The hospital has to take care of you.

I told folks when I was practicing—it would be the middle of the night—that as long as that emergency room was open—and it was open 24/7—in through the door came folks vomiting blood, heart failure patients, folks with drug overdoses, schizophrenics, diabetics, asthmatics—you name it. They came through that door, and we cared for them all—and somebody paid.

President Trump understands that even if you say you can't afford it, everybody is going to be treated. That is our current system, and that is not going to happen under his watch.

We mentioned that one way to lower premiums is to give poor coverage. I think everyone knows, or many people know, of Mr. Kimmel, the late night comedian who pointed out that when his child was born, instead of celebrating and handing the baby to the mother so the mother could kiss and the father, Mr. Kimmel, could cuddle the baby, the nurses and the doctors looked at the baby and immediately

recognized that something was wrong. They recognized that this child was blue. He didn't have oxygen, and if something wasn't done immediately, this child would die.

Folks criticized Mr. Kimmel for being emotional. I totally get it. Instead of cuddling, you are signing a release waiver so your child can be transferred across the city of Los Angeles for emergency surgery. In his emotion, he asked that all children—and I would expand to all Americans—have the ability to get that sort of emergency care done.

Again, the President was about that. I came up with what I called the Kimmel test. Again, it echoes President Trump's contract with the American voter—that we would protect those with preexisting conditions, that we lower premiums, but as we lower premiums, we make sure that the coverage is adequate.

The Kimmel test, making sure there is adequate coverage while lowering premiums and caring for those with preexisting conditions, is so compatible with what President Trump said, because Americans need lower premiums.

Let me echo that one more time. We need to lower premiums. The President's approach, the contract he made with the voters on the campaign trail, is the right approach. You get a bigger risk pool, lots of younger people, so those who are older and sicker have the cost of their care spread out among the many.

We have a plan, the Cassidy-Collins plan, or the Patient Freedom Act, which I introduced with Senator SUSAN COLLINS and four other Senators. We have a way to go about it. One way to get young, healthy folks involved is to do something that we do on Medicare. If you are eligible, you are enrolled unless you call up and say you don't want to be. That is what we do with Medicare. By the way, that is what Fortune 500 companies do with their employees for 401(k) plans, and it works really well.

Ninety-five percent of employees are likely to participate in a 401(k), and they love it. As to people on Medicare, 99 percent stay on Medicare, and 1 percent call up and say: I don't want it. Usually they have better coverage someplace else. As a rule, no one feels coerced because they all know they can call up and say: I don't want it; I don't get it. As it turns out, most do.

The plan we have taken with Cassidy-Collins, in our attempt to fulfill President Trump's contract with the American voter, is that we allow a State to automatically enroll for this, and you would be in. The credit you receive would be sufficient to pay for the annual premium.

If you don't want it, call up. Make it easy. Get out of here. I don't want it.

As a rule, we think folks would be in. By doing this, you expand that risk pool so those old and sicker, those with preexisting conditions, can have their

conditions cared for, but we fulfill President Trump's campaign pledge. We also lowered those premiums.

Ultimately, to lower the cost of insurance, you have to lower the cost of healthcare. Cassidy-Collins does that with some conservative approaches that even liberals will like. One way is that we put in what is called price transparency. You would know the price. A mother would know the price of a procedure—an x-ray, a blood test—before she gets it for her daughter, as opposed to finding out 6 months later when she gets the final bill.

Let me give one example. We have all seen those urgent care centers. Some are run by hospitals. Typically, a visit there will cost you \$500 to \$1,500. Others are run by a group of physicians, or maybe a small business decides to set up an urgent care center. The same visit might cost you as little as \$75 to \$150. The patient doesn't know that until she gets the bill.

One door has exactly the same appearance and exactly the same type of facility with the same capabilities. In one door and it can cost \$500 to \$1,500, and in the other door and it can cost \$75 to \$150, and the patient never knows.

I think we can lower the cost of healthcare by giving the patient the power of knowing what is the price of healthcare.

Think of it. You walk up to a French restaurant in a city you are not familiar with, and you look at the menu posted on the door. You see the prices of the food. Oh, the food is pretty good, but look how expensive it is. Let me go down the street. You go down the street. The food looks good, and it is less expensive.

The power of price informs the patient of what is the best deal for both our health and for our pocketbook. One way we can lower the cost of health insurance is by lowering the cost of healthcare. There are other ways of doing so as well.

Let me return once more to what I said earlier. Americans need lower premiums. President Trump, during the campaign—his contract with the voter, I think, is the right approach to get there.

I will summarize with this. He said he wanted to maintain coverage for those who have insurance, lower premiums, that preexisting conditions would be cared for, and eliminate the ObamaCare mandates. If we fulfill President Trump's goals—and these are goals that folks on the right and left can get behind. By the way, if we do get behind them, premiums will be lower. If we can fulfill President Trump's campaign contract with the American voter, we will lower those premiums, and we will do so by achieving these other great goals.

I yield back.

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

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

JERUSALEM DAY

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to mark a momentous day. Starting this evening, millions around the world will celebrate Yom Yerushalayim, also known as Jerusalem Day. I am proud to join our close ally, Israel, and the Jewish people in celebrating this historic 50th anniversary of the reunification of Jerusalem.

Half a century ago, overcoming Arab armies intent on Israel's destruction, the Israel defense forces liberated the Old City of Jerusalem during the Six-Day War. They courageously and miraculously fought their way to the Temple Mount and the Western Wall, the holiest sites in Judaism. The commander of the paratroopers, Mordechai Gur, unable to contain his emotion, exclaimed through his wireless radio: "The Temple Mount is in our hands!" The army rabbi blew the shofar, and the eternal capital of Israel was reunited.

This war was not the first time that Israel was threatened with annihilation. After the Jewish people established the modern State of Israel in their ancient homeland just 19 years earlier, neighboring Arab States responded to Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion's declaration of independence with an invasion. The Arab armies failed to destroy the newly established Jewish State, but Jerusalem, the ancient and Holy City central to the identity of the Jewish people, was left divided and occupied by Jordan.

Residents of the Old City were murdered or expelled. Jews were prohibited from visiting and praying at the Temple Mount and Western Wall. Their synagogues were destroyed, and their cemeteries, such as the Mount of Olives, were desecrated. Access for Christians to their holy sites was also severely restricted.

Leading up to June of 1967, Arab leaders repeatedly and openly expressed their desire to wipe Israel off the map. Syria was engaging in attacks on Israel from the Golan Heights and soon started to mobilize its forces for battle. Egypt began moving troops into the Sinai Peninsula in a massive military buildup, demanded and achieved the withdrawal of the U.N. Emergency Force that had been stationed in the Sinai, and then closed the Straits of Tehran, imposing an illegal blockade on Israel and cutting off a vital shipping lane for the Jewish State. Jordan then signed a mutual defense agreement with Egypt.

Outnumbered and outgunned and against all odds in the face of external pressure not to act first to ensure its survival, the Jewish State launched a successful, preemptive strike against its hostile neighbors and prevailed in a defensive war. When it was over, Jerusalem was liberated, reuniting the city

and Judaism's holiest sites with the Jewish people and putting an end to almost two decades of exclusion from the Old City.

Since coming under its sovereignty, Israel, the one true democracy in the Middle East that shares our values of freedom, has protected people of all faiths in Jerusalem and ensured their access to holy sites so that they might worship freely. They have protected the rights of Jews, of Christians, and of Muslims. This has occurred even while religious minorities are being targeted, persecuted, and attacked throughout the Middle East and religious and historical sites are being demolished today by radical Islamic terrorists.

Today is a day where we must also reassert historical truth: The historical connection between the Jewish people and Jerusalem and the land of Israel did not begin in 1967. These profound ties to Jerusalem have existed for thousands of years. They can be traced back and have been reaffirmed through numerous archeological excavations such as those in the city of David.

In the past several years, I have traveled to Israel three times. There is something that stirs inside each time I am there. It is remarkable to observe the great successes and achievements of this small and yet mighty country that is one of America's strongest allies in the world.

It is long past time that America do something it should have done two decades ago: Move the American Embassy to Jerusalem and formally recognize Jerusalem as Israel's eternal and undivided capital. In every nation on Earth our Embassy is in its capital city except for Israel. There is no reason Israel should be treated any worse when they are such a reliable and unshakeable ally.

We should honor the promise that Democratic Presidents and Republican Presidents have made for decades and move our Embassy to Jerusalem. So I stand today to express my solidarity with Israel and with the Jewish people during this major celebration. Now, more than ever, America stands strong with our unshakeable friend and ally, the nation of Israel.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here to discuss what you might call

the Scott Pruitt philosophy of environmental regulation. In a recent interview, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency expressed his view that the EPA should "simply pass regulations that provide fairness and equity and allow utilities to make decisions based upon stability, cost, and security to the consumers that they serve." Did we notice anything missing in that assertion of what EPA's role should be? How about no mention of the environment, no mention of climate change, no mention of public health? So my 168th "Time to Wake Up" speech will look at how paid-for Administrator Pruitt is by the very industries he is supposed to be regulating. Often, the word for this is "corruption."

Scott Pruitt is a functionary of fossil fuel money. He has a long record of dark money fundraising and long, cozy relationships with big fossil fuel political donors.

As you can see, energy interests contributed over \$136,000 to Pruitt's 2014 campaign even though he ran unopposed. During the 2010 and 2014 election cycles, oil and gas giants Devon Energy and Koch Industries—yes, of those infamous Koch brothers—maxed out to Pruitt's campaigns.

Thanks to Pulitzer Prize-winning reporting by the New York Times, we know that backing Pruitt was a good fossil fuel investment, particularly for Devon Energy. In 2011, Attorney General Scott Pruitt took a letter written by Devon Energy, he put it onto his Oklahoma attorney general letterhead, he signed it for them, and he sent it off to EPA, pleading Devon Energy's antiregulatory case as if it were his own.

As attorney general of Oklahoma, Pruitt directly solicited political donations from companies now regulated by EPA, then regulated by EPA as well.

He spoke at dozens of industry events but never at a public health or environmental event.

He led the boards of political organizations, like the Republican Attorneys General Association and its dark money political fundraising arm, the so-called Rule of Law Defense Fund, this thing. Pruitt was a member of the RAGA executive committee—RAGA being Republican Attorneys General Association. He was a member of their executive committee between 2014 and 2016, when RAGA raised \$530,000 from Koch Industries—yes, those same infamous Koch brothers—and \$125,000 from Devon Energy—yes, of the letter he put onto his own letterhead.

Coal giant Murray Energy donated \$50,000 to Liberty 2.0, Pruitt's own super PAC, and it donated \$350,000 to RAGA between 2014 and 2016.

The Rule of Law Defense Fund doesn't have to disclose its donors. They hide in a loophole in the law. But other public reporting has shown that it received at least \$175,000 from something called Freedom Partners. With a name like that, you know it is up to no good. Sure enough, it is another dark

money group run by several Koch Industries executives. That is not Coca-Cola; that is the Koch brothers' fossil fuel processing company.

We don't know more about this. Why do we not know more about this? Because Republicans in the Senate protected Scott Pruitt from having to answer these questions during his confirmation process.

While he was busily helping raise dark money, dark money groups, in turn, came back and worked hard to help Pruitt get confirmed to the EPA. A Republican opposition research PAC called America Rising launched a pro-Pruitt ad campaign, and its dark money arm, America Rising Squared, funded confirmpruitt.com. A 501(c)(4) dark money entity ironically named Protecting America Now was created solely to help confirm Pruitt to the EPA. Its fliers asked for contributions ranging from \$25,000 to \$500,000. Just another grassroots group trying to get a good guy confirmed. Koch Industries' own lobbying disclosure forms reveal it spent part of \$3.1 million lobbying to confirm Scott Pruitt.

In Trump's science-denial Cabinet, Administrator Pruitt seems to see little reason to hide his anti-environment and Republican political interests. He has spoken at the Conservative Political Action Conference and the American Farm Bureau board meeting. He attended rallies with coal miners against his own regulations and met with the National Mining Association's executive committee "to lay out his concerns with the Paris accord" the day before the mining association voted to press President Trump to withdraw from that agreement.

Administrator Pruitt planned to appear as the keynote speaker at the Oklahoma Republican Party Gala on May 5. This invitation mentioned his official position as EPA Administrator three times. It featured this photo of him being sworn in as the EPA Administrator. It promised donors a "once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to hear him discuss his plans to slash regulations, bring back jobs to Oklahoma, and decrease the size of the EPA." Well, the 1939 Act to Prevent Pernicious Political Activities, more commonly known as the Hatch Act, forbids this, so I filed a Hatch Act complaint and Administrator Pruitt's appearance was canceled. The Office of Special Counsel is now conducting a full investigation.

But it wasn't just there. He goes to other dinners. On February 28, 2017, Pruitt was a speaker at a RAGA major donors dinner. You know who major donors are by now. Days after the RAGA major donors dinner, Pruitt unilaterally withdrew an EPA request for information from oil and gas producers about their methane emissions, citing a letter from nine members of RAGA and two Republican Governors, who alleged the methane information request "further the previous administration's climate agenda and supports . . . the imposition of burdensome climate

rules on existing sites, the cost and expense of which will be enormous."

There was no public comment period. There was no request for input from other States. This basically was a little party favor for his RAGA pals right after the RAGA dinner.

This EPA Administrator has solicited thousands, if not millions, of dollars from corporations he now regulates. Our current ethics laws do not require nominees in the confirmation process to disclose their political and dark money connections, so the Senate and the public are kept blind to the conflicts of interest of such nominees, and we have no idea how those conflicts would manifest in their offices. Pruitt knows who gave dark money to his political causes. The corporations know what dark money they gave. It is just the rest of us who are in the dark.

This is new, and this is weird. This was not a problem for President Obama's nominees because the dark money political tsunami that has swamped our politics in slime did not exist when President Obama was elected. It was the Citizens United decision of 2010 that allowed unlimited political spending by big special interests, and that unlimited money found dark money channels.

To address the gaping loophole in our Federal ethics laws, I have introduced the Conflicts from Political Fundraising Act with Senators UDALL, CARPER, VAN HOLLEN, and FRANKEN. This bill would require Presidentially appointed Federal officials like Scott Pruitt to disclose their political fundraising, and it would require Federal ethics officials to address these conflicts by, for example, making sure officials are recused from decisions affecting big political donors, making sure the public has the information to know they should ask for a recusal because the director is conflicted by reason of his political relationship with big dark money donors.

I wish the conflicts at EPA stopped with the Administrator, but they don't. It is a swarm of swampy conflict over there. Pruitt has surrounded himself with political operatives and fossil fuel lobbyists. The Associate EPA Administrator for Policy previously worked at RAGA, the Rule of Law Defense Fund, and something called the Freedom Partners Chamber of Commerce—a Koch brothers-funded dark money group that has underwritten the Rule of Law Defense Fund. EPA's Senior Adviser for Regional and State Affairs came from Pruitt's own fossil fuel-funded super PAC, Oklahoma Strong. The Assistant Administrator for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations came from the oil company, the Hess Corporation. One Deputy Associate Administrator is the former president of the Ohio Coal Association. Another Deputy Associate Administrator was a registered lobbyist at the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, where she specifically lobbied against EPA's Clean Power Plan

and New Source Performance Standard, the clean water rule, the ozone standard, EPA enforcement, pesticides bills, budget resolutions, and EPA appropriations bills.

This corruption of EPA is the work of the fossil fuel industry. One day there must come a reckoning.

Just this weekend, the New York Times reported "How Rollbacks at Scott Pruitt's E.P.A. Are a Boon to Oil and Gas." The article included a checklist of rollbacks that specifically benefit long-time Pruitt benefactor Devon Energy—the one that got the letter—delaying a rule raising royalties on fossil energy production on Federal land, undoing new fracking standards, rolling back rules on the leaking and flaring of methane, and rolling back reporting of methane emissions.

In another matter, Devon Energy had been preparing to pay a settlement of over \$100,000 and to install emissions scrubbing equipment to remedy illegal emissions from a Wyoming natural gas facility. Five days after Pruitt was installed at EPA, the company told officials it was "re-evaluating its settlement posture," offering a quarter of what it had previously proposed to settle the charges and scrapping the emissions controls entirely. They know their Administrator Pruitt.

Pruitt's record at EPA reveals he is unabashedly looking out for his industry donors at the expense of public health and the environment. As far as I can tell, every action he has taken since taking office will lead to an enriched industry—at the expense of dirtier air and dirtier water—and a more imperiled climate.

Myron Ebell is someone I don't quote often. He is the head of President Trump's EPA transition team and a prominent climate denier. He has something interesting to say about Scott Pruitt. He has said that he thinks Scott Pruitt is using EPA as a "stepping stone to political office" and that "everything he does is going to be a political calculation about what furthers his own political career."

This is not a liberal environmentalist making these accusations. This is somebody who is right in Scott Pruitt's climate denial wheelhouse. This is someone from the Trump science denial EPA destruction team. This is the guy who is in the club of fossil fuel-funded climate denial, and he thinks everything Pruitt does is a political calculation about what furthers Pruitt's own political career. If that is the case, everything Scott Pruitt does is a conflict of interest, as he sees regulated industry as the funders of his next political campaign. They pay for him now, and he delivers.

Sadly, the people who own Pruitt also own Congress. So good luck getting an honest look at this mess from our fossil fuel-funded colleagues in the majority.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL J. McLAUGHLIN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments to acknowledge my friend, Mayor Daniel J. McLaughlin of the Village of Orland Park, in my home State of Illinois. There is no stronger advocate for the people of Orland Park than Dan McLaughlin. For more than three decades, he has served his community with distinction.

Dan began his service to Orland Park in 1983 as a village trustee. A decade later, he was elected mayor and would go on to serve for six terms. In 1995, Mayor McLaughlin created the Orland Park Open Lands program, which preserved nearly 300 acres of open space, two family farms, and created the village's nature center. In the same year, he completed the Orland Park Veterans Memorial. Each Memorial and Veterans Day, the village gathers at the memorial, Ara Pace—Place of Peace, at the Orland Park Village Center—and adds the names of veterans to the granite wall surrounding the memorial. It is a wonderful tribute that allows residents of Orland Park to thank those who bravely served our country.

During his tenure, Mayor McLaughlin also brought the community together through an increase in village sponsored events and outdoor concerts. He believed in fitness for fun, and his leadership helped save the Orland Park Health and Fitness Center, created Centennial Park West, and expanded the aquatic center, which now includes ice skating, sledding, a dog park, and bicycle paths.

His governing philosophy was simple, "plan for people not cars." That vision led to a pedestrian-friendly center in the heart of downtown Orland Park in the historic 143rd train station, where people can come together to play and work. Throughout his career, Mayor McLaughlin grew Orland Park's economy by marketing the I-80 corridor, helping to bring in new businesses while retaining the ones already thriving in the village.

Mayor McLaughlin has been honored by numerous organizations, including

the American Institute of Architects; Chaddick Institute; Chicago Magazine; Chicago Southland Convention & Visitors' Bureau; Congress of New Urbanism; Government Finance Officers Association; Home Builders Association of Greater Chicago; Illinois Arts Council; Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police; Metropolitan Mayors Caucus; Moraine Valley Community College; the Chicago Building Congress; the United States Conference of Mayors; and the United States Green Building Council—just to name a few.

I want to thank Mayor McLaughlin for his commitment to the people of Orland Park. I especially want to thank Dan's wife, Patricia McLaughlin, and four children—Bridget, Mary Kate, Dan, and Matt—for sharing so much of their husband and father with the Village of Orland Park. Now as he moves to the next chapter in his life, I wish him and his family all the best.

LIFESPAN RESPITE CARE REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator BALDWIN, in introducing the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act of 2017.

Every day, an estimated 43 million family caregivers attend to loved ones who are experiencing chronic, disabling health conditions. While many of these individuals care for an older adult, almost one-third of caregivers attend to persons under the age of 50. Caregivers help individuals remain at home, often delaying the need for nursing home or foster care placements. The value of their efforts are tremendous, amounting to more than \$470 billion in uncompensated care. This task, however, can take a toll. Caregivers experience higher mortality rates and are more likely to acquire acute and chronic health conditions. That is why respite care is so important. It provides temporary relief to caregivers from their ongoing responsibilities, reducing the toll they experience. Respite care helps keep caregivers healthy, keeps families intact, and provides a substantial public value.

Recently, the Senate Aging Committee, which I chair, held a hearing on age-friendly communities. Meg Callaway, the project director of the Piscataquis Thriving in Place Coalition in Dover-Foxcroft, ME, testified that "the one most critical service is respite." We have heard this time and time again.

In 2006, when the Lifespan Respite Care Act was originally enacted, the goal was to improve the delivery and quality of respite care available to all caregivers. Since that time, 35 States and the District of Columbia have received grants to increase the availability and quality of respite services.

Still, with an increasing number of Americans with chronic conditions who require some amount of caregiver sup-

port on a daily basis, the need for respite care continues to increase and outpace available resources.

The legislation that we are introducing would authorize \$15 million per year for 5 years, through 2022, to extend the program. Such funding would provide competitive grants to States to establish or enhance statewide Lifespan Respite systems that maximize existing resources and help ensure that quality respite care is available and accessible to all family caregivers. This reauthorization also would require grantees to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of programs and activities funded under such grants.

Thirty-six aging and disability organizations have endorsed the Lifespan Respite Care Reauthorization Act, including the ARCH National Respite Network, the Alzheimer's Association, the Michael J. Fox Foundation, and the Elizabeth Dole Foundation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important legislation.

35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MARGARET CHASE SMITH LIBRARY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in 1973, when Senator Margaret Chase Smith returned to private life and her hometown of Skowhegan, ME, she brought with her hundreds of thousands of documents, photographs, recordings, and memorabilia accumulated during her remarkable 33 years of public service. Nine years later, in 1982, with the support and encouragement of her many friends and admirers, her dream of establishing a library was realized. Today I wish to commemorate the 35th anniversary of the Margaret Chase Smith Library.

The Margaret Chase Smith Library is one of our Nation's premier free-standing congressional libraries, a priceless archive and museum, and an invaluable educational center. From the very start, it was Senator Smith's wish for the library to be more than a storehouse of papers and a collection of mementos. She wanted it to be a place of aspirations, an institution where students would be inspired to public service. She wanted it to be a source of insight and information for historical scholarship from the perspective of a historic leader. Just as important, she wanted it to be a place where citizens would come together to discuss important policy issues in an atmosphere of civility and respect.

Senator Smith did more than wish for those things; she worked to bring them about. From opening day in August of 1982 until shortly before her passing in 1995, she presided over the facility, meeting with schoolchildren, researchers, policymakers, and engaged citizens. The library as it exists today stands on the foundation of a great leader's commitment to service.

This great accomplishment is the work of many hands. Outstanding directors, dedicated staff, an exceptional board of directors, Northwood University, the Margaret Chase Smith Policy

Center at the University of Maine, the Margaret Chase Smith Foundation, and Senator Smith's close friend and adviser, Merton Henry, have worked together in a collaborative spirit that pays the highest tribute to Senator Smith and her legacy.

That legacy is, above all, a reminder of the obligation we all share to uphold the values and ideals of our Nation. Thanks to the Margaret Chase Smith Library, that message remains strong. I congratulate its staff and many supporters on this 35th anniversary and know that this library will continue to inspire us for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING LONGFELLOW'S GREENHOUSE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 40th anniversary of Longfellow's Greenhouse of Manchester, ME, a family-owned small business and a leader in the greenhouse industry.

Longfellow's Greenhouse opened during the winter of 1977. That year, with the help of their son, Scott, owners Lawrence and Mavis Longfellow built 12 large greenhouses and a retail shop on a meadow in Manchester. In the years that followed, the business flourished and expanded. Scott has been integral to that success, applying the knowledge and expertise learned through his studies at the University of Maine at Orono and holding the positions of grower and general manager up until this year. Today Scott's son, Will, carries on the tradition as general manager.

Over the course of four decades, the Longfellow family and their devoted employees have built more than a business. They have created a seasonal destination, especially in the spring and holidays, where families can gather to create gardens, landscapes, and traditions filled with flowers, plants, and fond memories. In addition to providing outstanding services and a great experience, they are widely known for giving back to the community through both their time and proceeds. Longfellow's has helped create new ideas that enrich the gardening experience for their customers, all the while placing a special emphasis on presentation and education by holding special events that offer demonstrations, lectures, and hands-on classes.

Today Longfellow's stands out with 21 greenhouses, where they produce 40,000 geraniums, 22,000 fall mums, 15,000 flowering hanging baskets, 75,000 perennials, and 25,000 poinsettias. Among the diverse flowers and plants they house are 800 varieties of perennials, 200 varieties of herbs and scented geraniums—over half of which are grown on site—more than 500 varieties of trees, shrubs, and vines, and 100 varieties of roses.

Longfellow's Greenhouse has set the standard for horticulture in Maine, and they have done so while promoting civic engagement and practicing hon-

est and ethical business—all of which will continue to make it a special part of central Maine. Not only have they fostered a positive culture around gardening, but their efforts have also engaged the imagination of people of all ages. I am proud and honored to join with all those who are celebrating this achievement and recognizing their high quality of work on behalf of all Maine people. I thank them for their tremendous contributions to our State.

TRIBUTE TO RANDALL D. BOOKOUT

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute and offer my deep appreciation to Randy Bookout for his many years of dedicated service as a professional staff member on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, SSCI. Randy joined the committee staff in October 1999 and served in various capacities, most recently as the committee's budget monitor for the Central Intelligence Agency, CIA. During his almost 18 years with the committee, Randy established a solid reputation of fairness and professionalism that was widely respected by members and staff, regardless of party, and officials within intelligence community elements over which he conducted oversight.

Randall D. Bookout joined the committee after serving a 28-year career with the Army, retiring as a colonel in the infantry. His distinguished Army career included assignments as a company commander in Korea and Panama and as an infantry battalion commander in Alaska. He served as a staff officer in the Office of the Army Chief of Staff and later as the senior military aide to Secretary of the Army Togo D. West, Jr. His last duty in the Army was as the Army's Chief of Legislative Liaison for the Senate from 1995–1999. Randy graduated with a bachelor of science degree from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point and a master's degree in business administration from the University of Northern Colorado. He attended the Army's War College at Carlisle Barracks, PA, as well as airborne and Ranger training.

Senator RICHARD SHELBY of Alabama, who often traveled with Colonel Bookout when he served as the Army chief liaison for the Senate, was chairman of the SSCI in 1999 and asked Randy to interview for a nonpartisan staff job on the committee. Randy retired from the Army on a Friday and began work at SSCI the following Monday. As often was the case, Randy took to the challenge of this new role with a deep commitment, including long hours of study to learn an entire new encyclopedia of acronyms from the ones he knew after 28 years in the Army.

Much of Randy's work for the committee must remain unspoken. I will simply say here that he has made significant contributions to this country's national security and to the operations

and activities of the CIA and the rest of the intelligence community. He knew the Agency in detail, seriously challenged it at times, and fiercely defended it at others. He forced changes that improved its operations, while at all times respecting its mission and, most importantly, respecting the women and men who worked there.

In fact, one of Randy's greatest traits and admirable qualities is that he cared not only for the organization, but genuinely cared about the individuals. His job was to focus on big programs, run by hundreds if not thousands of people, worth hundreds of millions of dollars, and affecting the lives of countless others. He did that oversight job exceptionally well. He also saw and noticed each person who was a part of these big operations. Randy did what he could to help them perform their mission and to help them in their personal lives when something was amiss. For example, he helped a woman who served admirably for both the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the CIA, who unjustly lost her American citizenship. Randy helped get her legal resident status back. He helped an intelligence official, who left government service due to health problems incurred in a war zone, get the retirement ceremony he rightly deserved and was important to him and his family. After every trip he took for the committee, he left a trail of handwritten thank you notes that traced his path. He not only never forgot the little guy, Randy knew their name.

In the committee office, Randy always represents the highest standard of professionalism and collegiality. He always took the time to mentor young staffers, was willing to share his knowledge on programs or activities, and has never shied away from a request for assistance from a colleague. A fellow staff noted that Randy "treats colleagues, superiors and the most junior staff member with respect and encouragement. He treats the intelligence officials with whom we interact in the same manner. So many times I've seen him engage with junior officers in challenging and remote settings at odd hours of the night, and his interest and enthusiasm for their work leaves them invigorated and inspired to do their work."

Staff have shared many interesting stories and traits about Randy. He is generally the first to arrive in the office, around 5 to 6 a.m. For his 60th birthday, he ran an Iron Man triathlon. Colleagues talked about his love of travel, strange penchant for weird hats, participation in a Tough Mudder, and the particularly interesting fact that he and his family were chosen to be on the "Family Feud" TV show. They won. Staff also have noted his constant positive demeanor, even when addressing difficult and challenging issues, but, foremost, they noted his commitment to and pride in his family.

After 46 years of serving his Nation, Randy will retire next week to the

great State of North Carolina with his wife of 44 years, Cindi Bookout. He talks proudly and lovingly of her and their two children. Their son, LTC Josh Bookout, graduated from West Point and is currently serving his third tour in Afghanistan as a battalion commander. Their daughter, Whitney Corey, achieved a master's degree in psychology and is currently in San Diego. Retirement will give Randy and Cindi well-deserved time to be grandparents to their six wonderful grandchildren: Cade, Brock, Colt, Ali, Chloe, and Ainsley.

Let me close by again noting that Randy's commitment to his mission, his colleagues, his family, and his country is unquestioned. I want to thank him for his energy, his intellect, his passion, and his efforts on my behalf and on behalf of the committee. I am certain that I can on the Senate floor here today also express the appreciation of the six chairmen and vice chairmen of the committee, all of whom Randy served, for his service and share our collective wish for great joy and happiness in the next stage of his life.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING RUTH'S REUSABLE RESOURCES

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the efforts of Ruth Libby and her work with Ruth's Reusable Resources. Her organization operates in southern Maine and is dedicated to ensuring that students ranging from preschool to 12th grade are adequately prepared with the basic tools of learning.

When Ruth Libby's son was in kindergarten, she received a note from his teacher requesting household items such as egg cartons, meat trays, and juice can lids for use in craft projects. Ruth responded to this request in full force and went above and beyond by not only getting supplies to her son's classroom, but also for other classrooms in the school. As time went on, she began receiving, sorting, and stocking products donated by corporations, businesses, and individuals for use by local classrooms. Ruth started by delivering these items to the school, and a few years later, she established a "storeroom" in her basement where teachers could come and "shop" at their convenience. With financial assistance from the Unum Group and a grant from the State of Maine Department of Education, Ruth was able to create a unique and effective nonprofit organization and relocate to the organization's current 21,000-square-foot warehouse and 7,000-square-foot teacher store in Portland, ME.

Since its inception in 1994, Ruth's Reusable Resources has provided more than \$60 million worth of surplus furniture, paper, books, office supplies, and computers to nonprofits and

schools. They have also received donated furniture, paper, books, office supplies, and computers from corporations, businesses, and individuals across the State of Maine. In turn, Ruth's Reusable Resources allows staff members of participating schools to "shop" for supplies at no charge. Ruth, together with a diverse group of hard-working volunteers, ranging from retired teachers, students, current teachers, corporate groups, retirees, court appointed volunteers, civic groups, collegiate ministries, and many more, work to ensure that every Maine student is provided with the necessary supplies to succeed in school.

Ruth's Reusable Resources is a shining example of what can happen when you have determination and a passion to make a difference. Ruth is an outstanding example of a hard-working Mainer who is making a difference in her community and across our State. She has played an instrumental role in providing resources for classrooms in Maine which has furthered the education of many students. Thank you, Ruth, for all you have already done for both the students and their teachers in communities throughout Maine. I look forward to following your continued success.●

170TH ANNIVERSARY OF CLIFFS NATURAL RESOURCES

• Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to offer my congratulations to Cliffs Natural Resources and its outstanding employees on the company's 170th anniversary. I am honored to celebrate this milestone with the largest and oldest independent iron ore mining company in the United States.

In 1847, 11 men from Cleveland founded Cliffs Natural Resources to develop ore in Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Cliffs has since grown to be a leader in North American mining, employing thousands and providing U.S. steelmakers with world-class raw materials.

Mining has always been a way of life for families on Minnesota's Iron Range, including my own. My grandfather worked 1,500 feet underground in the mines of Ely, MN. His generation helped build our Nation's steel industry into the global power it is today. The Iron Range has the largest concentration of iron ore in the United States. Right now, Minnesota is first in the Nation in the movement of iron ore, with more than 4,000 jobs associated with the iron ore and steel industries. Throughout our State's history, iron ore mining has not only brought jobs to the region, it has also built our country, from our roads, bridges, buildings, and railways, to the tanks and ships critical to our Nation's defense. The Iron Range also supplied most of the iron used in World War II.

In recent years, Cliffs has focused its energies on revitalizing iron ore mines and processing plants in the United States. In August of last year, Cliffs

broke ground on a \$75 million expansion at its United Taconite plant in Forbes, MN. I am proud to support companies like Cliffs that are committed to creating jobs for Minnesotans for generations to come. Cliffs is also well known for its commitment to corporate stewardship. From contributing to building homes for families through Habitat for Humanity, to helping ensure children in need get a nutritious meal through United Way programs, Cliffs has been committed to Minnesota families and communities.

This 170th anniversary of Cliffs' founding is a remarkable achievement. I am pleased to take this opportunity to congratulate Cliffs chairman, president, and chief executive officer Lourenco Goncalves and the employees of Cliffs on celebrating this occasion. Best wishes for much continued success.●

REMEMBERING SUE SHAFFER

• Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to honor a rare and wonderful individual known throughout Oregon and the Nation who passed away on April 11 at the age of 94. Chairman Sue Shaffer, of the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe of Indians, lived a powerful life as a nonstop advocate for her family, her Tribe, and her community. As a mother, wife, daughter and friend, Sue created an atmosphere of energy, honesty, and kindness wherever she went. For Sue, no person or job was too big or too small to embrace.

Sue was a descendant of one of the seven founding families of the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe. She grew up during the Great Depression in rural Douglas County at a time when everything was scarce. Despite her family's own struggle, their door was always open to neighbors in need of food or lodging, and they were always willing to support their community members. As she liked to recall, she grew up in a household where honesty, moral integrity, education, hard work, and helping others were all high priorities. For Sue and her family, life's rewards came from working hard and reaching out to others—and that is just what she did.

Sue's mother, Nellie Crispin, kept records of the Tribe's heritage and passed down to her daughter the desire to fight for Tribal recognition. That vision and determination drove Sue to play an instrumental role in convincing Congress to formally recognize the Tribe in 1982. In 1983, Sue Shaffer became chair of the newly restored Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe, and for nearly 30 years, she worked with her Tribe and the community and expanded the Tribe's prominence by growing its economic footprint.

Sue served as delegate to the National Congress of American Indians, delegate to the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, and delegate to Indian Women's Leadership White House

Conference, but her leadership in the community was not limited to the Tribe. Sue served on a myriad of boards in the community, including Umpqua Community College, becoming the first woman to chair the board. Throughout her life, Sue was also honored with many awards, including the 1999 President's Award for outstanding contribution to community in economic development by the Roseburg Chamber of Commerce, 2000 Female Citizen of the Year award for "unselfish devotion and distinguished service" by the Roseburg Area Chamber of Commerce, and the Eleanor Roosevelt Award in 2003. She was inducted into the Hall of Fame at Umpqua Community College in June 1999 in recognition of the 17 years she served on the UCC board of trustees.

Sue Shaffer was a dear friend, always known for being fair and never one to hesitate to "tell it like it is." I will greatly miss Sue's friendship and good counsel. She was a true dynamo whose eloquent and powerful advocacy helped right the long, tragic history of wrongs inflicted on the Cow Creek and other Tribes in Oregon. Sue gladly led on so many fronts to improve life for the Cow Creek Band of the Umpqua Tribe, create a better Douglas County and a better place for all of Oregon to enjoy. Her indelible legacy of achievement for our State and our Nation will live on to benefit generations to come.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

BUDGET OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018—PM 8

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying reports and papers; which was referred jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on the Budget; and Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

On February 28, I spoke to a joint session of the Congress about what we need to do to begin a new chapter of American Greatness. I asked the Nation to look forward nine years and imagine the wonders we could achieve by America's 250th anniversary of our Independence if we set free the dreams of our people by removing the barriers holding back our economic growth.

This Budget's defining ambition is to unleash the dreams of the American people. This requires laying a new foundation for American Greatness.

Through streamlined Government, we will drive an economic boom that

raises incomes and expands job opportunities for all Americans. Faster economic growth, coupled with fiscal restraint, will enable us to fully fund our national priorities, balance our budget, and start to pay down our national debt.

Our moral commitment to replacing our current economic stagnation with faster economic growth rests on the following eight pillars of reform:

Health Reform. We need to enable Americans to buy the healthcare they need at a price they can afford. To this end, we must repeal Obamacare and its burdensome regulations and mandates, and replace it with a framework that restores choice and competition. This will lower the cost of care so that more Americans can get the medical attention they need. Additionally, Medicaid, which inadequately serves enrollees and taxpayers, must be reformed to allow States to manage their own programs, with continued financial support from the Federal Government.

Tax Reform and Simplification. We must reduce the tax burden on American workers and businesses, so that we can maximize incomes and economic growth. We must also simplify our tax system, so that individuals and businesses do not waste countless hours and resources simply paying their taxes.

Immigration Reform. We must reform immigration policy so that it serves our national interest. We will adopt commonsense proposals that protect American workers, reduce burdens on taxpayers and public resources, and focus Federal funds on underserved and disadvantaged citizens.

Reductions in Federal Spending. We must scrutinize every dollar the Federal Government spends. Just as families decide how to manage limited budgets, we must ensure the Federal Government spends precious taxpayer dollars only on our highest national priorities, and always in the most efficient, effective manner.

Regulatory Rollback. We must eliminate every outdated, unnecessary, or ineffective Federal regulation, and move aggressively to build regulatory frameworks that stimulate—rather than stagnate—job creation. Even for those regulations we must leave in place, we must strike every provision that is counterproductive, ineffective, or outdated.

American Energy Development. We must increase development of America's energy resources, strengthening our national security, lowering the price of electricity and transportation fuels, and driving down the cost of consumer goods so that every American individual and business has more money to save and invest. A consistent, long-term supply of lower-cost American energy brings with it a much larger economy, more jobs, and greater security for the American people.

Welfare Reform. We must reform our welfare system so that it does not discourage able-bodied adults from work-

ing, which takes away scarce resources from those in real need. Work must be the center of our social policy.

Education Reform. We need to return decisions regarding education back to the State and local levels, while advancing opportunities for parents and students to choose, from all available options, the school that best fits their needs to learn and succeed.

To unleash the power of American work and creativity—and drive opportunity and faster economic growth—we must reprioritize Federal spending so that it advances the safety and security of the American people.

This Budget, therefore, includes \$639 billion for the Department of Defense—a \$52 billion increase from the 2017 annualized continuing resolution level. This increase will be offset by targeted reductions elsewhere. This defense funding is vital to rebuilding, modernizing, and preparing our Armed Forces for the future so that our military remains the world's preeminent fighting force and we can continue to ensure peace through strength. This Budget also increases funding to take care of our great veterans, who have served their country with such honor and distinction.

The Budget also meets the need to materially increase funding for border security, immigration enforcement, and law enforcement at the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice. These funding increases will provide additional resources for a southern border wall, expanded detention capacity, and initiatives to reduce violent crime, as well as more immigration judges, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers, and Border Patrol agents. The Budget also invests significant resources in efforts to combat opioid abuse.

In these dangerous times, our increased attention to public safety and national security sends a clear message to the world—a message of American strength and resolve. It follows through on my promise to focus on keeping Americans safe, keeping terrorists out of our Nation, and putting violent offenders behind bars.

As this Budget returns us to economic prosperity, it will also allow us to fund additional priorities, including infrastructure, student loan reform, and initiatives to help working families such as paid parental leave. We will champion the hardworking taxpayers who have been ignored for too long. Once we end our economic stagnation and return to robust growth, so many of our aspirations will be within reach.

It is now up to the Congress to act. I pledge my full cooperation in ending the economic malaise that has, for too long, crippled the dreams of our people. The time for small thinking is over. As we look forward to our 250th year, I am calling upon all Members of Congress to join me in striving to do big and bold and daring things for our Nation.

We have it in our power to set free the dreams of our people. Let us begin.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 2017.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:33 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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 695. An act to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 883. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1188. An act to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1625. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1842. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1862. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 4003(e) of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114-255), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Health Information Technology Advisory Committee: Mr. Patrick Soon-Shiong of Culver City, California.

The message further announced that pursuant to section 1 of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act (2 U.S.C. 154), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following individual on the part of the House of Representatives to the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board for a 5-year term: Ambassador Richard Fredericks of San Francisco, California.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2(a) of the National Cultural Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76h(a)), amended by Public Law 107-117, and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts: Mr. MACARTHUR of New Jersey.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 695. An act to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 883. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a certification process for the issuance of nondisclosure requirements accompanying certain administrative subpoenas, to provide for judicial review of such nondisclosure requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1188. An act to reauthorize certain programs established by the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1625. An act to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to include severe forms of trafficking in persons within the definition of transnational organized crime for purposes of the rewards program of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 1842. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to include State crimes of violence as grounds for an enhanced penalty when sex offenders fail to register or report certain information as required by Federal law, to include prior military offenses for purposes of recidivist sentencing provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1862. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the scope of certain definitions pertaining to unlawful sexual conduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-1637. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the designation of a group as a Foreign Terrorist Organization by the Secretary of State (OSS-2017-0521); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1638. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to the United Kingdom, Italy, Spain, and Saudi Arabia to support the assembly, modification, testing, training, operation, maintenance, and integration of the Paveway II and II, Enhanced Paveway II and III, and Paveway IV Weapons Systems for the Royal Saudi Air Force, in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-043); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1639. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical

data, and defense services to Saudi Arabia to support the integration, installation, operation, training, testing, maintenance, and repair of the FMU-152A/B Joint Program-mable Bomb (JPB) Fuze System in the amount of \$14,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-011); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-1640. A communication from the Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services to Saudi Arabia to support the integration, installation, operation, training, testing, maintenance, and repair of the Joint Direct Attack Munition (JDAM) in the amount of \$50,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 16-132); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*David L. Norquist, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller).

*Elaine McCusker, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Kari A. Bingen, of Virginia, to be a Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

*Robert Daigle, of Virginia, to be Director of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation, Department of Defense.

*Robert Story Karem, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

*Kenneth P. Rapuano, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Sean L. Murphy, to be Major General.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. John A. Okon and ending with Capt. Michael W. Studeman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 21, 2017.

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Edward L. Anderson and ending with Capt. James P. Waters III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 21, 2017. (minus 1 nominee: Capt. Peter G. Vasely)

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Bradford J. Shwedo, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Giovanni K. Tuck, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. James C. McConville, to be General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Stuart W. Risch, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Thomas C. Seamands, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Col. Mark E. Black, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Matthew V. Baker, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Chris R. Gentry, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert A. Karmazin, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Marion Garcia, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Joseph E. Whitlock, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Col. Miguel A. Castellanos, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Windsor S. Buzza, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Randall V. Simmons, Jr., to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Michael D. Wickman, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Carl A. Alex and ending with Brig. Gen. Brian E. Winski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Susan K. Arnold and ending with Col. Robert P. Huston, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Army nomination of Col. Richard J. Lebel, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Todd W. Lewis, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. George N. Appenzeller and ending with Col. Telita Crosland, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 8, 2017.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Steven R. Rudder, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. Laura J. Richardson, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Charles N. Pede, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Phillip G. Sawyer, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Brian D. Beaudreault, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Air Force nomination of James E. Thompson, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Johanna K. Ream, to be Major.

Air Force nominations beginning with Paul R. Aguirre and ending with Peter Lawrence Zalewski, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Army nomination of Kalie K. Rott, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Norma A. Hill, to be Major.

Army nomination of Frank C. Pescatello, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Basim M. Younis, to be Major.

Army nomination of Stanley F. Gould, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Scott W. Fisher, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Gary L. Beaty and ending with Michael A. M. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Daniel J. Convey and ending with Philip A. Horton, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Sophia Dalce and ending with Burke Lenz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nomination of Dawn E. Elliott, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of D012528, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Benjamin W. Hillner, to be Major.

Army nomination of Celina S. Pargo, to be Major.

Army nomination of Paul R. Ambrose, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with James L. Dungca and ending with Nathan S. Lanham, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 24, 2017.

Army nomination of Charles R. Burnett, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Pablo F. Diaz, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Craig A. Nazareth, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Brian C. McLean, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Raymond C. Casteline, to be Major.

Army nomination of Daniel J. Shank, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher W. Degn, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Jason T. Kidder, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Tito M. Villanueva, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Philip J. Dacunto, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Stephen R. November, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Luisa Santiago, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Robert J. Bonner, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Mohamad El Samad, to be Major.

Army nomination of Lana J. Bernat, to be Major.

Army nomination of Patrick K. Sullivan, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Derek L. Adams and ending with James M. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Rodney Abrams and ending with D010081, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Army nominations beginning with Christine N. Adams and ending with Charlette K. Woodard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Mark S. Jimison and ending with Shawn P. Wonderlich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 27, 2017.

Marine Corps nomination of Jason G. Lacis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Kevin J. Goodwin, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Javier E. Vega, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Sergio L. Sandoval, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Michael S. Stevens, to be Major.

Marine Corps nomination of Patrick J. Mullen, to be Major.

Marine Corps nominations beginning with Raymond L. Adams and ending with Douglas S. Woodhams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 10, 2017.

Navy nomination of Susan M. McGarvey, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Sheila I. Almendras-Flaherty, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Adrian D. Ragland, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Christopher R. Desena, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Kenneth L. Demick, Jr., to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Michael C. Bratley, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Evan M. Colbert, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Luciana Sung, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of William A. Schultz, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of William L. McCoy, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Chris F. White, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Karl M. Kingry, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Michael A. Polito, to be Commander.

Navy nomination of Raymond J. Carlson, Jr., to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Christopher M. Allen, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Aaron L. Witherspoon, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of John E. Fritz, to be Captain.

By Mr. CRAPO for the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

*Sigal Mandelker, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes.

*Heath P. Tarbert, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

*Mira Radielovic Ricardel, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration.

*Marshall Billingslea, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, Department of the Treasury.

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

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

S. 1202. A bill to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. 1203. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program under which the Administrator shall defer the designation of an area as a nonattainment area for purposes of the 8-hour ozone national ambient air quality standard if the area achieves and maintains certain standards under a voluntary early action compact plan; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. MCCASKILL (for herself and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1204. A bill to authorize the United States Postal Service to carry out emergency suspensions of post offices in accordance with certain procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1205. A bill to authorize the establishment of American Dream Accounts; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1206. A bill to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SASSE, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 1207. A bill to amend the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 with respect to the application of the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule to certain farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1208. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to provide for an option under the Secure Mail Initiative under which a person to whom a document is sent under that initiative may elect to have the United States Postal Service use the Hold for Pickup service or the Signature Confirmation service in delivering the document, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MARKKEY):

S. 1209. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 58

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 58, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage.

S. 59

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 59, a bill to provide that silencers be treated the same as long guns.

S. 196

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 196, a bill to provide for a Public Health Emergency Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 203

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 203, a bill to reaffirm that the Environmental Protection Agency may not regulate vehicles used solely for competition, and for other purposes.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 374

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 374, a bill to enable concrete masonry products manufacturers to establish, finance, and carry out a coordi-

nated program of research, education, and promotion to improve, maintain, and develop markets for concrete masonry products.

S. 379

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 379, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the five month waiting period for disability insurance benefits under such title for individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis.

S. 407

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 407, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 470

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 470, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit and make the credit fully refundable.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive co-insurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 602

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 602, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation.

S. 720

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 720, a bill to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to include in the prohibitions on boycotts against allies of the United States boycotts fostered by international governmental organizations against Israel and to direct the Export-Import Bank of the United States to oppose boycotts against Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 722

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 722, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to Iran in relation to Iran's ballistic missile program, support for acts of international terrorism, and violations of human rights, and for other purposes.

S. 778

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 778, a bill to require the use of prescription drug monitoring programs and to facilitate information sharing among States.

S. 782

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 782, a bill to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

S. 798

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 798, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program to apply to individuals pursuing programs of education while on active duty, to recipients of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship, and to programs of education pursued on half-time basis or less, and for other purposes.

S. 829

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 829, a bill to reauthorize the Assistance to Firefighters Grants program, the Fire Prevention and Safety Grants program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 896

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 896, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 912

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 912, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a free on-line tax preparation and filing service and programs that allow taxpayers to access third-party provided tax return information.

S. 926

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 926, a bill to authorize the Global War on Terror Memorial Foundation to establish the National Global War on Terrorism Memorial as a commemorative work in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

S. 976

At the request of Mr. ENZI, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 976, a bill to restore States' sovereign rights to enforce State and local sales and use tax laws, and for other purposes.

S. 989

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 989, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of pediatric subspecialists in the National Health Service Corps program, and for other purposes.

S. 1016

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1016, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes.

S. 1073

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1073, a bill to authorize Escambia County, Florida, to convey certain property that was formerly part of Santa Rosa Island National Monument and that was conveyed to Escambia County subject to restrictions on use and reconveyance.

S. 1094

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1094, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1113

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1113, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. STRANGE, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to prohibit certain Federal funds from being available to sanctuary jurisdictions that refuse to cooperate with the Federal Government on immigration matters or retaliate against border security contractors, and for other purposes.

S. 1136

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1136, a bill to improve the structure of the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to help prevent acts of genocide and other atrocity crimes, which threaten national and international security, by enhancing United States Government capacities to prevent, mitigate, and respond to such crises.

S. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr.

CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate to support the territorial integrity of Georgia.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

S. 1202. A bill to modify the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, September will mark the 60th anniversary of the Little Rock Nine, the nine African-American students who enrolled in the then-all-white Little Rock Central High School in 1957. Ask anyone who lived through the crisis, and they will tell you they remember it vividly. They may not have been there in person, but they remember the photos, those searing images of an angry mob, the stoic students, the bayoneted troops, all gathering in a high school, of all places.

Perhaps the most searing image is of Elizabeth Eckford, one of the nine who was then only 15 years old. She didn't get word that the other students were going as a group. She went alone in a simple black-and-white dress she had made just for the occasion. The mob baited her, menaced her, cursed her, some threatened to lynch her. She later said of her walk to the school's entrance: "It was the longest block I've ever walked in my whole life."

I think it is of the highest importance that we preserve their story and share it with our kids. It is a reminder of pretty sad times in our history and, more important, of the courage shown by nine young Arkansans, who helped our State and our Nation overcome deep-seated prejudices by appealing to the better angels of our nature.

We preserve historic battlefields like Yorktown and Gettysburg because we want our children to know what it took to gain and keep our freedom—the sacrifices made, the hardships endured. Equally important is preserving historic sites like Central High, where our citizens began the long road to freedom from oppression and intolerance.

That is why we made Central High School a historic site years ago, though with one oversight. There are seven homes across the street from the school. Their exteriors were in many of the pictures that are now so famous. There has long been a movement to preserve those exteriors so future generations will be able to see Central High exactly as it looked when the Little Rock Nine arrived to school.

I am proud to say that today I am introducing a bill with three of my colleagues—the senior Senator of Vermont PAT LEAHY, Congressman FRENCH HILL of Little Rock, and civil rights legend Congressman JOHN LEWIS—that would do just that. It would extend the boundary of the Central High historical site to include these seven homes.

It would add about an acre and a half to the park, although I should say this bill would not authorize the Federal Government to take ownership of the homes and wouldn't allow the National Park Service to buy them in the future. Instead, it would simply encourage the homeowners and National Park Service to work together to preserve these homes so future generations could see them and learn from them. That is one reason our bill has the support of the homeowners, the Central High Neighborhood Association, and my State's historic preservation advocacy group, Preserve Arkansas. All three have written to me to express support for the bill. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have their letters printed in the RECORD.

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

CENTRAL HIGH NEIGHBORHOOD INC.

May 16, 2017.

U.S. Senator TOM COTTON,
ATTN: Lisa Harst,
Washington DC.

DEAR SENATOR COTTON: On behalf of the Central High Neighborhood, Inc. (CHNI), I would like to express support for your proposed legislation that would move the boundary of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site to include seven properties across the street from the high school.

CHNI is proud to support this initiative, which would recognize the historical significance of seven homes located on the 1400 and 1500 blocks of Park Street. The boundary adjustment encourages proper care and preservation of these homes by allowing property owners, on a case by case basis, to enter into cooperative agreements with the National Park Service.

CHNI understands that property owners will maintain rightful ownership and that the Park Service has no intention to purchase the homes neither now, nor in the future.

CHNI would like to thank you for your work on this very important issue and hopes you will remain engaged with us as your bill advances through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

WHITNEY PATTERSON,
President, on behalf of
Central High Neighborhood, Inc.
PRESERVE ARKANSAS,

May 4, 2017.

Ms. LISA B. HARST,
Legislative Assistant, U.S. Senator Tom Cotton,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HARST: My name is Rachel Patton, and I am the executive director of Preserve Arkansas, Arkansas's statewide historic preservation advocacy group. On behalf of our board of directors, I am writing to support the proposed expansion of the Little Rock Central High School National Historic Site boundary to include the seven homes across the street from the high school. This

simple boundary adjustment will encourage the preservation of the seven historic homes in the 1400 and 1500 blocks of Park Street and allow homeowners, on a case by case basis, to enter cooperative agreements with the National Park Service while retaining private property ownership.

We feel that this is an important step in the right direction for the Central High School Neighborhood Historic District as a whole. Please let me know if I may provide further assistance with this initiative.

Sincerely,

RACHEL PATTON,
Executive Director.

From: Patricia McGraw.
Subject: Washington Heritage House.
To Whom It May Concern: City Officials

DEAR MS. HARST: We, the owners of the properties, addresses listed above, located directly across Park Street in front of the famous and renowned educational facility, Little Rock Central High School, wish to express our gratitude and appreciation of all that you do for our neighborhood, our city, and our state, particularly in learning that the National Park Service wishes to expand their boundaries to include our seven houses. It is our belief that our houses add to the beauty and dignity of the structural and environmental beauty, dignity, and grace to this area of Little Rock.

In that we are greatly interested in the continuous celebrated dignity of this site, we are very supportive of direction to expand upon this historic city development, and we appreciate our being included in this significant idea. Please continue to keep us abreast of new developments and ideas which we intend to implement as wished by the city officials, and intend to seek funding to make this dream of our foreparents to come true.

Thanks again for including us, and please take care of yourselves and our city. Love and Deep Appreciation For All That You Do:

Sincerely,

DR. PATRICIA WASHINGTON
MCGRAW,
MRS. GRACE BLAGDON,
OTHER CONCERNED OWNERS.

Mr. COTTON. There is widespread agreement in the community and in our State that this site is not just a part of Arkansas' history, it is a part of our national heritage.

Central High stands as a reminder of an article Billy Graham published during the crisis, "No Color Line in Heaven." It was a hard-won lesson and one I think we should do everything we can to pass on to the next generation.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have 8 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the majority and minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on worldwide threats.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 10 a.m., to conduct an executive session to vote on the following nominations: Ms. Sigal Mandelker, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, U.S. Department of the Treasury; Ms. Mira Radielovic Ricardel, to be Under Secretary for Export Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce; Mr. Marshall Billingslea, to be Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing, U.S. Department of the Treasury; and Mr. Heath Tarbert, to be Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of the Treasury.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017 from 2:15 p.m.-4 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed member briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWERS

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in closed session, to receive a briefing on Navy readiness challenges, emerging threats, and the requirements underpinning the 355-Ship Force Structure Objective.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE, SCIENCE AND COMPETITIVENESS

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a Subcommittee Hearing on "Reopening the American Frontier: Exploring How the Outer Space Treaty Will Impact American Commerce and Settlement in Space."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CLEAN AIR AND NUCLEAR SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Clean Air and Nuclear Safety of the Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room 406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled, "Making Implementation of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ground-Level Ozone Attainable: Legislative Hearing on S. 263 and S. 452."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON BORDER SECURITY AND IMMIGRATION

The Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Border Security and Immigration, is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on

Tuesday, May 23, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Building America's Trust Through Border Security: Progress on the Southern Border."

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 24; 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; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Sullivan nomination.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DURBIN.

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

The Democratic whip.

MANCHESTER ATTACK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me say at the outset that I offer my condolences to the families and friends of those who were killed or injured in last night's despicable attack at a concert in Manchester, England. Details are still coming in, but this looks like an act of terror in the heart of one of our key European allies. America is joining with the people of Great Britain in expressing our sorrow and sadness over the loss of these lives and the injuries that were sustained.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on a separate note, it has been more than 5 months since the intelligence agencies in the United States reached a solid consensus on a critical issue. The agencies presented to the American people 5 months ago their damning assessment that Russia actively tried to interfere in our last Presidential election to help elect someone they thought would be a better friend to the Russian interests.

I think it is important to recall some of the key findings by our own intelligence agencies on a virtually unanimous basis. They said:

Russian efforts to influence the 2016 U.S. presidential election represent the most recent expression of Moscow's longstanding desire to undermine the U.S.-led liberal democratic order, but these activities demonstrate a significant escalation in directness, level of activity, and scope of effort compared to previous operations.

We assess Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election.

Our intelligence agencies went on to say:

Russia's goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency. We further assess that Putin and the Russian government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.

Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes.

We have never seen anything like this in our history—nothing. What Vladimir Putin did—or tried to do—is staggering, momentous, and something we should not ignore. A foreign adversary intentionally manipulating America's democracy and election to try to get a result friendly to Russia but not consistent with American public opinion—that was his goal.

The dictionary defines an act of war as “an act of aggression by a country against another with which it is nominally at peace.”

Was the Russia attack on our election an act of war? Is sure seems close to the definition. At a minimum, it was an act of cyber war against America and an attack on our democracy. It should not go unanswered. Troublingly, there have been few answers forthcoming from this President and this Congress.

What did the White House and the majority party in Congress do to respond to this act of cyber war to protect against any future attacks? Virtually nothing. As more and more questions have emerged about possible collusion between the Trump campaign and these Russian actions against our election, possible Russian money, and the President's business interests, and troubling ties between those close to Trump and the Russians, this President has instead been trying to endear himself to the Russians, incredibly.

That is right. On May 10, he had a closed meeting with the Russian Foreign Minister and Ambassador in which the President reportedly boasted about sensitive intelligence and—this is truly incredible—also boasted about firing our Nation's FBI Director to relieve the “great pressure” on him over the Russia investigation.

In fact, he reportedly told the Russians:

I just fired the head of the FBI. He was crazy, a real nut job . . . I faced great pressure because of Russia. That's taken off . . . I'm not under investigation.

That is the end of the attributed quote to the President of the United States.

Let that sink in for a moment. The President of the United States was bragging to the same people who attacked our election and democracy that he had fired the top law enforcement officer investigating that attack. That is incredible, both for its obvious

appearance of obstruction of justice but also for what should have so obviously been said in that meeting instead.

President Trump, instead of a frivolous exchange with a dictatorial regime that attacked our Nation, should have had as his first message to the Russians the obvious: Do not ever interfere in our elections or those of our allies again or you will face serious consequences—end of meeting.

Then the President should have come out and related this conversation to the American press and to the American people.

Instead, the President let the Russians bring their own official photographer from the TASS Soviet news agency into the Oval Office and—get this—excluded all of the American press—just the friendly Russian cameras. Then, the Russians gleefully sent out victory tweets of the President's warm and friendly greeting.

This is totally upside down. Yet it only gets worse. Stunningly, it was just revealed Monday night that President Trump asked two of the Nation's top intelligence officials in March to help him push back against the FBI investigation into possible collusion between his campaign and the Russian Government.

The Washington Post reported that President Trump made separate appeals to the Director of National Intelligence, Dan Coats, and the Director of the National Security Agency, Admiral Mike Rogers. Coats and Rogers both rightly refused to comply with President Trump's request, properly deemed as an inappropriate request from the President of the United States to leaders of our intelligence-gathering community. I applaud the respect of these two men for our democratic norms and system of government and the rejection of the President's reckless, selfish request.

This is breathtaking—an American President running from the Russians to our Nation's top law enforcement agency to our intelligence community, bizarrely pleading innocence on a matter of grave national security and trying to undermine ongoing investigations.

Former CIA General Counsel Jeffrey Smith said Trump's deeply troubling effort is an echo of President Nixon's “unsuccessful effort to use the CIA to shut down the FBI's investigation of the Watergate break-in on national security grounds” and, in his words, these actions were “an appalling abuse of power.”

I had argued that Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein should either appoint a special counsel to look at the allegations of collusion between the Trump campaign and the Russians or tender his resignation. I said this after he was set up by the Trump administration to write a memo explaining the firing of James Comey as Director of the FBI and giving as his reason to protect the honor and integrity of Hillary Clinton during the campaign.

That was a laughable assertion.

Rosenstein wrote it. For at least 24 hours, that was the official line from the Trump White House. Then, there was the Lester Holt interview on NBC, and the President came out and said: I wanted to get rid of him months ago; I wanted to put an end to this Russian thing.

I am pleased that Mr. Rosenstein made the right decision when he appointed former FBI Director Robert Mueller to fill the special counsel role.

Back in the year 2001, that ominous year of 9/11, I first met Robert Mueller. He was the Director of the FBI. We worked together on some important issues relative to the FBI. I came to respect him very much. He is a decorated veteran of the Vietnam war, where he served as an officer in the Marine Corps, a former Federal judge, a man of the opposite political faith, but a man who clearly loves his country above party, whenever he is asked. He is a man who has not only risen to the challenge of public service but who has excelled to the point where his term as Director of the FBI was extended—a rarity around Washington and, certainly, on a bipartisan basis almost unthinkable these days. But it happened with Robert Mueller. It happened because he is smart, he is principled, and he loves his country, and we know it. I don't think Rod Rosenstein could have chosen a better person.

I don't know if I will ultimately agree with his investigation of this critical issue, but I will respect his findings, whatever they may be, because I know that they are heartfelt, sincere, and principled.

While this special counsel investigation will be critical, it is not a substitute, however, for continued congressional action, as well, as some have suggested or perhaps hoped. I know the Senate Intelligence Committee is actively pursuing this matter, and I salute them for that effort, but I think we need to think about more. We need to think about an independent commission—a bipartisan, transparent commission—to deal with policy questions. For instance, what are we going to face from the Russians in the next election? What did we learn in the last election to protect ourselves?

The special counsel is going to focus on whether crimes were committed, but I am deeply concerned that there may be matters related to Russia's attack that may not involve crimes themselves but should be made public to the American people. It is Congress's responsibility, just as it was after the September 11 tragedy, to make sure the American people know as much as possible in a democracy. That is how it works.

Former Watergate investigator Scott Armstrong made this point in an op-ed in Sunday's New York Times. He pointed out how a select congressional committee and a special prosecutor overcame partisan and jurisdictional conflicts to get to the truth during Watergate. He noted:

A mature special prosecutor and a well-led congressional inquiry can coordinate over issues like witness immunity. Congress can creatively expand its witness list beyond prosecution targets and fill in critical details from satellite witnesses . . . If the committee is aggressive and truly bipartisan, it can not only educate and reassure the public, but also legislate solutions to prevent future abuses.

There are a lot of parallels between the Watergate era and what we face today, but, sadly, one major difference from the Nixon era to the Trump era is the willingness of members of the President's own party to stand up and speak out.

Back in Nixon's day, there came a moment when a handful of Senators from this Chamber changed history, and one of them was Barry Goldwater. He met with President Nixon and he said: There are only so many lies you can take, and now there has been one too many.

Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania joined him, as well as another Republican—John Rhodes, a Republican leader in the House. They made it clear to President Nixon that what he had done was unacceptable by any standard and they would no longer stand by him. It took courage for them to do that. The President saw the writing on the wall, and he resigned.

We are looking for similar leadership today from both sides of the aisle—not just Democrats but Republicans as well—to stand up and defend our democracy from Putin's interference.

There have been months of relative inaction. It is clear that the President is not going to stand up to Russia. It is time for all of us—Democrats and Republicans in Congress—to act for the good of this Nation and get to the truth of what happened and make sure Russia can never do this to our democracy again.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Trump administration released its fiscal year 2018 budget this morning. For all the talk on the campaign trail of standing up for the forgotten Americans in this country, the President's budget takes aim at the exact programs that many rely on. From healthcare and food stamps to student loans and disability, President Trump's budget is nothing less than an assault on seniors, low-income Americans, children, and the disabled.

The President's budget calls for more than \$3.6 trillion in cuts to Federal spending over the next 10 years, with more than \$1 trillion of these cuts coming from some of the most vital pro-

grams in our Nation's social safety net. Nothing is more essential to our Nation's low-income, disabled, and elderly Americans than Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, known as SNAP. But the President's budget slashes more than \$600 billion from Medicaid, despite the President's repeated promises on the campaign trail to protect the program. More than 3 million people in my State—20 percent of the people who live there—currently depend on the Medicaid Program for healthcare, including 1.5 million children and more than 300,000 seniors and disabled people.

The budget cuts \$193 billion from SNAP by making it harder for people to qualify for this assistance in putting food on the table. Forty-four million children, disabled, and low-income people around the country accessed food through the SNAP program last year.

Also weakened in the President's budget is the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant that helps States provide financial assistance to families who are literally struggling to survive. And the budget cuts about 20 percent of funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, providing health insurance for poor children. Isn't that incredible? The President doesn't believe that is a priority—health insurance for poor children.

It is often said that the President's budget reflects our values, and this budget shows that President Trump clearly values tax cuts for the upper income individuals in America over the lives of poor and middle-class Americans.

The President's budget also includes historic cuts in nondefense discretionary spending. Over the next 10 years, President Trump proposes to cut domestic spending so significantly that spending on defense would exceed spending on domestic priorities by almost \$300 billion. To pay for an increase in defense spending and to build his big, beautiful wall, the President would slash funding from programs essential to hard-working Americans—programs that support affordable housing, home heating bills, Meals on Wheels, student loans, clean drinking water, preserving the Great Lakes, early childhood education, and infrastructure.

Even medical research is on the Trump chopping block. President Trump has proposed cutting one-fifth of the budget for the National Institutes of Health, including \$1 billion from the National Cancer Institute. President Obama, with Vice President Biden, with strong bipartisan support,

put together a moonshot—a Cancer Moonshot—to do something significant in cancer research. President Trump's budget virtually eliminates it.

NIH has helped cut U.S. cancer death rates by 11 percent in women and 19 percent in men. It has helped ensure HIV/AIDS is no longer a death sentence. It contributed to the near eradication of polio and smallpox, but make no mistake, these changes didn't just happen. They occurred because of sustained Federal investment in medical research.

I salute my colleague on the other side of the aisle, ROY BLUNT, the Appropriations subcommittee chair when it comes to NIH. For 2 straight years now, 2 fiscal years, he has given more than 5 percent real growth in NIH spending. I have praised him on the floor and back home and publicly over and over again. That Republican Senator, and many Democratic Senators, stood together because we believe in medical research. The Trump budget does not.

We cannot afford these devastating cuts, and we can't afford to sit on our hands and face the millions of families across America who count on us to have the right priorities. Clearly, the President's budget is far from a new foundation for American greatness. This budget would have a devastating impact on Americans most in need of a helping hand, on everything from healthcare to food access, to quality education and affordable housing.

They always say the President's budget is dead on arrival. This budget, I hope, will be dead on arrival. It doesn't deserve the light of day or a breath of life.

We need to come together, as we did in this year's budget, on a bipartisan basis, order the priorities that America sent us to prioritize, and then work together to pass it. I hope it is done on a bipartisan basis. That is what America wants, both parties to work together. We can do it. We did it for this fiscal year. We can do it for the next, but our first step in reaching an agreement is to make sure there is a sound rejection of President Trump's budget. His budget will not make America great again.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:18 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 24, 2017, at 10 a.m.