United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 22, 2018 *No. 140*

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, August 24, 2018, at 11 a.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 22, 2018

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TOM COTTON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal Father, You lead us like a shepherd, for we desperately need Your tender care. We thank You for life's clouds and storms that position us to receive Your deliverance and assurance. Thank You also for refusing to move our mountains but instead giving us strength to climb them.

Today, bless our Senators and each member of their staffs, who routinely deliver excellence in the midst of frenetic activity. May these faithful staffers never forget Your promise to always be with them. Guide them today with fresh insights on abundant living, as You supply all their needs out of the riches of Your celestial bounty.

We pray in Your generous Name.

Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable TOM COTTON led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 22, 2018.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week, I have been highlighting some of the examples of the strength of the U.S. economy. The people of West Virginia, where President Trump visited yesterday evening, are no exception to this national trend.

During the Obama years, West Virginia's economy was hit hard. Manufacturing employment shrunk by 13 percent. Coal and logging employment shrunk by 38 percent. But today things are different. The State's unemployment rate has been lowered during each of the past 19 months under this united Republican government than it was during any month of the Obama administration. Coal jobs are surging back, and according to one industry estimate, in 2017, West Virginia saw faster growth in construction jobs than any other State.

As Senator CAPITO explained in a recent op-ed, figures like these are more evidence that Republican policies are helping her State and the entire country write a new chapter. Senator CAPITO recently shared with me that in Wheeling, WV, the owners of Warwood Tool are creating a new line of products thanks to the new flexibility brought about by tax reform. In Wellsburg, Eagle Manufacturing is buying new machinery. In Jane Lew, Doss Enterprises is planning to hire up to 30 new workers. It is really amazing when we remember that only one of West Virginia's Senators voted for the tax reform policies that helped make all of this good news possible.

As Senator CAPITO notes, recent months' promising economic numbers and all the new opportunities they represent are only the beginning. Tax reform will also help strengthen our economic foundation for the long term.

In particular, one provision of the tax rewrite will specifically help the most depressed communities in our Nation. It will turn these areas into opportunity zones that are especially attractive for investment. The Treasury Department has already certified zones in every State, including 55 in West Virginia and 144 in my home State of Kentucky. Nearly 35 million Americans live in communities within the newly designated opportunity zones. Together, they have an average poverty

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

rate of around 32 percent. This program is just one of so many ways that Republican policies are providing a boost to the very communities that Democratic policies systematically left behind.

The opportunity zones, by the way, were the idea of Senator TIM SCOTT from South Carolina, who was able to insert them into the pay raise—into the tax reform bill.

So there are bonuses, pay raises, and tax cuts for middle-class families today and the foundation for more investment and more jobs tomorrow.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on a related matter, I am proud that on this Congress's watch, our economy has produced so many job opportunities for the American people.

Here was the AP's headline a few weeks ago: ''Open jobs outnumber US unemployed for 3rd straight month.'' But that growth and prosperity needs to reach all families and all communities. That means expanding Americans' opportunities to invest in their own human capital by building new skills and transitioning into growing industries. That is why the appropriations legislation the Senate is currently considering provides billions of dollars for training and employment services. It includes $160 million for apprenticeship programs, $220 million for dislocated workers, with a special $30 million emphasis on displaced workers in rural communities like those I represent in Eastern and Western Kentucky, and just under $100 million to integrate ex-offenders back into productive society.

These are just a few of the important items that our appropriation for Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education will fund.

It provides the resources to continue investing in college affordability through Pell grants, Federal work-study programs, and programs specifically aimed at low-income and first-generation students.

It contains a $2 billion funding increase for the National Institutes of Health, paving the way for important research and, we hope, new medical breakthroughs.

Crucially, it will supply more resources for treatment, prevention, and recovery programs pertaining to the opioid epidemic. State opioid response grants put States in the driver's seat so local responses can be tailored to local challenges. This legislation funds them to the tune of $1.5 billion. In addition, there are hundreds of millions of dollars for community health centers, hundreds of millions for prevention and public awareness, and more for research into the nature of this addiction and alternatives for managing pain. There is over $100 million in targeted help for rural communities, like those in Kentucky, which continue to bear the brunt of this national crisis.

I was proud to secure $5 million for a brandnew Centers for Disease Control initiative to help prevent the spread of infectious diseases like HIV and hepatitis B and C, which are a consequence of the opioid epidemic. The CDC is directed to prioritize high-risk areas, including 54 counties in Kentucky.

This legislation also contains provisions from my CAREER Act, which would dedicate new Federal funds to career and training services so that recovering substance abuse patients can transition back into the workforce and begin to rebuild their lives.

In sum, the appropriations measures we are considering this week invest in human capital from all angles. They will put new tools in the hands of distressed communities, of workers who need new skills, and of families who need help defeating drug addiction.

I thank the subcommittee chairman, Senator BLUNT, and the ranking member, Senator MURRAY, for their bipartisan work on the Labor-HHS title. I look forward to voting in support of this legislation, along with the vital funding for the Department of Defense, in the coming days.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday I met with President Trump's nominee for the Supreme Court, Judge Brett Kavanaugh. Our conversation covered many different topics. Unfortunately, Judge Kavanaugh refused to answer even the most basic questions about his jurisprudence.

He refused to say if he believed Roe was correctly decided. He refused to say if he believed Casey was correctly decided. He could not name for me a restriction on a woman's right to choose that he would consider an undue burden. Even when I asked him if a ban on abortion after only 4 to 6 weeks would be an undue burden, he said he couldn't answer that.

He could not tell me if he believed the Affordable Care Act was constitutional. Nor would he answer or recall his level of involvement in a number of controversies during his time in the Bush White House, a portion of his record the Senate has been denied access to by the Republican majority.

Now, I understand the imperative all judges face not to bias themselves by commenting on cases that could come before their court, but these are some basic questions of already decided cases. Furthermore, I told Judge Kavanaugh that he is in a different place than others.

President Trump has said that he will only appoint nominees who will undo Roe v. Wade. President Trump has said he will only appoint nominees who will declare the ACA unconstitutional. Judge Kavanaugh is under a burden to refute that.

I asked him if, even when he sat with the President, did he tell the President not to count on him, that he will not absolutely vote to repeal Roe. He didn't.

So Kavanaugh has a burden beyond that of a normal Justice because of what President Trump, the person who selected him, has said unequivocally.

So here is Justice Kavanaugh's silence or refusal to commit to even the most common things that should be said. He said he would say Brown was correctly decided. Why can't he say Roe was correctly decided? There is his silence, especially given his recent praises of dissent in Roe and Casey. In 2016 and 2017 he praised Justice Rehnquist and Justice Scalia's views that Casey and Roe were decided wrongly. What is anyone supposed to reasonably believe?

Given that President Trump said that he will only choose people who will repeal Roe and declare ACA unconstitutional, given that he has praised the dissents in Roe and Casey, the fact that he was unwilling to refute any of that in any way or to even say that a limit on abortion after 4 weeks was an undue burden should raise real questions for any American who believes in choice and who believes in the constitutionality of government helping with healthcare, including preexisting conditions.

Then, there is one issue we discussed yesterday that took on a whole new light mere minutes after our discussion concluded. I asked Judge Kavanaugh about his remarkably expansive views on executive authority. As context, Judge Kavanaugh has said that Presidents should not be subject to criminal or civil investigations while in office. He said the only remedy for a President who committed a serious crime is impeachment by Congress.

So I asked Judge Kavanaugh a more basic question: Does he believe that a sitting President must comply with a subpoena or testify or provide records? He would not say that the President must comply with a subpoena.

I asked him that in the most extreme situation: In a criminal investigation

against a sitting President, where our national security is at stake, could the investigator subpoena the President? He wouldn't say he would.

Now, that was before the news that broke late yesterday. During our meeting, actually, the news broke that President Trump's former personal attorney, Michael Cohen, implicated the President in a violation of campaign finance laws.

The sequence of those two events—Kavanaugh's refusal to say that a President must comply with a duly issued subpoena and Michael Cohen's implication of the President in a Federal crime—makes the danger of Brett Kavanaugh's nomination to the Supreme Court abundantly clear. It is a game changer. It should be.

The President, identified as an unindicted coconspirator of a Federal crime—an accusation made not by a political enemy but by the closest of his own confidants—is on the verge of making a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court, a court that may someday soon determine the extent of the President's legal jeopardy.

In my view, the Senate Judiciary Committee should immediately pause the consideration of the Kavanaugh nomination.

The majority of the Senate has still not seen the bulk of Judge Kavanaugh's record. At the very least—the very least—it is unseemly for the President of the United States to be picking a Supreme Court Justice who could soon be, effectively, a juror in a case involving the President himself.

In light of these facts, I believe Chairman GRASSLEY has scheduled a hearing for Judge Kavanaugh too soon, and I am calling on him to delay the hearing.

I know that Chairman GRASSLEY and Leader MCCONNELL hold all the cards in terms of scheduling hearings, but the plain facts of the case should compel them to the same conclusion I have reached—that the Judiciary Committee should postpone Judge Kavanaugh's hearings.

At this moment in our Nation's history, the Senate should not confirm a man to the bench who believes that Presidents are virtually beyond accountability, even in criminal cases, and a man who believes that Presidents are virtually above the law and that only Congress can check a President's power.

Over the past year, despite numerous abuses of Presidential authority, despite numerous encroachments on the separation of powers, despite numerous attacks on the rule of law, this Republican Congress has done almost nothing—nothing—to check this President. If Congress can be captured by one party's deference to the President, we cannot allow the Supreme Court to be captured as well.

The doubts about Judge Kavanaugh's fitness for the bench were just magnified by Mr. Cohen's plea agreement. The prospect of the President being implicated in some criminal case is no longer a hypothetical that can be dismissed. It is very real.

If Judge Kavanaugh truly believes that no sitting President, including President Trump, must answer for crimes he may or may not have committed, then he should not become Justice Kavanaugh with the power to make those views manifest in our books of law.

More broadly, yesterday's news has blackened an already dark cloud hanging over this administration. In addition to Mr. Cohen's implication of the President, Paul Manafort was convicted of violating Federal law on eight different counts in this trail, his first of two trials.

To take a step back, President Trump's campaign manager was convicted of Federal crimes. President Trump's personal attorney pled guilty to Federal crimes. President Trump's first National Security Advisor pled guilty to Federal crimes. A foreign policy advisor to his campaign pled guilty to Federal crimes, and more trials are coming.

Cabinet officials have been forced to resign for flagrant graft and profligacy funded by the American taxpayer. That is to say nothing of the fact that the first two congressional endorsements of President Trump's campaign came from two Congressmen who have recently been indicted on counts of insider trading and campaign finance violations—what a swamp, what a swamp. It is far worse than the swamp that existed when President Trump took over. He has not cleaned the swamp. He has made it more retched and more fetid.

No one in America can dismiss what has happened as the actions of a few bad apples. There is a cesspool around this President. There is now an unmistakable sinister hypocrisy to President Trump's campaign slogan: Drain the swamp. President Trump brought the worst swamp we have seen in Washington's history to town when he came here.

Yesterday's news leads me to make two points. First, Special Counsel Mueller's investigation is clearly doing what it was constituted to do and finding criminal activity in the process. Already there have been four guilty pleas or verdicts and dozens of indictments. The idea of calling Special Counsel Mueller's investigation a witch hunt was already absurd and laughable, and it becomes even more so today.

Second, the President should not even consider pardoning Mr. Manafort or Mr. Cohen at any point in the future. To do so would be the most flagrant abuse of pardon power and a clear obstruction of justice.

The Rosenstein-Mueller investigation must be permitted to conclude its work, and the President must resist the impulse to interfere with pardons, dismissals, or any other action that prevents the work of the Justice Department from going forward.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 6157, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6157) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Shelby amendment No. 3695, in the nature of a substitute.

McConnell (for Shelby) amendment No. 3699 (to amendment No. 3695), of a perfecting nature.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

It has been 11 years since a Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill has been considered on the Senate floor, so let me begin my remarks this morning by commending the chairman and ranking member of the full Appropriations Committee, Senators SHELBY and LEAHY, for their determination to report each and every one of the appropriations bills so they can be considered, fully debated, and amended in the regular order. I also commend the subcommittee chairman, Senator BLUNT, and the ranking member, Senator MURRAY, for their leadership in creating a bipartisan bill.

This bill will make critical investments in medical research, opioid abuse prevention and treatment, the education of our students, and strengthening America's workforce.

I appreciate so much that the subcommittee accommodated so many of my priorities in crafting this bill. It has my very strong support. I am particularly pleased that the bill includes another $2 billion increase for the National Institutes of Health. Robust investments in biomedical research will pay dividends for many American families struggling with disease and disability, just as such research has enabled us to prevent, treat, or cure other serious illnesses.

Notably, this year, for the first time, the bill reaches the milestone of providing at least $2 billion a year for Alzheimer's disease research—the amount that the advisory council to the National Plan to Combat Alzheimer's Disease has calculated is needed to find an effective treatment for this disease by the year 2025. Tomorrow, I will join Senator BLUNT and others of my colleagues delivering separate remarks dedicated to this milestone achievement, but I did want to briefly highlight that investment now.

As founder and the cochair of the Senate Diabetes Caucus, I am also pleased this bill continues to recognize the importance of investing in diabetes research. Since founding the caucus in 1997, funding for diabetes has increased more than sixfold, from $319 million in 1997 to $2 billion in 2018, and that is only appropriate. We know treating and caring for older people with diabetes consumes approximately one out of three Medicare dollars, so this is a very expensive disease as well as one that causes a great deal of heartache and damage to those who are diagnosed with type 2 diabetes later in life. I have also worked very hard with the Juvenile Research Diabetes Foundation on type 1 diabetes, which is usually diagnosed in childhood and is a lifelong disease. The investments we have made have helped us make real breakthroughs in diabetes treatment. The bill provides a $60 million increase for the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Disorders at NIH. As the NIH's lead agency for diabetes research, this continued investment is critical to preventing diabetes, improving the lives of more than 30 million Americans, including 12 million seniors already living with the disease, as well as providing the foundation to ultimately discover a cure for type 1 diabetes.

This bill provides $3.7 billion in the fight against the opioid epidemic that is gripping our country. Sadly, in my State of Maine, the crisis has actually worsened with drug-related overdoses claiming the lives of 407 people in Maine last year, according to the new statistics from the Centers for Disease Prevention and Control.

The crisis in Maine shows no signs of abating. Indeed, the contamination of heroin with fentanyl has made this crisis even worse, taking the lives of even more who are in the grips of addiction. While I am very hopeful the Senate will consider a comprehensive opioids package put together by the Senate HELP Committee, to which many of us contributed in the weeks ahead, it is imperative that the funds provided in this appropriations bill reach our communities without delay.

This legislation also funds key priorities for vulnerable seniors, including the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which I know is of interest to the Presiding Officer because he represents the State of Alaska, and that program is critical there, as it is in the State of Maine. It funds the State Health Insurance Program, Meals on Wheels, and other essential programs that make such a difference to our seniors.

As chair of the Senate Committee on Aging, I am particularly delighted that this bill provides a $300,000 increase to the administration for community living for the establishment of the family caregivers advisory council. This council was created by a bipartisan bill that I introduced with Senator BALDWIN, the RAISE Family Caregivers Act, and it will help develop a coordinated strategic plan to leverage our resources, promote best practices, and expand services and training for our Nation's caregivers.

I am sure everyone here has had the experience of a parent who is already older taking care of a disabled spouse—perhaps someone with Alzheimer's disease, which is 24/7 for that caregiver. Caregivers need more support and assistance. They need to know where to go. We need to expand respite care, which is the No. 1 concern I hear from caregivers. Respite care in rural areas is extremely difficult to find. The hearings we have held in the Aging Committee have also put a spotlight on the mobility challenges that many seniors face as they age, such as difficulty climbing steep staircases that can lead to devastating falls, performing routine household chores, taking care of themselves, or being able to drive. This bill provides a $4 million increase for the creation of a new aging and technology program to support the development of assisted technology for seniors with disabilities in rural areas. The University of Maine Center on Aging is doing such interesting work in this area after collaborating with assisted living facilities and talking directly to older Americans to find out what they need. Sometimes it is merely a matter of renovating a bathroom or putting up grab bars, installing sensors to make sure the refrigerator door is being opened regularly so you know the older American is eating properly. Sometimes it is more complicated than that. This center will help us explore how technology can allow more of our seniors to age in place and stay in the comfort, security, and privacy of their own homes, where many of them long to be.

Maintaining access to care in rural areas is essential, and, thus, I also support the inclusion of $71.5 million for the Rural Health Care Services Outreach Grant Program. This bill also calls on the Federal Government to remove arbitrary barriers around collaboration between rural and nonrural health providers that could inadvertently close off opportunities. We have seen that happen in my State, where a community health center that is located in Bangor, ME, is trying to help a very rural community, Jackman, ME, which unfortunately recently lost its nursing home and was using the local hospital for assistance. We need to have more collaboration and not let arbitrary bureaucratic rules prevent that kind of cooperation. It is paramount that we do not discourage innovative approaches in healthcare.

On a related note, I also applaud the inclusion of increased funding to support community health centers, which serve approximately 27 million Americans, including upward of 186,000 individuals in the State of Maine. Community health centers will only continue to play a larger role in healthcare delivery as we seek to reduce overall healthcare costs, as well as provide greater access to behavioral health and substance use disorder prevention and treatment services.

In addition to key health and aging priorities, this bill also supports essential programs at the Department of Education. Notably, this bill provides increased investments in title I, which helps our public schools serve low-income students. The student support in academic enrichment grants, which help to provide students with well-rounded education, is an important program that brings art, music, and technology to our rural community schools. I also strongly support the increased investment in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, which has provided opportunities to children with disabilities and helped many of them reach their full potential. Across the State of Maine, superintendents, principals, and teachers tell me that one of the most effective ways we can support education overall is to better fund the Federal share of IDEA. That would help every single school district.

When IDEA became law in 1975, Congress set a goal of providing 40 percent of the excess cost of serving students with disabilities. I regret to say, we are nowhere near reaching that goal, but this increase in funding for IDEA represents a step forward toward fulfilling that commitment, and I hope we can do more next year.

This bill also funds teacher and school leader professional development, and the Rural Education Achievement Program, a law that I coauthored several years ago to bring additional resources to small and rural schools. Students in rural America should have the same access to Federal dollars and a good education as those living in urban and suburban communities. REAP has helped to provide equity for small rural schools in Maine and across the country. It has helped to support an array of activities, such as new technology in classrooms, distance learning opportunities, and professional development.

Here is a great example. REAP funding has helped Maine's small island schools connect together to create an island reading program using video conference technology that this program made affordable. In other parts of Maine, REAP has helped schools acquire new technology hardware, software, and to expand teacher training.

Having worked at a Maine college before I came to the Senate—Husson University—I know firsthand this bill's important investments in higher education, including Pell Grants and the TRIO Programs. The University of Maine is one of those institutions that has a great TRIO Program. It will help low-income and first-generation students access college education. TRIO often makes the difference in a student's ability to attend and complete a college education.

Funding for apprenticeships and workforce development programs are

also key priorities that will strengthen Maine's workforce, preparing people with the skills and experience they need to succeed.

I could go on and on, but there are many others seeking recognition. Let me just end by urging my colleagues to support the fiscal year 2019 Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill. It is good and much needed legislation.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, before I talk about what I came here to talk about, let me add my congratulations once again to the vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Senator LEAHY, and to Senator COLLINS, both of whom are critical members of the Appropriations Committee. They have gotten us much further than we have gotten in the last 15 years when it comes to the appropriations process.

I am optimistic that we will be able to wrap this up tomorrow. If we do, the Senate will have voted to fund 87 percent of discretionary spending. The last time we sent him an appropriations bill, the President told us: Don't send me another omnibus. He is exactly right. Omnibus appropriations bills are the worst way to do business; maybe close behind that is a continuing resolution.

We are not doing our job if we don't act in a bipartisan way to move these appropriations bills forward, especially since we have agreed to the spending caps.

I would just congratulate all the members of the Appropriations Committee—Chairman SHELBY and all of the committee—for their good work.

ARMY FUTURES COMMAND

Mr. President, tomorrow I will be heading back home to Austin where, on Friday, I will be attending the activation ceremony for the new Army Futures Command. The establishment of this command, which began operations last month, is the most significant Army reorganization since 1973. Its new headquarters is in the capital of Texas—Austin. It will make that the epicenter of Army technology development.

So what does the Army Futures Command do? How does it fit into the existing organizational structure? Why is it necessary?

Let's start with what it does. It seeks to modernize the Army, period. It will do this by leveraging commercial innovation, science and technology, and delivering them to warfighters in useful, cutting-edge ways. In a world with rapidly evolving threats distinct from others we have faced throughout our Nation's history, the Futures Command could not come at a more pivotal time.

The Army chose Austin because it wanted to be close to a hub of innovation, which Austin certainly is these days. It has roughly 6,500 high-tech companies nestled among what is affectionately referred to as ''Silicon Hills.'' We have Silicon Valley and Silicon Hills.

There are major academic institutions nearby, like the University of Texas in Austin, St. Edward's, Texas State, and Texas A&M, with thousands of students graduating each year with degrees in STEM fields—science, technology, engineering, and math.

It is also worth noting that Austin has become a hub for startup culture and is ground zero when it comes to useful talent, technological ingenuity, and path-breaking ideas that are changing industries, institutions, and what our normal ways of doing things were in the past. What sometimes people refer to as ''disruption''—certainly, we have seen that.

But Austin, let's not forget, is also a military city. We know Camp Mabry is there, the headquarters of the Texas Army and Air National Guards, and the Texas State Guard. Not far away is the ''Great Place'' called Fort Hood, as well as Joint Base San Antonio to the south.

Those military installations will now be joined by the Army Futures Command in Austin, giving the bustling, live music capital of the world an entirely new brand and reason for attention. If San Antonio, my home town, is ''Military City, USA,'' you might call Austin ''Military Innovation City, USA.''

You might be wondering how the Army Futures Command fits into the existing organizational designs of our military. In short, it complements the Army's three other four-star headquarters: the Forces Command, Training and Doctrine Command, and Army Materiel Command.

The first of those trains and prepares combat-ready soldiers. The second is essentially the Army's architect. It recruits, designs, and builds the Army. And the third sustains the Army by providing the necessary equipment.

Now the new fourth command will modernize the Army by integrating technology as it is developed in research labs and other facilities. When staffed at full capacity, the Austin headquarters will be home to 100 soldiers and 400 Department of the Army civilians. That is just a start.

Leading them will be GEN John Murray, who was nominated and confirmed just 2 nights ago to be the commanding general of the Futures Command. My friend and our colleague, Senator CRUZ, said it well. He said: ''Just as Austin is uniquely positioned to ensure the Army succeeds in this new mission, General Murray's long career and dedicated service in uniform makes him the right leader for Army Futures Command.'' I agree wholeheartedly.

General Murray and others will help create cross-functional teams designed to focus on specific things that the Army wants to build or improve—for example, next-generation combat vehicles, soldier lethality, or cloud and network capabilities.

The next question I want to answer is, Why is it necessary? I think the only answer is because our country's future military readiness depends on it. That is why it is necessary. Our ultimate goal here is to increase the Army's lethality against near-peer competitors in the global conflicts that could arise at some point down the road.

So the Army Futures Command is really the hub of modernization efforts for the Army. It takes new concepts from the realm of the abstract, and it puts them to use concretely in the form of real-world technology that the Army can acquire for its own purposes. Then it helps the warfighters implement and use these new tools in the field.

There is a rough consensus in Congress that the Army's acquisition machinery needs to operate faster and more efficiently—certainly, more cost effectively. It is my hope that the many entrepreneurs, the college graduates, and the military reservists collaborating with the Army Futures Command in Austin will provide innovative ideas to help remedy these problems. The Futures Command could reduce redtape, making it easier to make decisions or changes quickly, particularly ones involving the purchase or upgrade of equipment and systems.

In a world still marred by conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, strained by escalating cyber security threats, and threatened by the increased belligerence of China and Russia, the U.S. military must keep pace with evolving technologies in order to maintain our strategic advantage and to maintain the peace.

Modernization is the key to deterring aggression, promoting peace, and projecting American strength around the globe. Secretary of Defense Mattis has made it clear that this ranks among his top priorities.

In closing, let me say that the Army Futures Command is aptly named. When it comes to our national defense, we should always be looking toward the future. It is incredible to think that starting in just under 3 weeks, young people born in the aftermath of 9/11 will be eligible to enlist in the Army with their parents' consent. That is an amazing statistic. That tells you something about the rapid pace of modern life and some of the transitions that are occurring right before our eyes.

These young people born right after the terrible events of 9/11 have grown up in a world that sees new forms of conflict, as well as terrorism, the likes of which the Founders of this great Nation could never have imagined. It is imperative, as brave men and women continue to answer the call to service, even in such harrowing times as ours, that we do our part to give them the tools they need to be successful. The Army's Futures Command, therefore, is most definitely a step in the right direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Texas for his remarks. I do appreciate the encouragement he has given both Senator SHELBY and me in getting the appropriations bills through. He has been here long enough. He knows this is the way the Senate should work. We have done it in a bipartisan way, and we are way ahead of where we have been at any time in the past 2 years.

I also want to applaud the senior Senator from Maine. She sits on the Appropriations Committee. We have served together there throughout our careers, and she is a valuable member of that committee. She is one who has helped put together, with her Democratic counterpart, good legislation that is included. In fact, there was nearly a unanimous vote in the Appropriations Committee. Most of this has been either unanimous or virtually unanimous. I say that because some have felt that, in the Senate lately, you could not get a majority vote even to say the Sun rises in the East. But here we have been doing majority votes on things that involve everywhere from Alaska to Vermont. I am pleased with it.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. President, I take the floor in my role as vice chairman of Appropriations in managing this bill, but I am going to digress, as others have, for a few minutes and speak about something else.

We are now less than 2 weeks away from Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation hearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee. We are 2 weeks away, and according to the National Archives, the committee has received only 6 percent of his total White House records. This is virtually unprecedented—6 percent of his records and not a single one of the records we have received has been provided by the National Archives. That is because the Archives will not complete its review of the limited number of records requested by Chairman GRASSLEY until October, which is a month after the majority leader intends to hold a final vote on Judge Kavanaugh.

Actually, to date, every single record that we have received from the Judiciary Committee has been hand selected by a political lawyer representing President George W. Bush. He is a partisan lawyer who reported directly to Judge Kavanaugh in the Bush White House, a lawyer who also represents White House Counsel Don McGahn, Steve Bannon, and Reince Priebus in the Russia investigation. I mention this because he has been very selective in the very few things we have been allowed to see.

I mention this because this is in stark contrast to past precedent. Let me talk about the vetting of Justice Kagan, who, like Judge Kavanaugh, had served in the White House prior to her nomination. I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee at that time. I worked hand in hand with then-Ranking Member Jeff Sessions to ensure that we received every document of interest to the committee. Certainly, on behalf of the Republicans, Senator Sessions demanded an awful lot of records, and I worked with him to get them. In fact, when we were 12 days away from Justice Kagan's hearing, we had already received a full 99 percent of her White House records—99 percent.

I mention that because now, at the same time with Judge Kavanaugh, we are at 6 percent. The Republicans have allowed 6 percent, and the Democrats allowed 99 percent. Does this make the confirmation hearing a partisan joke?

In fact, every single one of Justice Kagan's records was provided by the nonpartisan National Archives. The 6 percent of Judge Kavanaugh's records has been provided by a political, partisan, hyperconflicted attorney. I mean that just on the face of it, it does not pass the giggle test. The Democrats provided from the nonpartisan National Archives 99 percent of Justice Kagan's records. Here we are getting only 6 percent of Judge Kavanaugh's records, and they have been picked by a political, partisan attorney with hyperconflicts.

The superficial vetting of Judge Kavanaugh is all the more troubling because there are still serious concerns about the last time he testified before the Senate. During his 2006 nomination hearing for the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, Judge Kavanaugh minimized his work on highly controversial issues in the Bush White House, including on detainee treatment and warrantless wiretapping. It is now clear that we will only know the full truth if we get his full record. With anything less, we will be, simply, rushing to a verdict before the trial.

Based on the very limited documents they have allowed us to see, there is an additional reason to be concerned. The committee has received new evidence that sheds light on whether Judge Kavanaugh was truthful while under oath in 2006. Unfortunately, I cannot even describe these documents because they have kept them in a classified or confidential forum, and the American people cannot see them. That is because nearly two-thirds of the documents the Judiciary Committee has received have been designated as ''committee confidential'' by Chairman GRASSLEY, following the request of the partisan attorney on whom the Senate is relying to do the job of the nonpartisan National Archives. To date, that means that two percent of Judge Kavanaugh's White House records have been made available to the American people—2 percent—compared to 99 percent for Justice Kagan, and they have selected what that 2 percent is. Golly, what is in the other 98 percent they don't want us to see?

I have served in this body for 44 years. I have been here for every Supreme Court nomination since John Paul Stevens. I have voted for a lot of Republicans and Democrats on the Supreme Court. For 20 years, I served as the chairman or as the ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. In those 44 years, I can tell you, frankly, that the vetting of Judge Kavanaugh has been the most incomplete, most partisan, and least transparent of any Supreme Court nominee I have ever seen of either a Democratic or a Republican President. It has not been even close. I have taken the experience I have had here with Democrats and Republicans as President. In 44 years, I have never seen such incomplete, partisan, or nontransparent vetting.

Yesterday, I met with Judge Kavanaugh—a very pleasant man. I had the opportunity to ask him about many issues, including about his work in the Bush White House. Following our meeting, I believe even more strongly that the documents he authored or contributed to during his 3 years as White House Staff Secretary should be released and made public now. What he wrote is far more important than what his personality might be. Let's find out what he wrote. That will tell us what kind of a Supreme Court Justice he would be apt to be.

A vigilant review of the Supreme Court nominee's full record isn't an optional matter. It shouldn't be dependent upon which party controls the White House or the Senate. Again, in 44 years, I have seen very vigilant reviews of Supreme Court nominees by both Republicans and Democrats. That is the way it should be, and I have agreed with that every single time. Yet never, never have I seen something like this. Never, never have I seen one's record hidden the way this one has been. It is undeniable that documents of clear public interest are being hidden from the American people—documents that will shed light on both his views and on his fitness to serve on our Nation's highest Court.

Wearing blinders in this moment is fundamentally incompatible with our constitutional obligation to provide advice and informed consent. The Senate is supposed to be the conscience of the Nation. It is a sad conscience.

The Federal judiciary stands alone. Unlike in any other branch of our government, the Justices, for good reason, never face the scrutiny of the electorate. Once a Supreme Court Justice is confirmed, he or she will serve for life. Barring impeachment, which has happened just once in our Nation's history, they essentially serve with no oversight.

The Senate has no second chance when it comes to vetting a nominee. We have to get this right. We can't have a vote now and 2 months from now get the records and say: Oh, golly gee, if we had known this, we would have voted differently.

We have to have all of the records now and then vote. There is time to do so. The Senate should not be focused on getting Judge Kavanaugh confirmed by October 1—some artificial deadline. Instead, the Senate should be focused

on doing its job. That requires allowing the National Archives to complete its review of Judge Kavanaugh's record as required by the Presidential Records Act.

At a time when the President is facing unprecedented legal jeopardy, it would be an extraordinary disservice to the American people to break all precedence and confirm his selection to the Supreme Court without there being an actual review.

Have the review. Then, every Senator—he or she—can make up his mind on how he is going to vote. Don't vote blindly without having all of the material. The fact that Judge Kavanaugh has a longer record than prior Supreme Court nominees—something the President was keenly aware of when he selected him—does not excuse the Senate from doing its job, because, if confirmed, he is going to shape the lives of all Americans for generations to come.

If, when the National Archives completes its review in October we learn that we did not get it right, it will fall squarely on the shoulders of this body. If the Senators rush this and find out later that there was material there they should have seen, they will have absolutely no excuse whatsoever because they will have concurred in the rushing. We should set this partisan vetting aside. We should work together, as we have in the past, to actually vet Judge Kavanaugh's record in a way that honors our constitutional obligation—the job the American people sent us here to do.

I feel honored to be here as a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont. I do strongly believe, as I did when I first came here, that this body can be the conscience of the Nation. We aren't following our conscience if we don't do the real work to find out what we are voting on. We have voted on a lot of things. Some have been routine. This is not. This is to vote for a person who will serve on the U.S. Supreme Court long after most of us will have left this body. We owe it to all Americans—I don't care what their politics are or where they are from—to get it right. That is what our oath calls for. That is why we are here.

I have voted more than all but three or four people in the history of this country. Every time I vote, I am hoping I am doing it right, and I try to do it in an informed way.

I know we are going to go back now to the appropriations bills, but here is a case in which I think we have done things right. Senator SHELBY is the chairman, and I am the vice chairman. It is one of only three committees that has a vice chairman. We have worked very closely together, and we have done it in a way to get bills through in a bipartisan fashion. We actually work the way the Senate did when I first came here, which is the way the Senate has worked under great leaders on the Democratic side, like Mike Mansfield, or on the Republican side, like Howard Baker, and we have gotten things done.

I am proud of the Appropriations Committee, but I am concerned about the Judiciary Committee. I have had the privilege of serving on it for over 40 years and have had the privilege of being chairman and ranking member. Yet I have to say that it is not doing its job if it is not requiring all of the material to be here. On the Appropriations Committee, Senator SHELBY and I work to make sure that everybody is heard and everybody has the material. We should be doing the same thing on the Judiciary Committee.

I see the chairman of the committee is on the floor, and I have spoken on the matter on which I wanted to speak.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, Senator BOOZMAN is here and is scheduled to speak before me. So I yield the floor to him and will speak after he is done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—AMENDMENT NO. 3793

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, included in the underlying appropriations bill are funds to continue the U.S. support for the Saudi-led bombing campaign inside Yemen. I will speak about an amendment I have that would stop the U.S. support for this campaign pending a determination by the administration that we are in compliance with U.S., international, and humanitarian law regarding the targeting of civilians.

At this point, I ask unanimous consent to set aside the pending amendment and call up amendment No. 3793.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I just say that the Senator from Connecticut has a worthy amendment. We are all concerned about what is going on in Yemen. I would have hoped that we would not do it on this bill because we are trying to keep out a lot of riders and things, but this is something we are going to have to address.

I and others on both sides of the aisle would like to work with him because what has been going on in Yemen is atrocious. I object, though, at this point in time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, of course, I am disappointed by the chairman's objection, but I take his commitment to work on this issue to heart, and I look forward to doing that.

I would like to speak for a moment about the amendment and the reason I was very hopeful, and remain hopeful, that we may get the chance to vote on this before the consideration of this bill is passed because in this legislation is substantial funding in order to perpetuate a bombing campaign inside Yemen that is making this country less safe. I argue that since this bill was debated in the Appropriations Committee, some horrifying, new information has come to light that should cause us to reconsider whether this is something that is so urgent, we need to deal with it now, this week, that it can't wait.

Unfortunately, these pictures are a dime a dozen. You could find any number of them every single day coming out of this theater. This picture, in particular, is of a community center that was bombed by the Saudi and UAE-led coalition that the United States finances and supports.

Inside this community center, a funeral was occurring when it was ostensibly targeted and bombed by the United States, the Saudis, and the UAE. This is a horrifying scene, in and of itself, but to know a funeral was occurring there makes it even worse.

What we now know is, the targeting of civilians inside Yemen is getting worse, not better. The new information I spoke of is something that I think is on the minds of many of my colleagues. That new information is that last week, the Saudi-U.S. coalition hit a schoolbus in northern Yemen intentionally. The Saudi's initial reaction was that it was a legitimate military target. There is no way a schoolbus is a legitimate military target. That schoolbus was carrying dozens of children, dozens of children who are now dead because of a 500-pound bomb made in the United States and sold to the coalition.

Over the course of this year, the targeting inside Yemen has gotten more and more catastrophic.

On June 11, a Doctors Without Borders cholera treatment facility, located in the center of a humanitarian compound, with no military value, was hit. There is no way this is a mistake. Everyone knew about this humanitarian compound with a cholera treatment facility inside of it, and the Saudi coalition bombed it anyway. There is no way that is a mistake. There is no way that is a military target. That is an intentional bombing of a cholera treatment facility.

Two weeks later, on July 24, a UNICEF water treatment facility was hit. I will talk a little bit about the cholera epidemic in Yemen in a moment, but the reason there is a cholera epidemic, the biggest in recorded history, is because of these water treatment facilities that are being taken down by the Saudi-led coalition—another one hit on the 24th.

On July 28, a water main supply for Yemen's most important port city was hit, and then on August 9, as I mentioned, there was the schoolbus full of children—kids 6 years old to 11 years old. Forty-four children died, and many

more were left without arms, legs, or had other injuries.

There was a video and photos of the wreckage. The coalition initially denied there were any children on the bus, and they still claim it was a legitimate military target.

The United States is a key player in this bombing campaign. The United States has personnel who sit in the targeting center when decisions are made as to what sites on the ground will be bombed. The United States pays to put planes in the air to refuel the fighter jets flown by the Saudis and the Emirates, and the United States sells the coalition the bombs that are used.

In fact, in this Congress, we have authorized, have taken votes on several sales of precision-guided missiles. We sell them PGMs because we believe they will make fewer mistakes. That probably is right. They are probably making fewer mistakes with the PGMs. The problem is, their targets are schoolbuses, funerals, water treatment facilities, and water mains. They can more effectively hit their civilian targets with the bombs we are selling.

My amendment, which was objected to, would simply say we should not continue to fund this bombing campaign until we have a certification from the administration that the campaign comports with international and U.S. humanitarian laws, humanitarian laws that the United States has signed on to.

These laws effectively say, bombing campaigns such as this need to be proportional to the threat, but, most importantly, they need to refrain from targeting civilian populations.

At some point, we need to believe our eyes rather than the reports we get from the administration that the targeting is getting better and that without the United States in these targeting centers, without the PGMs, and without the refueling missions, the targeting would be worse; that the civilian casualties would be worse.

It is hard to imagine it being any worse than it is today. It is hard to imagine anything worse than schoolbuses and water treatment facilities and cholera treatment centers being targeted by this coalition. At some point, we have to believe what we are seeing rather than what we are being told by the administration.

There has been a 37-percent increase in civilian casualties from airstrikes in 2018 compared to 2017. Seventy percent of the civilian deaths inside Yemen are caused by these coalition airstrikes.

I can spend time talking to you about the atrocities the Houthis, who are on the other side of this civil war, have committed, but the fact is, the majority of the civilian casualties are caused by the side we are supporting—that we are supporting.

Lastly, let me make the case to you that even if you don't buy the unconscionable nature of targeting civilians with U.S. support, this bombing campaign is making the United States less safe every single day. What we know is, AQAP is the most lethal arm of al-Qaida. It has the greatest capacity to hit the American homeland. It has gotten nothing but stronger inside of Yemen since this civil war started. There are new reports that our coalition partners, the Saudis and UAE, have been cutting secret deals with these terrorist organizations. They are not killing or defeating them, but they are just cutting deals with them to push them out of the way.

There are new reports that the UAE is aligning itself with radical Salafi militias inside Yemen. They are maybe not groups that are technically labeled ''ISIS'' or ''AQAP,'' but they are groups that essentially trade fighters back and forth with these groups that are aligned with the UAE, aligned with the Saudi coalition on the ground. The very people who want to kill us are getting stronger every single day inside Yemen—every single day that this war goes on.

We have been told by the Saudis and the UAE that if we just keep on backing their play here, eventually, there will be a political settlement. We are getting further and further away from a political settlement every single day.

They are going after Hodeidah now, the humanitarian port. Let me tell you, the Houthis are going to fight to the end to protect Hodeidah, never mind if there is an eventual assault on Sanaa. So the campaign is not expediting a political end; it is simply prolonging the misery and giving more opportunity for our mortal enemies there, those terrorist groups, to get stronger and stronger.

Lastly, the rationale we are given is that we have an interest here because the Iranians are backing the Houthis. There is no doubt—no doubt—that the Iranians are backing the Houthis. There is no doubt we have an interest in trying to push back against growing Iranian influence in the region, but every single day we participate in this campaign, the Iranians go in harder, the Iranians go in stronger.

The military campaign, which postpones the political settlement, is just making the Iranian presence in Yemen worse. They now have more advanced weapons than ever before inside Yemen, including short-range ballistic missiles, because they are readying to defend Hodeidah, and they are readying to defend Sanaa.

Just remember that when things like this happen, it is not that the Yemenis who survive blame the Saudis or the Emirates; they blame the United States. The world blames the United States. We are radicalizing a generation of Yemeni children against us, and that will have implications for U.S. national security for years to come.

Twenty-two million people inside Yemen today require humanitarian assistance. Seventy-five percent of the country cannot live without humanitarian assistance. Eight million people are on the brink of starvation, meaning they get one meal a day—one meal a day—and 1 million have been affected by cholera.

By the way, according to the WHO, we are on the brink of the third cholera outbreak in that country in the last year and a half because we continue to bomb water treatment facilities.

The bombing, the humanitarian catastrophe, it just shouldn't be on our conscience as a nation to be part of this, but it is making our country less safe every single day. Every single day that we continue this unchecked, unconditional support for this Saudi-led bombing campaign, we are making Iran stronger in the region, we are postponing a political settlement, and we are radicalizing Yemenis against us, driving them to AQAP, driving them into ISIS.

I am going to continue to try to convince my colleagues to allow us to take a vote on this amendment. Again, I just reiterate what this amendment says. It actually doesn't cut off support for this campaign. If I were King, I would cut off American support for this bombing campaign—I would—but I understand that is not where all of my colleagues are, so I am offering an amendment to simply say we should require the administration to certify that civilians aren't intentionally getting targeted, in contravention of U.S. law, before we continue to support this funding.

I truly think that if we took a vote on this, we would get the majority of the body to support the idea that a certification that civilians are not being targeted is a worthwhile precondition to continuing funding for this brutal military campaign.

I will continue to press this. I appreciate the support I have gotten from many Republicans. A growing number of Republicans are supporting the idea that as the facts change, we need to change our approach.

Before I wrap up, I will finally note that we had come together on an amendment to the authorization bill that we thought moved the ball forward. In the authorization bill, we actually did require that the administration make some of these basic certifications before continuing to fund the refueling missions.

In the President's signing statement, he effectively told us he would ignore that section of the authorization bill because he did not think it was in the authorizing power of the U.S. Congress to put those conditions on the refueling missions. I disagree. I think that is clearly within our authorizing power, but there is no way the President or the administration can object to conditions on appropriations because appropriations are unequivocally in the power of the U.S. Congress.

Given the fact that we all came together on these conditions under the leadership of Senator REED, Senator CORKER, and Senator SHAHEEN, amongst others, this is simply reiterating what we did in the authorizing

bill—in the appropriating bill—to make sure we are doing our due diligence as the U.S. Congress to make sure this kind of horror isn't undertaken unnecessarily with U.S. funds.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Arkansas.

PURPLE HEART RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to our Nation's Purple Heart recipients. The Purple Heart is one of the most recognizable medals of our Armed Forces.

The military decoration, a heart-shaped medal featuring a bust of George Washington and his coat of arms, is bestowed upon the men and women in our military who are wounded or killed in action. This is a powerful symbol of the sacrifice made by our Nation's military servicemembers.

This month, we recognized Purple Heart Day, which is observed annually on August 7. This day commemorates the anniversary of the Badge for Military Merit, the precursor to the Purple Heart created by George Washington. Purple Heart Day recognizes those men and women who have borne the ruins of battle, and paying tribute to the recipients of our Nation's oldest military medal demonstrates our respect and gratitude for their sacrifices.

I have also been working on new ways to honor and acknowledge the men and women who put themselves in harm's way in the defense of our Nation. In July, Senator SCHATZ and I introduced the Purple Heart and Disabled Veterans Equal Access Act of 2018 to expand commissary eligibility to Purple Heart recipients and other deserving groups of veterans. I am pleased that the recently passed National Defense Authorization Act included this language that opens access to Purple Heart recipients.

Additionally, last year Congress passed the Forever GI bill. At the beginning of August, several provisions took effect, including the eligibility for post-9/11 Purple Heart recipients to receive full education benefits for up to 3 years.

An estimated 1.8 million Purple Hearts have been awarded in our Nation's history, and it is symbolic of the price our men and women who serve in uniform are willing to pay and the debt of gratitude we owe them for their selfless service. The story of these heroes who earned this military honor continue to inspire us all.

Purple Heart Day honors the sacrifice of Aaron Mankin. Aaron joined the Marine Corps in 2003. In May of 2005, while deployed in Iraq as a combat correspondent, he survived an IED attack near the Syrian border. He sustained intense burns and major lung damage. The injury to his lungs was so extensive that he was placed on a ventilator. He had third-degree burns on his arms and lost his thumb and two-thirds of the index finger on his right hand. To date, he has endured nearly 70 surgeries.

During a ceremony by the Military Order of the Purple Heart in Fayetteville, AR, earlier this month, Aaron spoke about the medal's significance to him. He said that his Purple Heart medal reminds him that we have those among us who are willing to shed their blood, their sweat, and their families' tears to protect the values and ideals we hold most dear. He told attendees: ''It is up to us to ensure that we are living lives worthy of such a sacrifice.''

Aaron has faced many challenges, but his contagious enthusiasm for life has opened many doors, including selection to serve in the Wounded Warrior Congressional Fellowship Program. Seeing how he has fought through this tremendous adversity continues to inspire me. It is important to recognize and not forget the sacrifice of Aaron and his brothers- and sisters-in-arms defending our way of life.

There are patriots like Air Force TSgt John Chapman, who gave his life in defense of this country while bravely fighting against al-Qaida. Sergeant Chapman exemplified the Air Force's core values of integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do, during his heroic efforts against the enemy in Afghanistan on March 4, 2002. He continued his defense against the enemy, saving the lives of American rescue team members, despite his own grave injuries. Today, President Trump will celebrate this American hero by posthumously awarding him with the Medal of Honor.

We owe all of the men and women killed or wounded in combat our heartfelt gratitude for their selfless sacrifice. Although they often are not seeking out recognition, awards, honors, or things of that nature, they certainly deserve nothing less than our public and our private displays of appreciation. The Purple Heart symbolizes their patriotism, dedication, and commitment in defense of a grateful nation. It is a fitting tribute to those whose own hearts overflow with a fierce love for their country and who are willing to defend it with their lives.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND—UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. BURR. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Today we have only 39 days until September 30, which is the expiration of the current authorization for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I am committed more than ever to getting LWCF reauthorized or the authorization across the finish line. I have been waiting to get a vote for the entire 115th Congress. I have been told to wait, and I was patient for a while. The last time I was on the floor, I offered it as an amendment to the last appropriations bill, knowing that it was not germane but knowing that the issue needed to be brought to the forefront of the U.S. Senate because it is at the forefront of the American people. I will reiterate again that I can't wait any longer.

In 2015, it took the expiration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund before Congress got serious about reauthorizing the program and allowing these vital conservation efforts to continue. I am putting this body on notice once again: I will not allow it to expire again.

Several pieces of legislation have come before this body over the previous months, and yet again I am being told by my colleagues—many of whom profess, by the way, to be supportive of this legislation—that we should wait just a little bit longer, that I can't even receive a vote on the matter until then. I have offered my colleagues a very simple proposition: Give me one vote on reauthorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund at a 60-vote threshold. I am not asking for us to forgo the requirements for a 60-vote threshold.

I have asked for an amendment for months on any legislation coming through the Senate, and I am being repeatedly told no. So I am here offering a somewhat different solution. The bill that I will ask unanimous consent on shortly is different in that the language hasn't been offered as a stand-alone bill, but it is actually language that has been passed by the U.S. Senate—this Chamber—by a vote of 85 to 12. It is a bipartisan bill—or it is bipartisan language that was part of the energy package that Chairman MURKOWSKI negotiated with the ranking member, and it includes reforms that both sides would like to see.

There is one change that I am offering today; that is, the ability for LWCF to be reviewed every 3 years for all future Congresses, if they believe it is warranted. It does so by including a joint resolution of disapproval every 3 years in perpetuity, meaning an individual from this body can come to the floor and, with the appropriate votes for disapproval, can eliminate the automatic reauthorization.

This is a permanent authorization of LWCF, but every 3 years, the Senate as a body can vote to disapprove the automatic reauthorization, and, in fact, they would essentially bring an end to the program. The provision gives Congress a chance to take another look at the program every couple of years, which seems to be in line with a number of what my colleagues currently want, given the short-period options that I have been offered in the past few years.

Let me talk about the reason this is permanent, because when LWCF was created in the 1960s, its original authorization was for 25 years, and when it came up for reauthorization in 1989, we reauthorized it for another 25 years. It wasn't until 3 years ago, when it was up for reauthorization, that all of a sudden the Senate, in their infinite wisdom, decided: Well, we are only

going to do this in 3-year increments. And even as late as a month ago, we were offered a 1-year reauthorization. What does a 1-year reauthorization say to the conservation community, which plans for generations what programs they will have to work with? It was only in 2015—after LWCF expired, I might add—that Congress chose a short-term extension.

I believe that to embrace what the creators of this program believed, we have to get back to a longer term reauthorization, and I will propound in this unanimous consent request that it be permanent, with a 3-year review and the ability to pass a disapproval of that authorization. It is a responsible proposal.

This Chamber agreed to pass these reforms on a bipartisan basis, and I am offering even more opportunity to appeal to the concerns of my colleagues than we have ever done. I would urge my colleagues to allow me to get this bipartisan language passed so that we can concentrate on other pressing matters.

I think it is important, and I can never miss an opportunity to talk about what LWCF is. It is a popular and successful bipartisan program. There is a House companion bill, which has 233 cosponsors. Let me say that again: It has 233 cosponsors.

LWCF is a dedicated means for the conservation and protection of America's irreplaceable natural, historic, cultural, and outdoor landmarks. Over the 50-plus years of its history, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has conserved iconic landscapes in every State and is responsible for more than 42,000 State and local outdoor recreation projects. It is far and away the Nation's most important conservation program.

LWCF has protected places like the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Cape Lookout National Seashore, and the Blue Ridge Parkway through the Federal programs and places like Whitehurst Forest, Camden Community Park, and Four Mile Creek Greenway in Mecklenburg County through State and local programs.

LWCF is already paid for by using a very small percentage of receipts off of oil drilling revenues. Let me put that in layman's terms that every Member of Congress can understand. It requires no taxpayer money. We use a percentage of receipts that we collect off of exploration, and that funds the Land and Water Conservation Trust.

I might add that this doesn't bypass appropriators. I will remind everybody that I am not here amending an appropriations bill. This requires appropriators on an annual basis to appropriate money. The pot, though, is accrued based upon the royalties off of exploration, so not a dime of taxpayer money is used.

I might also add that the current account balance for the Land and Water Conservation Fund is $21 billion. This year, the Congress of the United States will appropriate roughly $450 million. So if we were to appropriate the same thing and never increase the size of the trust fund, this program would run well over 30 years on the existing money that is in the fund, assuming that there was no increase in the fund's balance because of money it might make off of it.

LWCF helps make access for outdoorsmen easier by purchasing inholdings and edge holdings. With changing land use and ownership patterns, historic recreational access can be cut off or blocked in many areas. Oftentimes, vast expanses of public land are separated from roads and towns by narrow strips that are privately held, necessitating a long drive to access hunting or fishing grounds only a few miles away.

America's growing population needs more outdoor recreation and more access opportunities, not fewer. If we want our children and grandchildren to enjoy the same hunting, fishing, camping, hiking, and paddling opportunities we enjoy today, protection of habitat and watersheds must keep pace with the growing population and development pressures. This program is widely supported by the outdoor recreation industry, conservationists, hunters, anglers, birdwatchers, and all who appreciate access to America's unparalleled public assets. The U.S. outdoor recreation economy generates $887 billion in consumer spending and $65 billion in tax revenue.

North Carolina has received approximately $246.7 million in LWCF funding over the past five decades. This is a newsletter I got in the mail over the weekend from the Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation. I want to highlight a few things in this because this is all about the program.

The first one is the ''Community of Stewards'' thanking Project Parkway volunteers, highlighting the effort where 200 volunteers devoted their time to cleanup projects along the Blue Ridge Parkway.

''High Pass Boogie riders'':

> This spring's High Pass Boogie motorcycle event was a hit! Riders enjoyed a weekend of fun and raised $13,000 for the Parkway.

''Happy Camper Memories.'' Here is an individual who, as a child, actually spent her summers camping in the Blue Ridge Parkway, and this is her story of what it meant to her. Talk about a generational impact. It is right there.

''Overlooks get a clear perspective.'' Some of my colleagues say this empowers the Park Service—or somebody—and they limit access. I just talked about how we are using this to expand access. But here is one where the Park Service took on the opportunity, with private funding, to begin to clear the view over overlooks so that people who ride down the Blue Ridge Parkway can stop at the overlook and actually see the beautiful land that is out there, where it had been encroached by scrub trees. Some of my colleagues would never think that the Park Service would go in and actually cut down something. Not only did they do it, they did it with money that was donated to them by people who use the park.

''A Fresh Face for Flat Top.'' Flat Top is a property that, when the Parkway was created in the 1950s under the jobs program, was a residence that was absorbed into the park property. Hopefully, the restoration on this will let this property last for another 100 years—all driven with volunteer dollars, not with appropriations. We know the backlog we have with maintenance needs on our parks.

The last one I will highlight is ''Farm Aid: Repairs to historical structures at Humpback Rocks are underway.'' I will just read the last sentence of the paragraph: ''This is a much needed transformation and a great example of your donations at work!''

You see, this isn't something where we are trying to pull the wool over the eyes of the American people. We are actually highlighting the great things we have preserved, and we have an opportunity to use the Land and Water Conservation Fund with zero taxpayer dollars to leverage these private donations for projects like farm aid.

The last one: ''Leave Your Mark on the Mountains: Where there's a will, there's a way.'' This basically says give to the Blue Ridge Parkway Foundation.

I say to my colleagues, this makes such common sense to me. Across this country, we have individual Americans who give of their own money, not just to protect but to maintain these valuable pieces of land. Here, we have an opportunity to use money that was designated over 50 years ago, authorized, that we accumulate in a pot, and we use that to leverage the private donations. Maybe this is a model for us to look at as to how we do park maintenance, where we might be able to leverage more private sector dollars to help with park maintenance because this, in essence, is maintenance, but it is also preservation of national treasures.

The program has been so successful that just a decade after its original enactment, Congress, in 1977, decided to triple its authorization level to $900 million—the level it remains at today. Let me just point out for my colleagues, it is authorized to be appropriated, $900 million a year; it has $21 billion in its fund, and this year we will appropriate about $455 million. I am not here to fight an appropriations battle. I will save that for when we have permanent reauthorization because I think it is high on the passion list of many Members.

As of March 30, about $21.5 billion is in the LWCF fund. From 1965 through 2018, about $39.8 billion was credited to LWCF. Less than half that amount, $18.4, has been appropriated.

I want every Member to understand what I am asking today. I am going to ask unanimous consent that the Senate take up a bill with an hour debate

and an up-or-down vote that does this: It permanently authorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It does not appropriate. It still leaves up to appropriators the annual amount that is appropriated. The language of this bill is a negotiated, bipartisan reform package led by the chairman of the Energy Committee. Most importantly, to those who have been uncomfortable with the extension of reauthorization in the past, every 3 years the Congress is given the ability to pass a disapproval for reauthorization, and if they collect those votes, the program is not authorized.

I am not sure that we have left any concerns that have been raised over the past year and a half out of the equation in this bill. I thank the chairman of the Energy Committee for her diligent work at negotiating the bipartisan language and her willingness to be supportive of the reauthorization. I firmly believe that she will have to object because, in some cases, that is your job when you chair a committee. But before I make my unanimous consent request, I want to make a promise to all the Members: If I have to come down here and do this morning and afternoon, day after day after day, I will do it. I have enough iterations of this bill that I can accommodate the concerns anyone may have and find a way to get permanent authorization. It is not because I want it; it is because the American people want it. It is because the next generation deserves for us to do this. For some unknown reason, a small number of people will not even allow a vote to happen.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—LWCF

Madam President, at this time, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to consideration of my bill, which is at the desk, in relation to LWCF; that there be 1 hour of debate; and that the Senate vote on passage with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I do stand reluctantly and in an unenviable position, as my friend from North Carolina has noted. As the chairman of the authorizing committee, the Energy Committee, I will be objecting at this time. But I want to acknowledge not only the work of the Senator from North Carolina but the passion with which he has put himself into this issue, which is something I think all of us—whether we are from North Carolina or Alaska or points in between, coastal, inland—care about. We care about our Nation's environment. We care about the land that supports us. In our hearts, I think we are all conservationists.

When you think about the purposes for which the Land and Water Conservation Fund was established, it is to do just exactly what Senator BURR has outlined. Some of the good work we see in North Carolina; some of the good work we see with stateside LWCF. In my State, and in all of our States, I think we have seen that role.

What the Senator has laid out here today I think is, in fairness, very right. It is a very popular program. We have had individuals look at it and see the concrete benefits in the places they love. It does have good support in both bodies. I think that is an absolute, when you look at the cosponsorship, particularly on the House side. Sometimes it is a little bit difficult over there to get those strong numbers.

The Senator rightly points out that the language he has used was part of an Energy bill that enjoyed strong, strong support on this floor—85 to 12—a year or so ago, and the language he has utilized in his proposed bill is language that we had included, for the most part, in our bill, with the addition of what he has suggested, with the opportunity every 3 years to revisit this. So it takes a good core of a bill that has already passed and kind of stood the test of fire, if you will.

I think it is important to note, with that Energy bill, that LWCF piece was part of a negotiated package that did include other components. I think we would still like to see those other components moving through. I am certainly committed to working to advance them and have told the Senator from North Carolina that is my intention.

I also believe Senator BURR when he says that he will continue with this effort—that he will continue to bring this issue to the fore—because he believes it is the right thing to do. Permanent reauthorization is timely. I will note to colleagues that while this authorization does expire September 30, it is important to remember that the outlays from the LWCF will continue. So the appropriations he has referenced—$450 million for this particular year—still go out. But he raises a very valid point that we have an authorization. As it is coming due at the end of this next month, this is an opportunity for us to act. It seems that we act best when there is a little pressure from behind or with a timeline, and my commitment to him this morning is to continue this work and continue this effort.

I appreciate what he has done to address some of the concerns. I think we both know there are still outstanding issues that we have with some colleagues. In an effort to not only move this across the Senate floor but allow it to get to the point at which it is successfully implemented into law—I want to work with him to achieve that. But at this point in time, I reluctantly will object to the request of the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Indiana.

LEAD EXPOSURE

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, as a parent, I know there is nothing more important than the health and safety of our children. It is the most basic desire of any mom or dad to watch their child grow up happy and healthy and to achieve his or her Godgiven potentials. Sadly, for too many children in this country, the chance at a healthy life and a bright future is stunted by external environmental factors beyond their control.

In some communities, in States like my home State of Indiana, with a long history of commercial and industrial manufacturing, the potential for exposure to hazardous contamination is a reality that must be constantly monitored and carefully managed. For that reason, I would like to talk about why our work on this appropriations bill that would fund agencies, including the Department of Labor, as well as Health and Human Services, is so important.

Last week, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, also known as ATSDR, held a community meeting in East Chicago, IN, to discuss the ongoing impacts of lead exposure in particular neighborhoods built over an old U.S. Steel lead smelter.

At the meeting, ATSDR released a report which indicated that in these neighborhoods 30 percent of children tested between 2005 and 2015 had blood lead levels above the CDC's reference level. That is 12 times higher than the national average of 2.5 percent.

The impacts of lead exposure are dangerous and irreversible. Even low levels of lead have been shown to affect a child's I.Q., the ability to pay attention, and academic achievement. Think about what that means for these children, for their families, for the community, and for our country.

In East Chicago, the fight to combat lead exposure is a team effort, and it also includes partners from the city, the State department of health, and IDEM, as well as the Environmental Protection Agency and the Departments of Housing and Urban Development and Health and Human Services at the Federal level.

It is critical that our Federal partners continue to support these efforts by providing the best science, research, and resources to help identify and remediate contamination, as well as educate our impacted communities. That is why I am pleased that this appropriations bill more than doubles the current level of funding for CDC's efforts to reduce childhood lead poisoning. This funding is critical for lowering blood lead levels and preventing future harm. It also helps educate healthcare providers and the public about lead poisoning, monitor childhood blood lead levels, and provide funding to States for childhood lead-poisoning prevention.

Another important tool we have to protect the health and safety of our communities is Trevor's Law. Authored by my good friend Senator MIKE CRAPO and passed as part of the bipartisan Frank Lautenberg Chemical Safety for the 21st Century Act in 2016,

Trevor's Law was designed to provide Federal agencies with the authority to help conduct investigations and to take the necessary actions to help address factors that may contribute to the creation of cancer clusters. Additionally, the law is intended to better enable Federal agencies to coordinate with State and local agencies and the public in investigating and addressing potential cancer clusters. It is the type of commonsense support and coordination Americans expect when they face the fear that something may be putting the health and the safety of their community and their beloved children at risk.

For the community of Franklin, IN, in Johnson County, Trevor's Law is the type of Federal support they need today as they work with the State to seek answers to reports that nearly 50 children have been diagnosed with various types of cancers in the last 8 years. Unfortunately for these families, many of whom I have had the privilege and opportunity to get to know, Trevor's Law has not yet been implemented. That is why I am offering a simple amendment. It provides $1 million to fund the implementation of Trevor's Law so we can leverage every bit of knowledge, research, expertise, and ingenuity to make sure our communities are safe places to raise our families.

We are blessed to live in a great country, founded on the idea that our children can grow up to be anything they dream of. Our job is to keep that promise for future generations and to give young people every chance there is to succeed. I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator CRAPO in taking this important step to ensure that we employ the very best scientific research, knowledge, response, and coordination to ensure that our communities remain safe places to raise our children.

Madam President, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I rise today to support Judge Brett Kavanaugh and to join the chorus of Members of the Senate and millions of Americans who are coming to the conclusion, as I have, that Judge Kavanaugh will be an excellent addition to the U.S. Supreme Court. He has outstanding qualifications for the Court, but some of my friends on the other side of the aisle are desperately seeking to find an argument—any argument—to derail his nomination.

The latest attempt by my friends on the other side of the aisle is to claim they simply do not have enough information about him to make an informed opinion. Yesterday, the distinguished minority leader of the Senate came to the floor and suggested that Republicans and Judge Kavanaugh are hiding something. This raises the question: How much can you hide about a distinguished judge who has been issuing opinions for 12 straight years on the circuit court of appeals? How much can you hide about that person's legal philosophy?

In the past, my friend Senator SCHUMER has asserted that the best way to evaluate judicial nominees was to review their judicial record. Perhaps he should follow that advice this year, 2018, in our approach to Judge Kavanaugh. In 2009, when considering Judge Sotomayor's nomination to the High Court, my friend the senior Senator from New York encouraged this body to focus on the nominee's 17-year record as a judge rather than engage in what he called fishing expeditions.

To supplement Judge Kavanaugh's 12-year record of judicial opinions, the Senate is receiving a lot of documents—more than 1 million documents so far, the largest volume of records ever reviewed for any Supreme Court nominee. It is the largest volume of records ever. If our Democratic friends want documents, we have them for our Democratic friends to read.

In addition, Judge Kavanaugh has submitted more than 17,000 pages in response to the Senate Judiciary Committee's questions. The documents that have been turned in from his time in the Bush White House total more than 238,000 pages. Most of these were already available to the public. In comparison, Judge Gorsuch made available 182,000 pages. Justice Kagan, when she was being confirmed, made available 170,000 pages for review. In comparison, Judge Kavanaugh's number is 238,000 pages.

What has changed? I think the American people know what is happening in this debate. The Senate should not be distracted by these stall-and-delay tactics. Instead, let's focus on the fact that Judge Kavanaugh brings with him a respected reputation and legal record. He has written some 300 published legal opinions. Let's use the Schumer rule and judge him on those legal opinions.

Judge Kavanaugh's positions have already been adopted by the Supreme Court. No fewer than 13 times, the Supreme Court has adopted for the law of the land an opinion put forth at the circuit court level by Brett Kavanaugh. I will admit that on one occasion, the Supreme Court partially reversed Judge Kavanaugh. To me, it is better than a 13-to-1 record of being adopted and upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Kavanaugh has earned positive attention and praise for being a good mentor, producing a number of clerks who have gone on to work for the U.S. Supreme Court itself. One of his former clerks wrote in July: ''No court-of-appeals judge in the nation has a stronger, more consistent record than Judge Brett Kavanaugh.'' Indeed, Judge Kavanaugh is known for being thoughtful, principled, and a jurist who will defend conservative values and uphold the sanctity of the Constitution. That is exactly what the American people want. It is exactly what the American people have voted for.

Recently, I had the opportunity to meet with Judge Kavanaugh, like many of my colleagues. I found him to be just as his reputation and record suggested—smart, genuine, approachable, and well qualified to serve on the highest Court of the land. What I have not found in my review of Judge Kavanaugh's qualifications is any indication that he is radical or outside the judicial mainstream, as some of my colleagues might contend.

It is disappointing to see that negative assumptions about Judge Kavanaugh were reached almost immediately after his nomination or even before the nomination took place, well before lawmakers could meet with him or take a serious look at his background. One activist group hastily sent out a press release opposing Judge Kavanaugh before filling in his name. It is clear that the message would have been the same no matter whom President Trump chose—just fill in the blank: Oppose President Trump's nomination of judge blank. He is radical and outside the judicial mainstream.

The American people understand this. The American people also chose President Trump in large part, I believe, to fill the vacancy left by the late Justice Scalia. This was a decision we preserved for the American people on election day. President Trump selected an excellent jurist in Judge Gorsuch, and I am certain Judge Kavanaugh will follow in the same great tradition.

The outside noise involving Judge Kavanaugh should not deter the Senate from upholding its constitutional duty to provide advice and consent on judicial nominees. Frankly, we need to get this done before the first Monday in October, when the new session of the Supreme Court will meet. If we follow the precedence of the last two confirmation processes, we will indeed have plenty of time to do that.

I look forward to our consideration next month of Judge Kavanaugh. I look forward to the hearings, which will deal with his many qualifications for the Supreme Court. I think the American people will be watching, and they will see that he is a jurist capable and willing to do what is right and fair under the law.

A former professor summed it up very well in writing about Judge Kavanaugh for the New York Times. Professor Akhil Reed Amar said this: ''Good appellate judges faithfully follow the Supreme Court; great ones influence and help steer it.'' As a circuit judge, Judge Kavanaugh has influenced the Supreme Court, has steered the Supreme Court. It is now time for him to be elevated to the highest Court in the land, and I support his confirmation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

What is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. H.R. 6157.

Mr. WICKER. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

FIRST ANNIVERSARY OF HURRICANE HARVEY

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the first anniversary of Hurricane Harvey's destruction along the Texas gulf coast. This Saturday, August 25, marks 1 year since the most destructive storm in Texas history made landfall.

Hurricane Harvey is now considered the second most costly hurricane in U.S. history, second only to Hurricane Katrina, but more importantly and more tragically, Hurricane Harvey took many, many precious lives. Harvey started out as a category 4 storm hitting South Texas, making landfall at Corpus Christi, Victoria, Port Aransas, Rockport, Aransas Pass, and Refugio, doing devastating damages with 135-mile-an-hour winds.

It took down powerlines. It stopped fresh water. It clogged sewage systems. It devastated people's homes and people's businesses.

I visited each of those communities many, many times in the weeks and months that followed Hurricane Harvey, and I have seen the transition those communities have undergone in dealing with the disaster and then rebuilding.

But Harvey wasn't done after making landfall. Then, it moved north and east, parking over the city of Houston and just sitting there. Over a 6-day period, Harvey dumped 27 trillion gallons of rain over Texas and Louisiana, causing historic flooding—flooding that is not a 100-year flood, not a 500-year flood, but a 1,000-year flood.

In southeastern Texas, Hurricane Harvey dropped rainfall of more than 60 inches, which exceeds the annual rainfall on average for that region. Over 300,000 structures were flooded in southeast Texas, and a half million cars. More than 200,000 single family homes were flooded across the State, many of which were not in flood plains and not deemed to be at risk of floods.

But we don't mark this anniversary in a spirit of tragedy—rather, in a spirit of triumph. There were many bright lights that cut through the darkness of the storm. There were the police and first responders who led thousands of families to safety. Some, like Sergeant Perez of the Houston Police Department, made the ultimate sacrifice while protecting his community.

There were over 17,000 national guardsmen who answered the call from Texas and from all around the country.

The U.S. Coast Guard rescued 11,022 people and 1,384 pets during the storm. There were countless acts of heroism from folks next door, from church basements offering shelter to neighbors, people making human chains, plucking one another out of the flood waters, and from our countrymen in the Cajun Navy, who boldly answered the call with memories of Katrina still fresh and vivid, to business owners like my friend Mattress Mack, who threw open the doors to give entire communities shelter, warmth, and comfort.

I have never been prouder to be a Texan than I was in the days during and after Hurricane Harvey, when you saw ordinary Texans risking their lives to save each other. There were no party lines. There were no Republicans and Democrats. There wasn't Black, White, Hispanic, or Asian. We were simply Texans helping Texans, standing as one, united. We were lifted up by prayers from millions across Texas, across the country, and across the world.

I remember one gentleman I met. It was at the George R. Brown Convention Center, which had been stood up as a shelter for the many who had lost their homes. I was there one morning volunteering, serving oatmeal. Next to me, someone else was volunteering, serving oatmeal as well, and I said to him, as I tried to say to many, many people throughout that tragedy: Thank you. Thank you for the difference you are making. Thank you for helping out your fellow Texans. Thank you for being here.

I remember he laughed, and he said: Well, I have to be here. My home is underwater. I don't have another place to sleep.

Even though he had gone to seek shelter, once he got there, he wasn't content simply to receive aid and assistance. He wanted to help out. That was the spirit and the community that we saw all up and down the gulf coast.

I remember visiting with two young boys. They were 8 and 10 years old. They were in their home when water rose to waist level, and they had to be rescued by boat. I remember visiting with these boys and saying: Was that scary? How are you doing?

Both boys started laughing, and they said: Are you kidding? We got to swim in our living room.

That kind of joy suffused dealing with the tragedy.

Since the flood waters have receded, many, many families have returned home. Some bravely made a home in new surroundings, and the long, important work of rebuilding has continued.

One year ago, you could take a boat through city streets. I still remember riding on a boat down Clay Road, a road in northwest Houston. I became a Christian at Clay Road Baptist Church. Clay Road was under 8 to 10 feet of water, and I remember taking a boat over cars, over trucks, going right down the middle of Clay Road.

Today, our communities are coming back stronger than ever. Our businesses are once more a part of the Texas booming economy. Our neighborhoods ring with laughter, lawnmowers, and barbecue grills.

I am humbled and grateful to say that the amazing success of recovery has been helped by the willingness of Congress to recognize the extraordinary crisis caused by Harvey and to step up in a bipartisan manner to address it. Since Harvey made landfall, Congress has appropriated over $140 billion in emergency funding to respond to the 2017 hurricane season and to the California wildfires. Over three separate bills, we came together and made it possible to clean debris, to open schools, to rebuild homes for families, and to give entire towns a new start.

My colleague Senator CORNYN and I have worked hand in hand on each of these relief bills in the Senate, increasing the funds available to hurricane victims from those that originally had come over from the House, increasing the overall amount of funding for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for flood prevention projects, as well as for funding other mitigation activities under the Community Development Block Grant Program and the Disaster Recovery Program.

Last month, as part of this funding, the Army Corps announced that Texas would receive nearly $5 billion for projects in the State as part of its disaster supplemental funding plan—projects dealing with long-term flood mitigation to prevent this sort of tragedy from occurring again and to rebuild in a way that is stronger and more resilient and that protects homes and businesses and families. This means that roughly half of the relevant Army Corps construction funds will go to projects in Texas intended to help to prevent future flooding events.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has awarded over $10 billion in community development block grant disaster recovery funds to Texas. These crucial funds will go a long way and already have to meet the needs of Texans who are continuing to repair and to rebuild from Harvey.

We also joined together to pass an emergency tax relief bill. I joined with Senator CORNYN and Senator RUBIO, and together the Cruz-Cornyn-Rubio bill granted over $5 billion in emergency tax relief to those who had been impacted by these hurricanes, allowing people who had lost their homes or had seen devastating damage to their homes to deduct those damages from their taxes and allowing people to take money from their retirement savings—their IRAs and their 401(k)s—and to use those savings to rebuild their homes without paying the ordinary 10 percent early withdrawal fee. It also gave a tax credit to employers—the many, many small businesses who kept the paychecks coming even as the businesses may have been underwater and even as the employees couldn't come into work because their homes and cars were flooded.

Until recently, houses of worship had been excluded from Federal disaster assistance just for being faith based. That policy was wrong. It was discriminatory. Many religious institutions were badly damaged or destroyed during Hurricane Harvey.

I remember visiting a synagogue in Meyerland, a neighborhood of Houston, that had been flooded repeatedly and badly. I went to work with my colleagues, introducing legislation to fix this problem. A few months later, FEMA announced a critical reversal in their policy so that houses of worship

would no longer be discriminated against and would be eligible for the same relief funds as everybody else. Then, in February, our legislation codified FEMA's decision into law, ensuring that religious institutions were not discriminated against. We protected the First Amendment rights of our churches, our temples, and our synagogues, which had suffered so greatly in Harvey and contributed so much to the relief efforts.

That was one of the striking things—how many people who were helping themselves had been damaged.

Just over a week ago, I visited Ellington Base, meeting with the Coast Guardsmen, the swimmers and pilots who had gone into harm's way. For many of them, their own homes were underwater. I visited with one Coast Guard pilot who had to walk through waist-high water to get to a parking lot where a helicopter could go and pick them up so they could fly and save others.

That story, over and over, was the story of Harvey.

One year after Harvey's devastation, the work continues. The Texas gulf coast continues to recover, and it will take years for the rebuilding to be complete, but as the Lone Star State rebuilds stronger than ever, we will keep moving forward.

May we never forget the tragic days that Harvey hit our shores, but may we always remember the heroes who triumphed in the midst of the darkness, the brave men and women who were a light to their country. They are the best of America. They are the best of Texas. God bless them all, and may God continue to bless the great State of Texas.

I field the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Rhode Island.

THE MILITARY LENDING ACT

Mr. REED. Madam President, I rise today to support the Senator from Florida, my dear friend Senator BILL NELSON, and to thank him for his leadership in working on a bipartisan basis to enact the Military Lending Act in 2006, which caps the annual interest rate for an extension of consumer credit to a servicemember or his or her dependents at 36 percent.

Because of his efforts, servicemembers and their families have strong consumer protections that defend them against unscrupulous lenders who unpatriotically, in my view, prey upon these young men and women while they are selflessly and valiantly serving this Nation.

It has been my honor to work with the Senator from Florida in enacting, protecting, and strengthening the Military Lending Act since 2006.

I must say that my experience is not just as a legislator. I had the privilege of commanding a paratrooper company in the 82nd Airborne Division, and before that I was the executive officer. I spent many, many hours with young soldiers who had been taken advantage of by—not all businessmen, but, in fact, very few—unscrupulous operators who would prey on them, who would leave them in a financial condition that ruined their careers and their lives. Because of Senator NELSON's efforts in passing the Military Lending Act, we took some steps to protect these young men and women who are protecting us, and we owe the Senator a great deal of regard and respect for what he has done because he, too, has recognized the demands of service to our Nation by men and women in uniform.

For generations, Americans have set aside partisanship and have made every effort to provide servicemembers and their families with all the resources and protections they deserve. Indeed, it should not matter to servicemembers whether the Commander in Chief is a Democrat, Republican, or Independent, and there should never be a question whether an administration will make every effort to support men and women in uniform.

Unfortunately, this administration is forcing servicemembers to question whether the administration has their backs in light of recent reports that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, under OMB Director Mulvaney's leadership, will no longer make every effort to protect servicemembers and their families under the Military Lending Act due to their claim of a purported lack of authority.

Let me be clear. The CFPB has all the authority it needs, and it should not be abandoning its duty to protect our servicemembers and their families and ensure that they continue to receive all their MLA protections.

We should not forget that the CFPB's routine examination of at least one payday lender already uncovered Military Lending Act violations, where a payday lender extended loans at rates higher than 36 percent to more than 300 Active-Duty servicemembers or their dependents. Let me also put this in perspective. The requirements of the Military Lending Act set an interest ceiling of 36 percent. In this environment, 36 percent is more than an adequate return, and the idea that businesspeople would be trying to engage soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen in lending arrangements that went beyond 36 percent is, on its face, not only deplorable but flabbergasting. That is what CFPB was able to further prevent. Because of their supervisory activities, they were able to discover these violations, alert the appropriate authorities, and stop these individuals from continuing to prey on service men and women.

In an April 2018 DOD letter I received, the Department of Defense stated: ''initial indications are the new MLA rules . . . are having their intended outcomes . . . the use of high-cost credit products and associated readiness problems appear to be decreasing.''

We are making progress under Senator NELSON's MLA and under the leadership of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to protect servicemen and servicewomen. Why would we turn our backs and retreat? Servicemembers wouldn't turn their backs and retreat. Why is Director Mulvaney suggesting we do that?

Indeed, DOD has stated that losing a servicemember due to personnel issues, such as financial instability, cost taxpayers and DOD more than $58,000 for each separated servicemember. Again, recalling my service, dealing with young men—and at that time paratroopers were all males in the 82nd—dealing with these young men, their whole lives were ruined. They were reported for being late for formations or missing formations because their car had been repossessed or they were so overwhelmed by debt they didn't realize they were accumulating, they couldn't function. They could lose their security clearances because one factor of maintaining a security clearance is having no credit problems. They could be dismissed at a cost to taxpayers of $58,000 per servicemember for each separation.

So in addition to saving the Department of Defense and taxpayers money, the CFPB's Office of Servicemember Affairs—again, on a bipartisan basis, working with Senator Scott Brown of Massachusetts, I cosponsored legislation that created within the CFPB an organization that is exclusively devoted to protecting servicemembers. The first Director was Holly Petraeus. She did a superb job. She was succeeded by a career JAG officer, Colonel Kantwill, who also did a superb job. This organization, the CFPB, with their Office of Servicemember Affairs, has all the authority it needs and an obligation to protect the men and women in uniform who protect us.

Their website says it has ''helped return hundreds of millions into the pockets of servicemembers affected by harmful practices.'' The CFPB, through the Office of Servicemember Affairs, has returned hundreds of millions of dollars to men and women in uniform who were being victimized by unscrupulous operators, and we are going to stop that? We are going to walk away from success? As I said before, are we going to turn our backs and retreat on people who don't turn their backs and retreat on this Nation? That is why it is frustrating, and it is inexplicable that the Trump administration would tout its dedication to servicemembers in one breath and roll back military consumer protections with the next. To set the record straight, rolling back MLA protections prioritizes the interests of predatory lenders over the interests of servicemembers and their families. If you can't make a decent return with a limit of 36 percent interest, you shouldn't be in business—you shouldn't be a legitimate business. This is not what any administration, Republican

or Democratic, should do and certainly not what the CFPB should do.

As the ranking member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and also having had the highest privilege of serving this Nation in uniform, I stand with my fellow veterans, my colleagues, and all Americans to call on the administration to do the right thing, honor our Nation's commitment to provide servicemembers and their families with all the protections they have earned.

Again, I thank the Senator from Florida for his efforts. Because without his efforts, we would not have the Military Lending Act. Service men and women would be victimized even more grievously. So to Mr. NELSON, I salute him and thank him and urge him to continue his valiant efforts.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, you can't say it any better than how the Senator from Rhode Island has said it. He is a West Point graduate, was a company commander, was the executive officer of a brigade—he just told us, the 82nd Airborne.

He has seen what has happened to these young troops. They get their pay, they go outside the gates, there are folks who want to give loans to them, and then they run up rates as much as 100 percent and 150 percent. That is why we passed the Military Lending Act back in 2006, to cap those rates at 36 percent. That is high enough, but it is a lot less than the 150-percent rates given to these poor, unsuspecting troops who are being taken advantage of.

As a former 82nd Airborne member, the Senator from Rhode Island has just shared his personal experience of what would happen. Troops would not show up for muster because suddenly their car had been repossessed or they had people hounding them. What has happened over the years since 2006, when we passed the bill, is, in fact, they found ways to get around it. Now commanders are receiving harassment calls. They found a way to get around the 36 percent.

What we want to do is lower it down to 24 percent. If someone cannot do well in business when getting a return of 24 percent on what they are loaning out, then they shouldn't be in business, and especially they shouldn't be in business to take advantage of our U.S. military troops.

That is why I have introduced the Military Lending Improvement Act of 2018. That is why it goes into more specifics. It not only lowers the interest rate but ensures that auto loans are covered by the Military Lending Act. Let's remove any ambiguity there—to prohibit creditors from calling servicemembers' commanding officers or improperly threatening action under the Uniform Code of Military Justice to collect a debt from a U.S. military servicemember. It is commonsense. It will show members of our military that the law will protect them and will go after these shady lenders.

I urge all of our colleagues to support it. Obviously, this doesn't have anything to do with partisanship. This is supporting the troops. I urge our fellow Members of the Senate to work with Senator REED and me to get the CFPB leadership off the dime to protect our bravest from financial scams. It is just mind-boggling that the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau that is set up for the purpose of protecting consumers would now turn a blind eye to protecting some of the most vulnerable who almost everybody in America would say we want to protect. That is because there are the unscrupulous lenders.

We saw a lot of this in the early years of the wars of Afghanistan and Iraq. When a servicemember was overseas in Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom, they were being scammed by the payday, title loan, and other kinds of lenders, and they were being charged those exorbitant rates. It is just morally wrong. That is what brought the law in 2006, and now we need to update that law.

Back in 2006, there was a Department of Defense report that told the story of one young servicemember who was charged $100 to take out a $500 loan. Using the CFPB's formula, that equates to an annual percentage rate of 520 percent. That servicemember was forced to take out other loans. He had to do multiple rollovers to pay off the initial $500. It snowballed into a cost of $15,000 when it was all said and done. The servicemember can't pay that. So the law was passed in 2006, but now we need to update it, and before we update it in law, we need to get the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau to act and to protect the consumer.

The law says creditors ''may not impose an interest rate higher than 36 percent,'' and it says that specifically on servicemembers. There is no ambiguity there. So the CFPB ought to enforce that law until we update it with this new one. When you have to force a member of the military to have to be concerned and harassed and taken away from his duties and to file a complaint with the CFPB, it just ignores the law. What is there to protect the very people we want to protect?

Indeed, this is a matter of right and wrong. Indeed, this is a moral reason. Let's get the administration to enforce the existing law, and then let's update that existing law with even tighter restrictions on the lenders that are taking advantage of the very people we want to honor and help, the people in uniform who are protecting this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

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

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

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, I rise today to call on each of us to take seriously one of our most important duties as Senators—our constitutional duty to provide advice and consent on Presidential appointments to the Supreme Court.

As we all know, over the last 3 years, the longstanding tradition of building bipartisan consensus in the Senate around nominees to our highest Court was flown into the ash heap of history. The majority leader and Senate Republicans completely dismantled the rules that made advice and consent real in the Senate—all to steal a Supreme Court nominee from our last President. By making nominations to the highest Court—perhaps the most consequential votes we take as Senators—subject to only a simple-majority vote, Republicans rigged the system to make it possible for the most extreme nominees to make it all the way to the Bench.

Before they broke the rules, requiring 60 votes ensured that both parties would have a real seat at the table and that mainstream nominees would be nominated and confirmed with the advice and consent of the Senate. Now we have been told that we must accept the resulting new normal of a politicalized and completely partisan selection process to fill any new vacant seat on the Court.

I, for one, refuse to legitimize this broken process. Under these broken rules, the minority party—even in as closely divided a Senate as we currently have today—has effectively zero ability to say: Wait. Hold up. There is something about this nominee that is too extreme or too disqualifying for a lifetime appointment to the highest Court in the land.

That is not democratic. That is not what the Founders had in mind when they created the Senate as a deliberative body. This body was intended by the Founders to be the methodical answer to the fiery passions of the day, not an amplifier of them.

I fear that this broken system will create potentially disastrous consequences for the health of our democracy as a whole. It has already resulted in a crisis of confidence where the public no longer views our Supreme Court as independent. Frankly, the public is correct—not just because of the precedent it set and hostility that it created but also because of the nominee before us.

Because President Trump knew going in that he would not need a single Democratic vote, he went straight to a predetermined list of names given to him by the Heritage Foundation and the Federalist Society. That meant that the President only considered nominees who fulfilled all of the ultraconservative special-interest litmus tests. This ensures that each of the judges he considered opposed women's

healthcare, environmental protections, and workers' rights. You don't have to take my word for that; President Trump was very explicit on the campaign trail in saying that he would only choose from this list of extreme conservatives for the Supreme Court. Without real advice and consent, there is no counterbalance and no real voice for Americans who don't want to see the country unrecognizably changed forever by his ultraconservative Court-packing.

We have been asked to go through the motions of a broken and partisan confirmation process for a nominee with a troubling and dangerous track record. If confirmed, a Justice Brett Kavanaugh would be a deciding vote on so many important issues that I have no doubt will come before the Supreme Court. Would a confirmation process in which both parties had a real seat at the table produce a nominee who believes that polluters should be able to poison our air and water unchecked; a nominee who does not believe women have the right to make decisions about their own private healthcare needs; a nominee who has ruled against well-established rights of privacy? No. And that is precisely the point.

Judge Kavanaugh's hyperpartisan opinions formed over a lifetime as a Republican DC operative will influence his decisions from the Bench. He is out of touch with consensus views held by the American people, and his extreme views could drastically alter our daily lives.

Judge Kavanaugh is exactly the type of ideologue and politically motivated nominee we can expect to see not just for this seat but for all Supreme Court seats moving forward if we allow the Senate rules for providing advice and consent to remain in tatters. But I worry that by rushing this through on a completely party-line vote, we are enabling an even greater threat to our democratic institutions and to our Republic itself, and that is because, from what we do know about his judicial record, work experience, and writings, Judge Kavanaugh believes in giving a disturbing amount of deference to the executive branch and to the President of the United States.

Judge Kavanaugh has written and delivered very clear statements saying that he believes a sitting President should not have to face prosecution, criminal investigation, subpoenas, or civil litigation. To be clear, this judge believes the President is above the law. This is the United States of America. No one—I repeat, no one—is above the law.

It really makes you wonder why President Trump would pick him for a potentially deciding vote on the Supreme Court, doesn't it. Do I need to remind you that our President and members of his campaign team remain under Federal investigation for coordinating with the Russian Government's interference in our election?

Just yesterday, the President's longtime attorney and his campaign chairman were each declared guilty in eight separate Federal crimes. In his guilty plea for campaign finance violations, the President's former attorney, Michael Cohen, implicated the President himself in coordinating payoffs to women who alleged affairs in an effort to influence the election.

Look, combine all of President Trump's ongoing legal troubles with his unbalanced and impulsive style of governing, and there are many plausible and even likely questions about the scope of the executive branch's authority that could come before the Supreme Court. Especially after yesterday's major developments, this is no longer purely hypothetical. We don't know enough about how Judge Kavanaugh might rule on these questions, but what we do know is deeply concerning.

Judge Kavanaugh has questioned whether Presidents should be forced to answer to civil lawsuits, criminal investigations, or questions from a prosecutor while they are in office. That, to me, is unbelievable. In another example before he became a judge, Kavanaugh said that he thought the Supreme Court had made an ''erroneous decision'' when it unanimously ruled that President Nixon needed to turn over White House tapes that ultimately proved the role that he played in covering up the Watergate scandal. Kavanaugh has also stated that he opposed the post-Watergate special counsel law and implied that nothing limits the President's authority to terminate a special counsel with or without cause.

It is easy to see how Judge Kavanaugh's views on Executive power are especially dangerous in the current times. This view of an executive branch untethered from the checks and balances that form the very norms of our political system should terrify Senators on both sides of the aisle who believe that the separation of powers is a cornerstone of our American democracy.

On top of this, we need to know more about Judge Kavanaugh's actions when he was in the executive branch. As a high-ranking official in the George W. Bush White House, Judge Kavanaugh served on the legal team and as Staff Secretary to President Bush during controversial abuses of Executive power. Senate Republicans have so far obstructed requests to review all of the records that would show what role Kavanaugh played in determining the legality of President Bush's policies. What side did he take as the Bush administration's CIA used illegal torture techniques, such as waterboarding? Was he aware of the Bush administration's warrantless mass surveillance of Americans' phone and internet records? These are unanswered questions until we are able to review relevant Presidential records—the same types of reviews we have been able to do for past nominees when there was real advice and consent.

The National Archives told Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, that it cannot physically process all of the relevant records until October. Yet Senate Republicans have scheduled confirmation hearings and then a likely confirmation vote for Judge Kavanaugh to begin in early September.

We should never proceed on a confirmation vote for a lifetime appointment to the Supreme Court until we have done our due diligence in reviewing every relevant document on a nominee's record. We should not proceed on Judge Kavanaugh's nomination until we have clear answers to highly important questions about his actions in the Bush White House. Under a functioning confirmation process, the need to review these records would not even be up for debate. It is just plain common sense and part of our constitutional duty to carefully, to methodically review the qualifications of nominees as part of providing advice and consent.

Unfortunately, as is obvious to anyone watching this process unfold, the United States is no longer operating under rules that ensure a fair process. Instead, Republicans are rushing to push this nomination through at a breakneck pace so that they can confirm Judge Kavanaugh before this fall's election regardless of legitimate questions about his record, regardless of the dangerous consequences of his extreme views on so many issues.

At a time when our democratic institutions themselves are under attack—from undermining the free press to there being foreign influence in our elections—we should be very careful in weighing who sits on this, the Nation's highest Court.

Once again, I plead with my colleagues that we can do better than this. We must restore advice and consent in the Senate before we confirm any nominee who will be tainted by this partisan, broken system. I call on each of us to work together to create a better system and to restore a bipartisan process on which we can build consensus to see us through these politically turbulent times. Until we restore a fair confirmation process, I will fight alongside the American people, who are demanding that we do our jobs that they elected us to do and with the seriousness required to get this right.

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

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

MANAFORT AND COHEN TRIALS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, there have been a number of headline-grabbing days during the first 18 months of the Trump administration, and I think yesterday is going to rank among the

most extraordinary. But for this Senator from Vermont, it has been the most troubling.

The President of the United States was effectively identified by his longtime lawyer and confidant as an unindicted co-conspirator in their efforts to commit criminal campaign finance violations. If what they are saying is true, what his confidant is pleading guilty to is that then-Candidate Trump arranged payments to two women he had affairs with, in violation of Federal law, in order to keep those affairs hidden from the American people at a most critical time, days before the election.

Further, last night, the lawyer for Mr. Cohen claimed that his client also has information relevant to whether President Trump had advance knowledge—and even supported—the hacking of Democratic electronic files. We know that he gave a speech at one point saying that if Russia is listening, they should hack. That crime, which we know was committed at the direction of Russian President Vladimir Putin, serves as a basis for Special Counsel Robert Mueller's investigation.

Also yesterday, within minutes of Mr. Cohen's entering his guilty plea, a jury found the President's former campaign manager guilty of numerous tax and bank fraud charges. Paul Manafort will now face a separate trial concerning his work for a Putin-connected oligarch both in Ukraine and here at home. In this second trial, scheduled to begin next month, Mr. Manafort has been charged with conspiracy to defraud the United States, failing to register as a foreign agent, and money laundering, among other charges.

The clouds of criminal conduct surrounding those close to the President are darkening. Directly or indirectly, his campaign manager, personal attorney, and multiple aides have now been swept up in the Special Counsel's investigation. This probe has resulted in numerous guilty pleas and 34 criminal indictments. And it is not complete.

I have watched, both as a Senator and as a former prosecutor, and it is so troubling. I know one thing; it is crucial that the special counsel be permitted to complete his investigation and to do so without the daily—often hourly—interference from the President. During my four decades in the Senate, I have never before seen an investigation led by career, apolitical law enforcement officials so personally and publicly maligned by a politician—let alone by the President of the United States. No one is above the law, and the President should stop acting as though he is.

I would also urge the Majority Leader to immediately bring the bipartisan legislation to protect the Special Counsel to the Floor. We passed this legislation out of the Senate Judiciary Committee with a bipartisan vote. Anyone who says that the President can be trusted not to undermine the Special Counsel has clearly not been paying attention. Think of all of the tweets he sent as the Manafort trial was going on. Do you think those weren't seen directly or indirectly by those involved in the trial? We know that the judge made clear his opposition to the prosecution, and the jury also had to listen to the President's tweets. Just think of what that does.

It is equally critical that the Senate reassert its oversight responsibility over the Executive Branch—something for which we have advocated. If these were normal times, the Senate Judiciary Committee would immediately pursue an investigation.

Indeed, the Judiciary Committee is uniquely situated to investigate the allegation raised by Mr. Cohen. The Committee has jurisdiction over our criminal laws, including our campaign finance laws. Mr. Cohen's lawyer has indicated that he is willing to testify before Congress without being granted immunity—pretty extraordinary.

It is difficult to reconcile the Judiciary Committee's inaction here with one of the most critical constitutional crises we have seen—certainly since I have been in the Senate, and I have been here for 44 years.

It is difficult to reconcile the Judiciary Committee's inaction with its race to confirm President Trump's nominee to the Supreme Court. In fact, the timeline the Republicans are pursuing to consider Judge Kavanaugh is so aggressive that it will sideline the nonpartisan review of the nominee's record performed by the National Archives. That has occurred for every Supreme Court nominee since Watergate, whether Republican or Democratic.

I mentioned earlier today that when I was chairman, Justice Kagan was up, and the Republicans asked for her records. We got 99 percent of them. I went to the Archives. I joined with the senior Republican, Jeff Sessions, on the Committee to request them. We got 99 percent of those records before the hearing. We have 6 percent of Judge Kavanaugh's records. And those were handpicked by a lawyer whose clients include, among others, Stephen Bannon and other very partisan clients.

The Russia investigation is the most pressing national security investigation of our time. Here we have a powerful country—Russia—that is working against us. We know it. We can just pick up the paper. Without going to any of the classified hearings that most of us have been to, we can read what is in the paper about the hacking Russia has done and the billions of dollars it has cost people and the hacking that continues to this moment against the United States. This is the Russia that the President publicly called upon during a campaign rally to hack his opponent's computers. We know from what we have seen and what our intelligence community has told us that they did try to influence the last election, and we do know they intend to try to influence the elections this year, not only in our country but in other countries. This is a major problem, and it is being ignored.

I think history is going to judge all of us in the U.S. Senate very harshly if we collectively shrug our shoulders and disregard our constitutional responsibility to oversee the Executive Branch in this moment. We represent a coequal branch of government. It is time to act like it.

Mr. President, I was going to suggest the absence of a quorum, but I see one of my distinguished colleagues on the floor, so I will simply yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Defense appropriations bill being considered by the Senate. With this important measure, we are greatly enhancing our national defense by providing the actual funds our warfighters need to maintain a decisive advantage over our adversaries.

As home to one-third of our strategic ground-based nuclear arsenal, Montana plays a critical role in deterring aggression, enabling diplomacy, and maintaining a posture of peace through strength.

While serving in the U.S. Senate, I have visited Malmstrom Air Force Base in Great Falls, MT, several times. I have toured the missile fields and the silos. I have had the honor of sitting down and speaking with the men and women who maintain this important nuclear deterrent. Their hard work and their professionalism are unmatched. We owe it to them to support their work and give them the tools they need to be successful.

It is so important that we advance the deployment and the development of the next ground-based strategic deterrent. This bill achieves that goal by replacing Montana's current Minuteman Missile, as well as the UH–1N replacement helicopter that services our missile fields. It also recognizes the important work Montana's university researchers and small businesses do in support of our Nation's military readiness.

Montanans are quite proud of the critical role our State plays in defending this great Nation. This bill strengthens and enhances that role.

As a member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I am pleased to note that it makes substantial investments in emerging technologies, such as hypersonics, directed energy, artificial intelligence, and cyber security. In particular, we are providing additional funding for new cyber units within the National Guard that will be available to the States under title 32 authority.

I worked with my colleagues here in the Senate to secure these additional funds because I believe the National Guard will play an increasingly important role in defending our Nation against government-backed cyber attacks from nations like China, Russia,

North Korea, and Iran. These nations target critical civilian networks like schools, hospitals, or private businesses, where the military's authority is limited. Only the National Guard has the unique ability to provide assistance on request by a State's Governor.

These new units will fill a critical need and increase the effectiveness of our military's existing cyber defense forces. They will also bring in new skill sets and new perspectives from citizen soldiers who work in cyber-related professions.

In closing, I wish to urge my colleagues to support the measure before us today to empower our servicemen and our servicewomen and ensure that our Nation's military capabilities are unmatched by our adversaries.

With that, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, Boy Scouts shouldn't get a merit badge for telling the truth, and U.S. Senators shouldn't get an award for passing appropriations bills. That is what we are expected to do. That is what we are here for. That is our most basic responsibility. But I think it is worth noticing, especially since the distinguished vice chairman of the Appropriations Committee is still on the floor, that this is the largest number of appropriations bills passed before August since the year 2000. We have already done that with seven bills, and if we are successful this week, as I expect we will be, in passing the third package of appropriations bills, we will have passed in the Senate annual appropriations bills that account for nearly 90 percent of the discretionary Federal Government spending. That is the part of the government spending that is not automatic—we call that the mandatory spending. It is the part of the government spending that is under control.

For the last 10 years, this basically 30 percent of the Federal budget that we call discretionary spending that we appropriate every year—that has been going up at about the rate of inflation, and over the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it will go up at just a little more than the rate of inflation. So this money we are spending on behalf of our taxpayers, we are spending in a budgeted, responsible way, and we are spending it on time—if we continue the progress we are making—which makes it easier for our military, our National Laboratories, and our agencies to plan and spend money more wisely.

Nothing is more wasteful—almost nothing is more wasteful—than the failure of the U.S. Congress to appropriate or decide the amount of money that is to be spent every year before the year begins. Too often over the last several years, it has been the middle of the year before agency managers knew what they could spend that year, and that is a wasteful practice. In a military sense, our leaders in the Department of Defense tell us it is a dangerous practice in terms of what we can count on for our national security.

I would like to pause for just a moment and reflect on what the Appropriations Committee is doing, what the U.S. Senate is doing and doing properly—not because we deserve an award or a merit badge for doing our most basic responsibility but because it is worth noting when we do it because it hasn't been done for so long.

The following are the seven appropriations bills that have already passed the Senate. One is the Energy and Water Development legislation. I am chairman of that committee and of the conference that is working on that. I am working with Chairman MIKE SIMPSON in the House, Senator FEINSTEIN, and Representative KAPTUR. We are working together. We hope to have that bill—which has already passed the Senate and has already passed the House—we hope to come together and have a conference immediately after Labor Day so we can complete the bill and send it to the President for his signature. That is one of the appropriations bills. Others are Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies—we passed that one; the Legislative Branch—we passed that one; and Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, and that passed.

In past years, Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies has been very difficult to pass. There are some controversial issues there, but Senator SHELBY and Senator LEAHY have led us, along with Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL, to say: We are not going to try to solve every controversial issue that we can think of on the appropriations bills, because we have learned in the past that practice will sink them. So we have tabled a few bills—a few amendments that have come before us because they would have kept the appropriations bills from proceeding. We can deal with those more controversial ideas and amendments at another time.

Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies has been passed. Financial Services and General Government has also been passed.

So there are seven. That is the largest number of appropriations bills the Senate has passed before August since the year 2000—18 years ago. This week, we are debating the third package of appropriations bills, which includes Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies and the Defense appropriations bill. That means that if we are successful in completing our work this week on those two, we will have considered all nine of those appropriations bills under what we call in the Senate the regular order. That means we have an opportunity to offer other amendments when they come to the floor, we debate them, we vote on those amendments, we pass the bills, and then we go to conference with the House. In other words, not just the 31 members of the Appropriations Committee get to work on this; all Members of the Senate get to have their say.

This week, we have already voted on some amendments, and we may get to consider more. After we finish these two bills—as I said earlier, hopefully tomorrow—the Senate will have passed the annual appropriations bills that account for nearly 90 percent of the discretionary Federal Government spending.

Senator SHELBY, the chairman, and the vice chairman, Senator LEAHY, as well as the majority leader, Senator MCCONNELL, and Senator SCHUMER, all deserve credit and our thanks for creating the environment that makes this possible. I appreciate their commitment. I want to especially commend Senator BLUNT, Senator MURRAY, Senator SHELBY, and Senator DURBIN for their work on the bills that are before us this week.

A few weeks ago, one of my friends in Nashville, one of the major contributors to Vanderbilt University Medical Center, came up to me. He said: It is a real shame that you guys in Congress aren't funding biomedical research.

So I said to my friend: Well, let me tell you what has happened the last 3 or 4 years, and see if you still believe that. The U.S. Senate is on track for the fourth straight year to provide record funding for biomedical research at the National Institutes of Health in a regular appropriations bill.

This year's bill includes $39.1 billion for the National Institutes of Health—a $2 billion increase over last year.

Over the last 3 years, Congress has increased NIH funding by about $7 billion. First, Congress increased National Institutes of Health funding by $2 billion in 2015. Then, in 2016, we increased it another $2 billion. Then, in 2017, Congress increased funding at the NIH by $3 billion, including $500 million to work on a non-addictive pain killer, which, in my view, is the Holy Grail of the fight against the opioid crisis—finding some form of painkiller that is not addictive for the 100 million Americans who hurt and the 25 million who have chronic pain.

This year's increased funding for biomedical research will mean more medical miracles—new treatments and cures. The reason Congress has given this such a priority was very well described by Dr. Francis Collins, the head of the National Institutes of Health. He calls it the ''National Institutes of Hope.''

When he testified before our Appropriations Committee, he talked about what we might expect to see during the next 10 years if we properly fund the National Institutes of Health. Some of those predictions by Dr. Collins were these: Being able to identify Alzheimer's disease before symptoms appear; the possibility that we could rebuild a patient's heart with the patient's own cells—in other words, put

the transplant surgeons out of business; the creation of a safe and effective artificial pancreas, making life easier and healthier for the millions of Americans with diabetes; development of new vaccines, Dr. Collins said, including for Zika, for HIV/AIDS, and a universal flu vaccine; development of a new, non-addictive painkiller, which I mentioned; significant progress on the Precision Medicine Initiative, which President Obama championed, which aim to map the genomes of 1 million volunteers so that we can better tailor treatments to patients; and new treatment for cancer patients. Those are just some of the new treatments, cures, and miracles we might expect, Dr. Collins said, in the next 10 years.

This bill we are talking about also provides $3.7 billion to help those on the frontlines of the opioid crisis and help bring an end to opioid abuse. Senator MURRAY and I, as well as about 60 Members of this body, have put together a comprehensive opioids authorization bill, which we hope to be able to present to the full Senate at the end of next week, or shortly after Labor Day, that can be put together with the House to address this crisis. But this is the money for the opioids initiative; it is in this bill: $1.5 billion for State Opioid Response Grants, state grants originally authorized by the 21st Century Cures Act; $500 million to develop non-addictive painkillers; funding for more substance abuse and mental health treatment services at Community Health Centers.

The other funding bill included in this minibus appropriations bill is the Defense Appropriations bill. The Senator from Illinois is on the floor. He is the ranking Democrat on that committee. He has also been one of the foremost leaders of the effort to increase the biomedical research I just mentioned.

Chairman SHELBY and Senator DURBIN worked together to produce a bill that provides a total of $675 billion to make sure our troops have the resources they need to maintain our national defense. The funding included in this bill will provide the largest pay increase since 2010 for the men and women serving in the military, including those who serve at Fort Campbell in Tennessee and Kentucky.

Also, $2.8 billion is provided for basic research at the Department of Defense. This is the largest Defense Department research and development budget in history.

It is hard to think of a major technological development since World War II in this country that wasn't supported in some way by federally sponsored research. Funding basic research at the Department of Defense will give the United States an advantage over our adversaries and allow us to maintain the strongest military in the world.

I have suggested to President Trump that he make science and research a part of his ''America First'' agenda. We need to do that. Since 2007, over the last 10 years, China has increased its spending on basic science by a factor of four and may surpass the United States in total spending on research and development this year, according to Norm Augustine, who, during the George W. Bush administration, chaired the bipartisan committee that wrote a report called ''Rising Above the Gathering Storm,'' which made recommendations to the Congress on how to retain America's competitive advantage.

Our country needs to continue to be first in the world in basic research. The President has already signed into law two consecutive appropriations bills that provide record funding for science, technology, energy, and biomedical research, and the two appropriations bills we are debating this week will provide even more funding for basic research.

I urge my colleagues to support these bills because passing these bills means more biomedical research at National Institutes of Health for treatments and cures; more Federal help for States and communities struggling to combat the opioid crisis; the largest Department of Defense research budget in history; and pay raises for the men and women who serve in our military.

Let me say again what I said a little earlier. This funding that we are talking about—this record funding for science, technology, basic research, supercomputing in another bill, the need for our national defense—all of this is within the part of the Federal budget that is under control. Over the last 10 years, this discretionary part of the budget—roughly one-third or a little less than one-third of the budget—has grown at about the rate of inflation, and over the next 10 years, according to the Congressional Budget Office, it is expected to grow at just a little more than the rate of inflation.

So this is not the Federal spending that is causing the big Federal deficit. This is spending for national defense, national parks, the National Institutes of Health, and national laboratories. This is the core of what we need to do in the United States of America.

We need resolve and courage in a bipartisan way, and the President needs to join us, in dealing with the part of the budget that is running up a big deficit; that is, Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and other entitlements. Nobody wants to touch that. That is a separate question. But it is important for people to know that there is no need to beat your chest and pat yourself on the back when you cut funding for the military, when you cut funding for the National Institutes of Health, when you make our national laboratories work less, or when the National Parks can't maintain themselves.

We go the opposite direction here: record funding for national laboratories; we are considering more maintenance for National Parks; record funding for supercomputing; record funding for biomedical research, all within the budget limits, all within our priorities. That is what we need to do.

As I said when I started, Senators don't deserve a merit badge for passing appropriations bills any more than Boy Scouts deserve a merit badge for telling the truth. That is what we are supposed to do. But when we do it and do it properly, as we are doing this year, it deserves to be noticed.

I congratulate Senator DURBIN, Senator LEAHY, Senator MCCONNELL, and Senator SHELBY for their roles and their leadership in this.

I thank the President.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The assistant Democratic leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 3787

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Tennessee for his kind words and thank him for his leadership on so many issues. He is chairman of the health and education authorizing committee, and we also serve together on Appropriations Committee. It has been a real pleasure to work with him over the years on so many issues but particularly on the issue of medical research.

It would surprise a lot of people—maybe even disappoint them—to know how bipartisan we are when it comes to this issue. I can say, on behalf of Senator MURRAY on our side of the aisle and Senator BLUNT on the other side of the aisle, that he and I have created a little team, a little cabal, that watches the authorization and appropriations bills.

This will be the fourth consecutive year that we have had 5 percent real growth at the National Institutes of Health. As Dr. Collins—one of the great living Americans—has told us, this is going to reap dividends, as the Senator described earlier in his speech, in terms of breakthroughs when it comes to dealing with suffering and disease and early death that we can do something about in our lifetimes.

I don't quarrel with the Senator's conclusion in his speech that we are talking about the direct appropriations bills here, the direct spending of the government, and we are keeping that at a slow rate of increase.

On the mandatory side of the programs where we see dramatic increase, part of it has to do with the cost of healthcare in America. That cost continues to go up. One of the drivers of the cost of healthcare, according to insurance companies and others, are the costs of prescription drugs. They are going up dramatically.

We had a hearing yesterday, and a young mother came to tell us the story of losing her son who, I think, was about 23 years of age. No, I know exactly; I remember now. He was 26 years of age. He no longer qualified to be on the family health insurance. He was diabetic, and he went to buy his insulin at the drugstore and was told it would cost him $1,300. He wasn't going to get paid for 4 days, so he put it off. During that period of time, he died from complications of diabetes.

The cost of insulin at $1,300 is incredible to me. This is a drug that has been available for decades, and that it would go up in cost so dramatically that he would be unable to afford it and lose his life is scandalous in this country.

I know the Senator senses this, as well, and believes, as I do, that we want pharmaceutical companies to be profitable, we want them to do research, and we want them to invest in new drugs. But we cannot step back and ignore when their pricing is out of control, and in many instances that is the case.

I have said before on the floor—I have asked the people who gathered here to follow our speeches: How many of you have never seen an ad on television for a drug? If you held up your hand, I know one thing for sure: You don't own a television because the average American sees nine drug ads a day—a day.

Why do pharmaceutical companies buy nine drug ads a day for every American to consume at $6 billion a year? So that, eventually, we will become so familiar with the names of their drugs that we will ask our doctors to prescribe them, and doctors do prescribe them when the patients ask. Sometimes the patient may not need that drug. The patient may be able to deal with a generic drug that is much cheaper, but the pharmaceutical companies want us to reach the point at which we know these drugs by name and ask for them, and the doctors prescribe them.

The most heavily prescribed drug in America today—here is a name you are familiar with: HUMIRA. Of course, if you turn on the television, you see HUMIRA, which was originally designed to deal with rheumatoid arthritis and is now being advertised as a cure for psoriasis. What they don't tell you is the information we put at the bottom of this display: HUMIRA costs $5,500 a month. Did you know that? You would never know it, listening to their ads because they don't disclose it.

I have an amendment here that is bipartisan, which Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY and I have offered, to say that on all the drug ads, they have to put the price of the drug. It is pretty simple, right? If you knew HUMIRA cost $5,500 a month, you might not even consider it for that little red patch of psoriasis on your elbow. If you knew that some of these drugs they are talking about, like XARELTO—it took about 10 times for me to figure out how to pronounce it and spell it, but they keep coming at you. It is a blood thinner, and it costs $500 or $600 a month. All of these disclosures made to consumers would give them more information to make a decision and perhaps think twice before they ask for a very expensive prescription drug.

So I have this bipartisan amendment pending on this bill, which would say to the Trump administration and the Department of Health and Human Services: Develop the rules for putting prices of these drugs on the ads. The Trump administration supports it. How about that? Republican Senator GRASSLEY, Democratic Senator DURBIN, and the Trump administration support it. It sounds like a pretty good deal, doesn't it? It sounds like just the kind of thing that would pass in the ordinary course of business in the Senate. But, unfortunately, it ran into a problem. The problem? Pharma. The pharmaceutical companies don't want to tell us how much these drugs cost, so they are trying to stop this amendment.

They are trying to stop this amendment. They have one Senator who has created many obstacles for me to bring this to the floor. We have had everybody on Earth calling him, and we are not getting anywhere. It seems that pharma is not ready for putting the cost of the drug on their ad.

It means that when it comes down to it, not only will the American Medical Association, which supports our amendment, the American Association of Retired People, which supports our amendment, and the 76 percent of Americans—despite all of the support—we are going to have a tough time passing it. Pharma is hard to beat. Pharma is hard to beat.

When we talk about the increasing cost of Medicare and the cost of healthcare across America, Blue Cross Blue Shield tells me it is the driver of the increase in healthcare costs, prescription drugs.

Blue Cross Blue Shield in Illinois told me they spend more money on prescription drugs each year than they spend on inpatient hospital care. Think about that—more money than inpatient hospital care.

If we are going to do something about it, we ought to do the basics. The basics would be disclosing to the American people how much these drugs cost. You haven't heard the last of it when it comes to this amendment.

If Pharma is successful in stopping us from offering this amendment, and even getting a vote on it, I will be back. I am going to continue to return because I think it is important that consumers across America get full disclosure of information on these drug ads.

Incidentally, you know how many countries in the world advertise drugs like the United States? Only one other country, New Zealand. New Zealand and the United States are the only two, and pharma spends $6 billion a year.

When it comes to dealing with increasing costs of Medicare, this is one of the things we can do. We also want to say Medicare can bargain, just as the Veterans' Administration does, to get a good deal on drug pricing. Right now, they can't, but if they could bring down the cost of drugs under Medicare, it would help us maintain the solvency of that critically important lifesaving program.

I see the Senator from Tennessee is on his feet.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, if I may, I thank the Senator for his remarks and his leadership on this amendment. I think it is important to be clear about this. Of course, the Senator has a right to object to the amendment, I suppose, but sooner or later this amendment, or something like it, is going to become law. I support the amendment. President Trump supports the amendment.

Senator DURBIN has worked with Republicans and Democrats, over the last 3 or 4 weeks, to think of different appropriate ways to require television advertising to state what the price of a drug is. There would be different ways to do it. I asked him to take a few weeks to help us talk that out. He did that. I think he has come to a conclusion that deserves support. I support the bill.

I am chairman of the authorizing committee, the Health Committee, in the Senate. This is going to happen one way or the other. I suggest we try to find a way to go ahead and do it now because if the President supports it and you have bipartisan support in the Health Committee and bipartisan support in the Labor and Health Appropriations Subcommittee, it is going to become law. It makes good sense.

The cost of healthcare is a major issue we need to address, and we can't do it all at once. Prescription drugs are a part of it. Prescription drugs are 10 percent of the cost of healthcare. They are 17 percent—we have had testimony before our committee—if you include the drugs that are administered in hospitals. There are other factors as well.

Complexity is a big factor. Administrative burden is a big factor. Electronic healthcare records and their inadequate operation and lack of inoperability are big factors. Overutilization is a big factor.

Through the Chair, I wish to say to the Senator of Illinois, we have had excellent witnesses through our committee from the Institute of Medicine—some of the most distinguished witnesses we could have in the country—who tell us that as much as 30 percent to 50 percent of all that the United States spends on healthcare is unnecessary, wasted.

We spend 17 or 18 percent of our entire gross domestic product on healthcare. We are the richest country in the world. We produce about 24 percent of all money in the world, and we spend 18 percent of that on healthcare, much more than similar countries do, and our own experts tell us much of it is unnecessary.

We can't deal with it all at once, but one way to deal with it is competition and transparency and letting patients know the cost of what they are buying, whether it is doctors' services or it is a prescription drug.

I believe Senator DURBIN and Senator GRASSLEY are correct. The President believes they are correct. The Secretary of Health and Human Services supports their bill, and we should pass

it. Consumers should know, when they see a television ad about a prescription drug, what the cost of that drug is.

My hope for the Senator from Illinois is that he is ultimately successful with his proposal, and if he is not, I hope he counts me as an ally in an effort to continue to see that it gets done.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, let me thank my colleague from Tennessee. I value his friendship and professional support on this idea. This is basic that Americans know what the cost of the prescription drugs will be. Do you know when you discover it? When you go to the cash register, that is when you discover it.

Shouldn't we know in advance? Shouldn't we know so that if Humira, which is now at $5,500 per month, goes up to $6,000—and I understand it just did—we are aware of that fact? If we can't use transparency in competition, what are the alternatives—a government mandate? There are alternatives to that, which I think we have come up with.

Let's let the American consumer know what they are facing when it comes to these drugs, and let's use this Congress, as we are elected to use it, to reflect the will of the people, who are fed up with the spiraling cost of prescription drugs.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for joining me on the floor.

I yield.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CALLING FOR THE RELEASE OF PASTOR ANDREW BRUNSON

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I have come to the floor every week for the past several months to draw attention to a matter that I think should be important to anybody who travels overseas, anybody who does missionary work, anybody who can go to a country and potentially get detained for false charges and imprisoned for nearly 2 years. I am talking about a Presbyterian minister from North Carolina who has been in Turkey for the better part of 20 years. He was a missionary that entire time. He created a church in Izmir and has lived there peacefully and lawfully for two decades.

In October of 2016, after the coup attempt—an illegal coup attempt, and the people responsible for it should actually have to answer to the Turkish justice system—they swept Pastor Brunson and thousands of other people into the Turkish justice system, and he has been in prison since 2016.

He was in prison for nearly 19 months before he was ever charged with anything. In fact, he lost 50 pounds over the course of about a year. He was in a cell that was designed for 8 people but had 21 people in it. I don't believe any of the others even spoke English. He was then transferred to another prison where he was kept in a cell with one other person, given virtually no access to the outside world.

He has experienced medical challenges, as anyone would expect when you are in prison without charges, and we found out the charges were bogus. That would weigh on you mentally.

We started working to try to first let Pastor Brunson know we knew about him and that I, as a Senator from North Carolina, cared about him. I cared enough to go to Turkey to visit him in prison several months ago. I told him I wanted to assure him face-to-face that as long as he is in prison, I will be working for his release. As a matter of fact, we have more than 70 Senators who have signed on to a letter who share my concern that he is illegally in prison.

What have we done? We actually put a provision in the National Defense Authorization Act that holds Turkey accountable. They are a partner in developing the Joint Strike Fighter. It is a capability I sincerely hope someday Turkey may have. There is no way on Earth we should transfer that technology to Turkey as long as they are illegally imprisoning Pastor Brunson and others whom I will talk about shortly.

We did make some positive progress a few weeks ago. After he had been in prison for nearly 20 months, a little over, he was released on house arrest. At least he is now in his apartment near Izmir. He has an ankle bracelet on and is not allowed to go out of his house.

He has had several hearings. I actually attended one earlier in the spring. I was in that courtroom for almost 12 hours. I heard some of the most absurd claims you could ever allege as a basis for keeping somebody in prison overnight, let alone 2 years in October.

We are working with the administration, and I want to give the President a lot of credit for making this a priority. If you have read the newspapers recently, it would be hard for you not to hear about the Presbyterian minister, Pastor Brunson, and the difference of opinion between Turkey and the United States on what should be done.

When I talk to a lot of the Turkish officials, they say you have to respect our justice system; this has to play out, no matter how absurd the claims may be. Those are my words, not theirs. I wonder if they are sincere. Here is why. Several months ago, President Erdogan, the President of Turkey, made a public statement saying: How about this? We will give you your pastor if you give us our pastor?

There is a person living in the United States named Gulen, who they believe may have had something to do with the coup. We have an extradition treaty with Turkey.

We said: Honor the requirements of the extradition treaty, present credible evidence that Gulen is guilty of having conspired, and then we will let our process take its course.

Let me tell you what is interesting about making that offer in the context of the other elected officials, including Erdogan, saying: We have to let our legal process play out.

On the one hand, how can you say your hands are tied but on the other hand make a hostage swap request—or what they would consider to be a hostage swap request.

Maybe he just misspoke. Presidents do that from time to time.

Let's take a look at what we are dealing with now. A week ago, instead of offering Pastor Brunson for Mr. Gulen, now there is a new exchange on the table: If we drop a case against a Turkish bank, which has risen to our level of jurisprudence, the allegations against them are going to have to go through the legal process. Apparently, their judicial system does allow you to say: Well, if you drop that case in the gold standard for judicial systems—that is the U.S. judicial system—then, we will release Pastor Brunson.

Clearly, Turkey has the authority to release Pastor Brunson. Turkey has the authority to release a NASA scientist who happened to be visiting his family, who has been in prison for almost 3 years now, and has a 7-year sentence or another 4½ years ahead of him. They had the authority to release him. The only thing he seems to be guilty of is having been in Turkey visiting relatives when the coup attempt occurred.

They have the authority to release a DEA agent who they said was involved in the coup attempt. They have the authority to release a number of Turkish nationals who have worked with our Embassy for years. All they were doing was their job, and they were swept up, as thousands more have been.

Thank you again for the opportunity for me to come to the floor and make sure the American people understand what is at stake.

Turkey is a NATO ally. No NATO ally in the history of the alliance has ever illegally detained a citizen from one of their partner countries, but that is exactly what has happened here since October of 2016.

So I hope this is the last time I have to come to this floor to talk about releasing Pastor Brunson. I hope next week I am coming to the floor thanking the Turkish leadership for doing the right thing, thanking them for letting Pastor Brunson and his wife Norine come back to the United States, and advocating for a great relationship with Turkey as a NATO partner, which is very important. But none of that can happen as long as Pastor Brunson and the others that I have mentioned are illegally in prison.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HEALTHCARE

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, what the Trump administration is doing to sabotage healthcare in our country is a monumental scandal in slow motion. What the President promised was better care for all Americans at lower cost. What he and his officials have delivered is special deals for special interests and rewards for rip-offs.

It is almost as if you took the clock above the Chamber and turned it back. What Americans want—and I heard it at townhall meetings last weekend at home in Oregon—is to move forward on healthcare. They want, for example, to have strong measures, not empty rhetoric, to hold down the cost of their medicines—lifting the restrictions so that Medicare can bargain and hold down the cost of medicine and use the smart principles of negotiating power that the private sector uses all the time. They want to move forward on healthcare, not backward.

There is no clearer example of the administration's trying to take the country back on healthcare than its efforts to give a green light to junk health insurance. Junk health insurance represents all of the unsavory insurance industry tricks and abuses that the Affordable Care Act sought to eliminate. Junk plans exist, literally and figuratively, so that companies can prey on the vulnerable and the people with preexisting conditions, such as if you have asthma or diabetes, or prey on women, prey on older people, or prey on the less fortunate. They certainly don't exist to cover the healthcare that Americans actually need because that is where they always fall short.

The centerpiece of the Affordable Care Act was an ironclad, loophole-free guarantee that no American would ever face discrimination over a preexisting condition.

I note that my friend, the President of the Senate, has joined the Chamber. He knows this pretty well because he worked with me on our bipartisan effort to ensure that there would be loophole-free, airtight protection for Americans from discrimination against those with a preexisting conditions. For all practical purposes, we got what we worked on in a bipartisan way, when we had eight Democrats and eight Republicans. We got that into the Affordable Care Act. Essentially, now what the Trump administration seeks to do is to undo that guarantee of airtight, loophole-free protection for people who have these preexisting conditions.

I am going to read a question that appears on an application for one of these plans that are being marketed now. Under a bold headline that says ''Important: You must answer the questions below as they apply to You and all other family members applying for coverage,'' the question reads: ''Within the past 5 years, have you or any other person to be insured been aware of, diagnosed, treated by a member of the medical profession or taken [medication] for: cancer or a tumor, stroke, heart disorder, heart attack, coronary bypass or stent, peripheral vascular disease, carotid artery disease, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease or emphysema, kidney disorder or disease, neurological disorder, degenerative disc disease or herniation/bulge, rheumatoid arthritis, degenerative joint disease of the knee or hip, diabetes, Crohn's disease or ulcerative colitis, bipolar disorder or schizophrenia, any eating disorder [or] alcohol abuse or chemical dependency, or does anyone listed on the application currently weigh over 250 pounds (women) or over 300 pounds (men)?''

Another question on the same application asks, ''Have you or any other person to be insured been hospitalized for a mental health condition in the past 5 years or been treated by a member of the medical profession for a mental health condition in the past 12 months?''

Finally, another question asks, ''Have you or any other person to be insured ever been diagnosed or treated for Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS), AIDS-related complex, or any other immune system disorder such as HIV?''

I would also note that this part of the application contained a number of typos, a mislabeled number, and a mislabeled word. Apparently, the scam artists are as bad at editing their documents as they are at covering the healthcare people actually need. But setting aside the bad grammar, the questions collectively tick through dozens of health categories that include hundreds of various conditions and illnesses, so we are talking about well more than 100 million Americans who would answer yes to at least one of them.

Americans need to know and they ought to know that the only reason junk insurance companies ask these probing questions about your health background is to use the information against you and keep you from getting meaningful coverage. That forms the basis of the Trump-era discrimination against those with a preexisting condition.

A lot of people have preexisting conditions. What is that? Everybody knows folks in Tennessee or in Oregon who have asthma or diabetes. We are talking about millions of Americans.

When my colleague from Tennessee and I were working together—eight Democrats, eight Republicans—I said: You know, it is really going to be monumental if we get airtight, loophole-free protection for those with pre-existing conditions. The reason I said that is that ever since I was director of the senior citizens at home, the Gray Panthers, it has been clear to me that as long as our country allowed discrimination against those with preexisting conditions, healthcare in America would basically be for the healthy and the wealthy. If you are healthy, no sweat, no preexisting conditions, and if you are wealthy, you have no real problems because you can just write out the checks to pay for your treatment. But now we are talking about going back to those days—not the days when the Senator from Tennessee and I and other Democrats and Republicans got together and did something that really was a monumental step forward, protecting millions of people with preexisting conditions—now we are going backward.

What are those Americans going to hear in their time of need when their cancer comes back or when they face another bout of medical illness? What they are going to hear, with policies like the one I just read from, is the fraudsters who conned them into buying the junk insurance basically saying: You are on your own. And those Americans are going to be buried under mountains of medical debt.

By the way, we are talking about medical debt. I think my friend from Tennessee and I have talked about this over the years. Healthcare is the great equalizer. For example, in a discussion Democrats ran yesterday on healthcare, we had a gentleman who did everything right. He worked hard. He was a professional. He was constantly trying to better himself and contribute—not just supporting his family but the community. He got Parkinson's. All of a sudden, he wasn't able to pay his bills. So healthcare is the great equalizer in America.

When I read about the junk plans, I have to tell you, it takes me back to the old days when these scam artists preyed on the seniors who needed insurance coverage above and beyond what they got from traditional Medicare.

Mr. President and colleagues, this is something that is very personal to me. When I was a young man, I was co-director of the Oregon Gray Panthers. I would go and visit seniors in their homes—very often they would have a small apartment or something—and they would go in the back, and they would pull out a shoebox full of Medigap policies. These were policies that insurance salesmen sold them that the salesmen said would fill in the gaps in Medicare. Frequently, a senior would spend thousands of dollars—this was a number of years ago—on these policies that were worth little more than the paper they were written on. They often contained—we saw this at our legal aid program for seniors—what were called subrogation clauses, which essentially meant that if you had another policy that covered it, the first one didn't have to cover it. The two of them canceled each other out. So vulnerable seniors with serious medical

conditions would get conned into buying these plans that were essentially worthless.

After years of effort—we began in Oregon in the State insurance commission office. I had the honor of getting elected to represent Oregon in the U.S. House of Representatives. We began there and continued it in the Senate. We acted in a bipartisan fashion to eliminate the junk plans. We did that literally decades ago. We drained the swamp, to use the lingo of today. We really drained the swamp as it related to these rip-off Medigap policies. We got it down to a handful.

I would be willing to bet that the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Ohio, and my other colleagues on the floor don't have folks at home coming up to them any longer and telling them that they have rip-off Medigap insurance. I haven't had a complaint about that for years and years. Now the Trump administration is trying to bring back junk insurance for an even larger portion of the American people—more people than just the seniors.

The bad news with these junk policies doesn't begin and end with discrimination and debt. The Trump administration is letting the junk insurance companies steal the money Americans pay in premiums and other expenses.

According to one recent study, half of each premium dollar and sometimes as much as two-thirds gets wasted on overhead, administrative costs, and profits. The Affordable Care Act had a rule that banned that kind of waste. The Trump administration threw it out so that the rip-off artists can once again pocket unsuspecting Americans' premium dollars.

What the Trump administration is doing to undermine healthcare is not only playing out in what is called the individual insurance market; the harmful threat is a threat to the 167 million Americans who get their insurance through their jobs as well.

Worse healthcare at a higher cost—a far cry from what people were promised a few years ago—is clearly a growing problem. Worse healthcare. Higher costs. A forced march back to the days when healthcare in America, as I have said—and it has really been my reference point as much as anything—I said: Let's not turn back the clock to the days when healthcare was for the healthy and wealthy. This junk insurance is unquestionably the kickoff of this administration's formal effort to do just that.

There was an effort in the Affordable Care Act to build a functional market that didn't trample all over typical Americans and their families. The President and his allies in Congress have done everything they can—starting with an Executive order on day one—to empower the scam artists and powerful companies to have the ability to make healthcare worse and rip off our people. That has been the story from day one of this administration. As I said a few minutes ago, it is a monumental scandal in slow motion.

On behalf of those Americans who are hurting, who are not being taken care of, many of us are going to do everything we can to make sure—for those who are getting hurt, who can't afford these kinds of practices, we are going to keep this front and center of the American people until we end this consumer scourge.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORKER). The Senator from Ohio.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, today I want to talk about a huge responsibility we have here in the Senate and a great opportunity that lies before us. The Senate is asked to confirm nominees both for executive branch appointments and for judicial branch appointments. We have heard a lot of great debate here on the Senate floor over the past 1½ years on some of these nominees. We were able to confirm Justice Neil Gorsuch to the Supreme Court, who I believe is doing a superb job. That was quite a debate here. In the meantime, we have been able to confirm a number of circuit court judges, some district court judges, and executive branch appointments.

That is all important, but once again, we are asked to do something that is perhaps our most important task, and that is to fill yet another opening on the U.S. Supreme Court. There are only nine of these Justices, and this is a lifetime appointment. What the district court and circuit court do—it all comes up to this one Court. Our Founders created this Court in order to have a place where people could get a fair hearing and where we could have a dispassionate look at whether what we pass here fits within the Constitution and whether laws are being properly interpreted. These are hard and tough issues, and we want the right people there to do it. Once again, because of an opening that has occurred on the Supreme Court, we have the opportunity and responsibility to step up as a body and do that.

In this case, we are asked to fill the seat of Justice Kennedy, who is viewed by many as being an important player in the Court because he was often the swing vote. He is a thoughtful guy. I think we are very fortunate in that one of Justice Kennedy's law clerks has been nominated by the President and has agreed to step forward for this confirmation process to be an Associate Justice on the Supreme Court and to fill that ninth spot. My hope is that this can be done in a way where we have honest and spirited but fact-driven debate on the floor of the Senate.

I have to tell you that I am probably a little biased in this case because I know this nominee personally. I think a lot of him, not just as a judge, where he has an amazing record on the second highest court in the land, but also as a person.

This is the third time I have come to the Senate floor to talk about him because I feel so strongly and I want to be sure that he gets a fair shake. I think that as the American people get to know him better, he will see a lot of support around the country for his confirmation because people will see that he is the kind of person they would want to have representing them, their family, and their children on the Supreme Court.

I worked with him in the George W. Bush White House. He had a job there, which we will talk about in a second, called Staff Secretary, which is a job where you are responsible for being the traffic cop, basically, for the Oval Office. The documents that go into the Oval Office and go out of the Oval Office go through that office. It is not a substantive job in that sense, but it is an important job to the President to have somebody he trusts to decide what he looks at, what he doesn't look at, and how this material is then distributed out.

He is someone who became close to President George W. Bush. President George W. Bush, as he has said many times publicly and to me and others privately, thinks the world of him. He got to know him very well.

So I know Brett Kavanaugh more as a person, as a friend, as a father, and as a husband, but his legal background is incredibly impressive. I don't think anybody is better qualified to serve on the Supreme Court based on his legal background and his judicial philosophy. I know some of my colleagues have now met with him, as well.

I am told that as of yesterday, 49 of the 51 Republicans who are here in the Senate have now met with Judge Kavanaugh. I am glad to hear that. By the way, the reactions have been very positive. I talked to most of my colleagues about their meetings with him, and a number of them have gone out of their way to speak publicly about how impressed they were with him, his demeanor, his background, and his character.

I am also pleased to hear that several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have now met with Judge Kavanaugh, as well. I think that is really important. I know that this is a partisan town these days, and it is tough to get things done, but in this case, I would hope that more of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree to sit down with him and talk to him. I think he needs to have the ability to talk one-on-one to some people who perhaps don't know him well, based on some of the comments I have seen about him. I think he could put some of their concerns to rest.

For some, that may not be possible. They may have philosophical differences with his approach to the law. I get that, but I hope they will take the opportunity to sit down with him and talk to him. The Supreme Court is going to be faced with a lot of tough issues, and this needs to be a serious consideration. I am pleased that we are taking it seriously.

Some have said that this is going too fast. I will tell you that the amount of time between when he was nominated and when his hearing will be—which is scheduled now for the week of September 4—is more time than elapsed during the previous few Supreme Court nominations—Justice Kagan, Justice Sotomayor, and Neil Gorsuch, about whom I talked a minute ago. There has been adequate time here relative to other confirmations.

Second, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are saying they want more documents to review his nomination. I would just make this point: More documents have been produced with regard to Judge Kavanaugh than any other Supreme Court nomination in history. That is what I am told by the Judiciary Committee. Some Democrats have suggested they need to review the literally millions of documents that passed through his office and passed through his desk when he held the job we talked about earlier as Staff Secretary for President George W. Bush.

Again, this is a job that is sort of like the traffic cop. It is not to be substantively giving the President the documents from an agency, department, or other White House policy office, but rather to provide the documents to the President in a timely way to be sure the President is seeing the right documents and to be sure there is coordination. It is the flow of the documents.

So I think seeing all those documents are not relevant, frankly, to the confirmation process because they don't relate to him. What they do relate to, obviously, are a lot of things that have to do with President George W. Bush, which I am sure were very personal documents where the President would write in the margin and so on. That would be interesting for people to look at. People could probably write a book about those things. That is not the purpose here. And that is why I think it is a fishing expedition to say: Let's see millions of documents that passed through this guy's desk, particularly in the context of a confirmation where more documents are being provided than any previous confirmation.

I was told by the Judiciary Committee this morning that 430,000 pages of documents are being produced. I don't know how many of my colleagues are going to read through 430,000 pages of documents, but they are free to do so. By the way, this compares to 170,000 pages of documents that were produced with regard to former Solicitor General Elena Kagan's confirmation. Think about that: 430,000 versus 170,000.

Elena Kagan also served as a senior aide in the White House. She worked for President Clinton. She had a senior position there—a substantive position, actually—in domestic policy. She also, of course, was the Solicitor General of the United States—yet 430,000 versus 170,000. I just hope people keep that in mind when they hear about the documents.

What is really relevant to me is what he has done as a judge. He has spent 12 years on the DC Circuit Court, which is viewed by most as being the second highest court in the land. He has a lot of documents that are related to that. He has authored more than 300 published opinions. Clearly, these opinions are relevant. By the way, more than a dozen of his opinions on the Circuit Court have been endorsed by the Supreme Court, which is an unusually high number and a testament to his outstanding judicial record.

In addition to the more than 10,000 pages of published opinions he authored or joined, out of the 430,000 pages of documents I mentioned, the Judiciary Committee tells me they have released more than 176,000 pages of appropriate documents from Judge Kavanaugh's time in the executive branch. So there are plenty of documents to look at. I encourage my colleagues to do so.

As I said earlier, based on the traditions that we have here and on the amount of time spent between nomination and confirmation and based on the number of documents that have been produced, I think it has been an appropriate and transparent process. I am glad Chairman GRASSLEY has made it so.

My hope is that from his time on the bench and his time in the executive branch, both of these documents will be reviewed—the appropriate ones.

Brett Kavanaugh is very well respected as a judge. He is the thought leader among his peers. I am sure you have heard a lot about that. There have been op-eds written about him from Democrats and Republicans alike saying: I know the guy. I clerked with the guy. I worked with the guy. I was one of his students. He is smart. He is thoughtful.

He has said very clearly that he will be guided by the Constitution and the rule of law. He understands that the proper role of the Court is not to legislate from the bench. He has respect for precedent. He actually wrote the book, meaning he is one of the coeditors of this book looking at legal precedent and what they call stare decisis. He is someone who is very much in the mainstream of legal thought and very well regarded.

His former colleagues, his current colleagues, his former students, and legal experts on both sides of the aisle have come out to say this about him. I think he has exactly the right qualifications, extensive experience, and a judicial philosophy that most Americans agree with and would want in a judge.

Again, as important as that is to me, he is also a good person. He is compassionate. He is humble. He is someone who has a big heart. Maybe, most importantly, he has the humility to be able to listen, to hear people out. As I said earlier, there is no more important a quality in a Supreme Court Justice given the incredibly important issues they have before them.

So, as his confirmation process continues, I hope my colleagues and the American people will get to know the Brett Kavanaugh that I know. I hope he is soon able to continue his lifetime of distinguished service as a member of the highest Court in the land. I am proud to strongly support his nomination for this important position.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, when Justice Kagan was up for nomination, I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. I, along with then Ranking Member Jeff Sessions, sent a letter saying that we needed all of her White House records. We received 99 percent of those records.

Now for Judge Kavanaugh's nomination we are told, after being carefully selected, that we can only have 3 percent of his records. It is an interesting standard. Republicans want all of it when there is a Democratic President, for a woman who was nominated by a Democrat. Now, when the Republicans nominate this man, they say: We will selectively give you 3 percent. It is an interesting double standard. It makes me wonder what there is to hide in there. Why not take the time to see it all?

If I am going to vote on a lifetime appointment—I voted for a lot of Republican nominees for the Supreme Court and other courts—I want to see the whole record. I don't want, a month after I voted, more to come out in the record and to think: Whoops, who knew about that? We had this happen with one judge already after they were confirmed to a lifetime appointment. The final records came out, and we found out what they did with issues of torture and other things. It was bad.

AMENDMENT NO. 3993 TO AMENDMENT NO. 3699

Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask unanimous consent that it be reported by number.

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

The clerk will report the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] proposes an amendment numbered 3993 to amendment No. 3699.

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following: ''$8,503,001.''

The amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

''$8,503,001''

MANAFORT AND COHEN TRIALS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, earlier I talked about what has happened on the Manafort and Cohen matters yesterday. I understand the great amount of consternation there is at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. Having been a prosecutor, I can understand why there is consternation.

I note for my colleagues that we passed in the Senate Judiciary Committee a bipartisan bill—Republican and Democrats voted for the bill—to protect the special prosecutor. There

are those of us who are old enough to remember when Richard Nixon fired the special prosecutor in the Watergate matter and the great constitutional problems that followed. It was something the country suffered over for years, and we want to make sure we don't have another firing like we did in the Watergate matter. So we wrote this bill. Again, Republicans and Democrats voted for it. It could be brought up anytime by the leadership, if they wished. I am hoping that it will be brought up. I am hoping we can bring it to the floor and we can have a vote. I know we had a good debate—again, Republicans and Democrats—in the Judiciary Committee, and I would like to see it voted on.

I notice we are at the hour of 3:30, and I know the Presiding Officer has a ruling to make, so I will withhold.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 4:30 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:30 p.m., recessed until 4:33 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. GARDNER).

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

HONORING JOURNALISTS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the work that reporters do as members of a free and independent press is vital to our country and to our communities.

It is why, last week, in an unprecedented action, nearly 300 newspapers all over the country—a dozen or so in my State—came together to stand up for the free press and defend the First Amendment. There were 300 newspapers that wrote editorials—all independently written, of course, with all different takes on this—to advocate for a free press and to defend the First Amendment.

The Chagrin Valley Times, which is not far from where I live in Northeast Ohio, wrote:

> We are indeed your lens into your community. We are not your enemy.

Clearly, this was a takeoff on the President's comments that the media are the enemies of the people.

The Athens NEWS, from Southeast Ohio, wrote: ''Good reporting often succeeds in righting wrongs and making things better for people.''

The Akron Beacon Journal, one of the great newspapers in this State, wrote:

> Power . . . belongs to the people. The press thus received extraordinary protection because of its capacity to inform readers and check the powerful.

It is shameful that journalists have to defend their First Amendment rights, our First Amendment rights, our Nation's First Amendment rights just so they can do their jobs. As these community papers show us, nothing could be further from the truth. That is why I want to highlight yet another story by an Ohio paper, informing the public, that has been reported by a journalist who serves her community.

CityBeat Cincinnati describes itself as having been ''a voice in Greater Cincinnati for nearly a quarter of a century now, publishing a print edition weekly, and producing regular content throughout the week online to try to help keep you informed of what is happening in your city.''

A great example of that content was in a story last week that was reported by Maija Zummo on the Black Family Reunion that took place in Cincinnati and its celebrating its 30th year. The event was founded in 1989 by the iconic Dr. Dorothy Height, who served as President of the National Council of Negro Women for more than 50 years.

As Ms. Zummo reported, the festival brings together community groups, performers, and small businesses to ''celebrate the values and strengths of the black family.'' Ms. Zummo's reporting informed Cincinnati readers about the events they could attend that weekend, including a parade, festival, church service, and other community activities.

That kind of reporting is what journalists do every day, every week, every month across Ohio and around the country. They serve their readers, their viewers, and their communities. They deserve our respect. They don't deserve a President who calls reporters, journalists, and all kinds of people in this business the enemies of the people. Again, reporters serve their viewers, their readers, and their communities. They serve all of us. They deserve our respect.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING MOLLIE TIBBETTS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak about a recent tragedy that has deeply impacted my home State of Iowa and I think all of the country because cable television is well aware of this.

Yesterday, authorities announced they found the remains of a 24-year-old University of Iowa sophomore, Mollie Tibbets, of Brooklyn, IA. After searching tirelessly for months, State and local law enforcements announced the unthinkable, Mollie was murdered in cold blood.

I would like to commend the efforts of all who were involved in searching for this remarkable young woman, including the Iowa Division of Criminal Investigation, the FBI, Homeland Security, and the individual members of the community who volunteered tirelessly to find Mollie.

Americans watched the news every night, all of us, holding out hope that Mollie would soon be found and returned to her family. I extend my sincerest condolences and sympathies to Rob Tibbetts, Mollie's father, and Laura Calderwood, Mollie's mother. They spent the last month and a half searching the State for their missing daughter. Rob and Laura traveled across the State, raised awareness on TV, and handed out buttons, T-shirts, and missing person fliers at the Iowa State Fair. Both Rob and Laura showed remarkable bravery in the face of tragedy.

Know that our thoughts and prayers are with you and your family during this difficult time.

For those of us in Washington, we ought to try to learn something from Mollie's character and the example she set. As Mollie's boyfriend Dalton Jack said, ''She's not just a missing person flyer.'' Mollie was an avid reader who enjoyed the choir, theater, and writing.

Mollie loved her friends and had a natural ability working with children. Her friends say she had a gift for making everyone feel like the most important person in the room. There is no doubt her nurturing character and her ability to be everyone's counselor—as a friend put it—led her to the University of Iowa to study psychology. While there, Mollie spent her summers taking classes and working at a day camp with the Grinnell Regional Medical Center, where she mentored children. It is no surprise that when Mollie went missing, over 200 people showed up for a vigil in her honor.

While we mourn the loss of Mollie Tibbetts, it is the duty of this Senator and every other Senator to act to prevent further tragedies such as this one from devastating a family and an entire community.

We now know that Mollie was murdered by a 24-year-old, undocumented immigrant who has been in the United States illegally for 4 to 7 years. That is right. For 4 to 7 years, this man was here undetected and unaccounted for. This raises questions about his immigration, employment, and criminal history, and we must receive answers.

So, today, I sent a letter to the Department of Homeland Security seeking any immigration history on this man and a briefing to better understand how he was able to get to and stay in Iowa. This isn't too different from what I have done in many cases with some undocumented person, particularly those who had been deported and returned, asking for answers when there was a tragedy such as what happened to Mollie. I think of recent cases, maybe within the last 2 years, of murders in Northern Virginia and in Maryland. The Tibbetts family, the people of Iowa as well, and I hope all of the American public feel they deserve answers.

Based on the information I do have, it seems this murder was preventable. Stricter border security measures, including increased personnel, enhanced technology, and modernized infrastructure could have prevented this man from crossing the border—in other words, secure the border.

Stronger interior enforcement and addressing weaknesses in E-Verify could have prevented this individual from working and would have allowed immigration enforcement authority to initiate removal proceedings years ago.

Earlier this week, President Trump invited officers and agents of Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement to the White House to thank them and the people under them for all they do on a daily basis to protect Americans. Recent events are a stark reminder as to how much we need these hard-working men and women.

Amidst cries from the radical far left to abolish law enforcement agencies, such as ICE, I am proud to stand in support of the brave men and women of that agency. Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement are tasked with protecting the homeland, a duty they willingly accepted on behalf of all Americans and, of course, the No. 1 responsibility, the Federal Government.

Every day, men and women of the Border Patrol and ICE, or Immigration and Customs Enforcement, put themselves in harm's way because Congress tasked them with this great responsibility.

So to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who call for abolishing immigration enforcement, I urge caution. We have heard a lot of that lately about abolishing immigration enforcement.

Scapegoating our uniformed officers, who are simply executing the law, to launch future Presidential campaigns only moves us further away from one another and further away from a lasting solution.

To put their efforts into perspective, let's take a look at some data. During fiscal year 2017, ICE arrested more than 127,000 aliens with criminal convictions or charges. ICE made 5,225 administrative arrests of suspected gang members. Last year, the criminal aliens arrested by ICE were responsible for more than 76,000 dangerous drug offenses, 48,000 assault offenses, 11,000 weapon offenses, 5,000 sexual offenses, 2,000 kidnapping offenses, and 1,800 homicide offenses. Those statistics are just for ICE Enforcement and Removal Operations.

Last year, ICE Homeland Security Investigations made over 4,800 gang-related arrests. ICE also targets illicit drug flows, human trafficking operations, and transnational criminal and terrorist organizations.

ICE is part of our broader national security apparatus and often works hand in hand with their partners at the Department of Justice, including the Drug Enforcement Administration, FBI, and hundreds of Federal prosecutors.

In 2017, ICE identified or rescued 904 sexually exploited children and 518 victims of human trafficking. ICE seized more than 980,000 pounds of narcotics just last year, including 2,370 pounds of fentanyl and almost 7,000 pounds of heroin.

To my colleagues who have spoken strongly about combating the moral stain of human trafficking or about ending the opioid epidemic gripping our country, I ask: How is ICE anything but an indispensable partner in this fight? How can we expect to combat the flow of lethal narcotics without the brave men and women of the Border Patrol and ICE?

Just last week, I sent a letter to Secretaries Nielsen and Pompeo about an Iraqi national who lied about his active membership in ISIS and al-Qaida in Iraq so he could claim refugee status and settle safely in Sacramento, CA. ICE played a very vital role in his arrest.

This weekend, ICE deported a Nazi prison guard who was living in Queens, NY, and yesterday ICE was immediately there on the scene in Brooklyn, IA, when State and local authorities determined the suspect was a foreign national.

Congress has been dancing around the issue of securing our borders and strengthening interior enforcement for far too long. We have told voters we will fix the problem, but we don't seem to get the bills passed. Stories like those of Kate Steinle, Sarah Root, Kayla Cuevas, and now Mollie Tibbetts continue to appear in the news, and we ought to come to the conclusion that enough is enough.

SARAH'S LAW

Mr. President, I urge the Senate to put partisanship aside and support Sarah's Law. That is a bill that some of us from the Midwest have introduced, but we also would like to see justice for Kate Steinle's murder because people who have been deported, coming back to the United States to do this killing—just for coming back and violating our law over and over and over by crossing into the country without papers, they should have mandatory sentences.

Sarah's Law is a bill I introduced with Senator ERNST in honor of a fellow Iowan, Sarah Root, who was killed by an undocumented immigrant driving drunk and was three times over the legal limit.

Sarah's Law is a commonsense bill that requires the Federal Government to take custody of anyone who entered the country illegally, violated the terms of their immigration status, and had their visas revoked and is thereafter charged with killing or seriously harming another person. It also requires ICE to make reasonable efforts to identify and provide relevant information to crime victims and their families.

I end thinking about Mollie's death, but you can continue to think about Sarah Root, Kate Steinle, and others. We haven't responded to it very well. We can and we must do better.

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. President, if I may, I want to continue to speak but on another subject.

Over the past day, several of my colleagues issued statements calling for Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation hearing to be delayed. A lot of these colleagues have written me very personal letters calling for Judge Kavanaugh's hearing to be delayed. Some of them have written me very personal letters about coverups or hiding or handling documents in ways they perceive to be different from what other committee chairmen have done. In regard to the delay of the hearing, they claim that it is because President Trump's former lawyer recently pleaded guilty to criminal violations of campaign finance law, allegedly at President Trump's direction.

I am not going to delay Judge Kavanaugh's nomination hearing. There is no precedent for delaying a hearing in these circumstances. In fact, it is just the opposite. There is clear precedent pointing in the other direction. I will give my colleagues at least one.

In 1994, President Clinton nominated Justice Breyer to the Supreme Court. At that time, President Clinton was under investigation by Independent Counsel Robert Fiske in connection with the Whitewater land deal. Indeed, President Clinton's own records were under grand jury subpoena. Yet the Senate confirmed Justice Breyer by a vote of 87 to 9 during all of that.

In fact, President Clinton was under investigation for much of his Presidency and was even impeached for committing perjury. Obviously, he wasn't convicted. But through all of this, the Senate didn't stop confirming his lifetime appointments to the bench. President Trump is not even close to being in the same legal situation as President Clinton, but obviously some people around here think he is.

So my colleagues' plea to delay the hearing rings very false considering the precedent I just gave, and maybe historians can give us more precedents.

So I want to tell my colleagues why liberal outside groups and Senate Democratic leaders decided to oppose the President's Supreme Court nominee by any means necessary. They even said so. Some even announced their opposition before Judge Kavanaugh was nominated. The minority leader said he would fight Judge Kavanaugh with everything he has.

Members of the Judiciary Committee announced their opposition before giving Judge Kavanaugh any consideration whatsoever. One Member said that voting for Judge Kavanaugh is ''complicit in evil.'' Another Member said that Judge Kavanaugh threatens ''destruction of the Constitution of the United States.''

The goal has always been the same: to delay the confirmation process as much as possible and hope that the Democrats take over the U.S. Senate in the midterm elections.

The Ranking Member's hometown newspaper reported on this strategy recently, and the headline called it an attempt to stall. The strategies may change, but the goal to obstruct the confirmation process remains unchanged. First, Democratic leaders tried to apply the Biden rule, which bars confirmations in Presidential elections and which many Democrats previously said doesn't even exist. They tried to apply it even to midterm elections. When they used it, it was applied just to Presidential elections.

Now, when this strategy failed, because it was completely and flatly false, they changed strategies. They tried pushing for an unprecedented disclosure of Judge Kavanaugh's executive branch documents, even though we have already received more pages of such documents than any previous Supreme Court nominee. This is on top of Judge Kavanaugh's 12-year judicial track record and other more relevant publicly available materials.

Now they are trying to latch on to the legal troubles of President Trump's former associates, but, as I just explained, there is no precedent or logical reason for the Senate to decline to proceed on Judge Kavanaugh's nomination in these circumstances. It is just another attempt to block Judge Kavanaugh's confirmation by any means necessary.

On a related note, we are working to make available as many of the documents relevant to Judge Kavanaugh's nomination to the Supreme Court when we receive them—to make them publicly available as soon as possible.

It is common practice—I hope everyone knows—to receive documents with a restriction called ''Committee Confidential'' until we can assure ourselves that we will not disclose sensitive, confidential information to the public in violation of the Presidential Records Act. Chairman LEAHY, who is here on the floor with me, did so during Justice Kagan's confirmation process, and I am doing the same. This gives Judiciary Committee members a jump start on reviewing documents because, otherwise, if you had to wait until they were all cleared, you wouldn't even be reading them yet.

The goal is to make as many publicly available as possible as soon as possible.

I have promised to work with President Bush and President Trump to waive committee confidentiality, when the law requires it, for specific documents that my colleagues would like to use at the confirmation hearings. This is also consistent with how the Judiciary Committee has handled this issue in the past. And, of course, all of my Senate colleagues are welcome to review committee-confidential documents at their convenience. Simply get in touch with my staff. The staff there will make sure that they have full access to the range of committee-confidential documents.

One of my colleagues tweeted, and I am not going to name this colleague because there is no point in embarrassing anybody to make a very strong point here about how ridiculous some of this argument has become. This is the tweet:

> Chairman Grassley unilaterally deemed Kavanaugh records Committee Confidential. Penalty for release could include 'expulsion' from the Senate, which hasn't happened since the Civil War, for disloyalty to the Union. GOP is going that far to keep them secret.

I hope all of my colleagues see the absurdity of that tweet.

Now, that person is kind of acting like the Senate has never received committee-confidential documents before. It is common practice, and it has happened in previous Supreme Court nominations, even under Democratic chairmen.

So to sum up, it is so regrettable that some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have politicized this process so much, but also, at the same time, they have short memories.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the Defense appropriations bill that we are now debating. I congratulate Senator SHELBY and Senator LEAHY, and other Senators for working together in a cooperative manner to fashion and advance this important legislation.

For my home State of Colorado, this legislation means critical funding for our men and women in uniform at installations such as Peterson, Buckley, and Schriever Air Force Bases, the Air Force Academy, and Fort Carson in Colorado Springs, and beyond.

This bill provides the first significant pay raise—the first significant pay raise—for soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines for close to 10 years, and it is well deserved and long overdue.

As the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on East Asia, the Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy, I want to highlight several provisions related to these areas. The bill provides $356 million in additional funding to expand and accelerate cyber research across the Department of Defense, including $117 million for Army cyber security research efforts and $116 million in Missile Defense Agency cyber security enhancements.

This legislation will support critical cyber security programs, including CyberWorx at the Air Force Academy, DIUx in Silicon Valley, and the Army Futures Command in Austin, TX.

The bill focuses on our ability to modernize not only what we might use in conflict but also to understand how conflict might be waged through technology.

Through a fully funded and equipped Cyber Command, we will be armed not only with new funded capability and technology but with new titles and authorities to be able to downgrade, disrupt, and destroy cyber attacks on our infrastructure and economy.

As our force evolves and changes, the Cyber Command will continue to be a vital stakeholder in our defense communities.

I am also pleased that the legislation supports the administration's concept of a ''free and open Indo-Pacific'' by fully funding our military activities in the Indo-Pacific region, including U.S. Pacific Command theater cooperation activities with partner nations.

I am also pleased that the bill specifically includes funds to support activity with the Pacific Island nations, including Palau. These nations are at risk of falling under more and more Chinese influence, and it is important for the United States to exert an active leadership role to keep these allies engaged.

Countering China's rise represents a grave challenge for U.S. national security, but it is a challenge that we must absolutely rise to meet. According to the ''National Security Strategy,'' released in December of just last year, ''for decades, U.S. policy was rooted in the belief that support for China's rise and for its integration into the postwar international order would liberalize China. Contrary to our hopes, China expanded its power at the expense of the sovereignty of others.''

According to the 2018 ''National Defense Strategy,'' ''it is increasingly clear that China and Russia want to shape a world consistent with their authoritarian model—gaining veto authority over other nations' economic, diplomatic, and security decisions.''

According to the annual ''Department of Defense Report on Chinese Military Power,'' released just last week, ''China's military modernization targets capabilities with the potential to degrade core U.S. operational and technological advantages. To support this modernization, China uses a variety of methods to acquire foreign military and dual-use technologies, including targeted foreign direct investment, cyber theft, and exploitation of private China nationals' access to these technologies.''

I am pleased that both the administration and Congress are now recognizing this reality and taking steps to rebuild our military to stand up to China.

I am leading a bipartisan effort in the Senate called the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act, or ARIA, which will set a generational policy toward the Indo-Pacific. I expect that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will mark up ARIA in September, and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this very important effort.

We know that China will continue to bully its neighbors and to test U.S. resolve, and we must respond accordingly.

On Monday, we heard the disturbing news that the nation of El Salvador,

under Chinese pressure, has decided to sever diplomatic ties with Taiwan in favor of Beijing. This is an outrageous and unwarranted move for El Salvador, which has enjoyed official relations with the Republic of China since 1933.

In response, I have introduced an amendment with Senator RUBIO to this legislation that will restrict U.S. funds to the government of El Salvador.

It is our sincere hope that this amendment will send a direct message to Taiwan's allies that the United States will use every tool to support Taiwan's standing on the international stage and will stand up to China's bullying tactics across the world.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 994.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services.

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 Lynn A. Johnson, of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for Family Support, Department of Health and Human Services.

Mitch McConnell, Richard C. Shelby, Cory Gardner, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, James M. Inhofe, Chuck Grassley, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Lisa Murkowski, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt, Bob Corker.

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. 910.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard Clarida, of Connecticut, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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 Richard Clarida, of Connecticut, to be Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of four years.

Mitch McConnell, Richard C. Shelby, Cory Gardner, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, James M. Inhofe, Chuck Grassley, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Lisa Murkowski, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt, Bob Corker.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislation 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. 911.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Richard Clarida, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2008.

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 Richard Clarida, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2008.

Mitch McConnell, Richard C. Shelby, Cory Gardner, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, James M. Inhofe, Chuck Grassley, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Lisa Murkowski, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt, Bob Corker.

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. 783.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph H. Hunt, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

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 Joseph H. Hunt, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Mitch McConnell, Richard C. Shelby, Cory Gardner, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, John Cornyn, Pat Roberts, Ron Johnson, James M. Inhofe, Chuck Grassley, Lamar Alexander, Richard Burr, Lisa Murkowski, Michael B. Enzi, Roy Blunt, Bob Corker.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we 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. 720.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Isabel Marie Keenan Patelunas, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of the Treasury.

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 Isabel Marie Keenan Patelunas, of Pennsylvania, to be Assistant Secretary for Intelligence and Analysis, Department of the Treasury.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Johnny Isakson, John Kennedy, John Thune, John Boozman, Tim Scott, Roy Blunt, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Cory Gardner, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

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. 633.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Terry Fitzgerald Moorer, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama.

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 Terry Fitzgerald Moorer, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Alabama.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 635.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. Stan Baker, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia.

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 R. Stan Baker, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Georgia.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 636.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles Barnes Goodwin, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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 Charles Barnes Goodwin, of Oklahoma, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Oklahoma.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 674.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Barry W. Ashe, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

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 Barry W. Ashe, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 676.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James R. Sweeney II, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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 James R. Sweeney II, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Indiana.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker.

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. 692.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Susan Paradise Baxter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

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 Susan Paradise Baxter, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 693.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Marilyn Jean Horan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

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 Marilyn Jean Horan, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 731.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William F. Jung, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

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 William F. Jung, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 779.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dominic W. Lanza, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

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 Dominic W. Lanza, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 782.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles J. Williams, of Iowa, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

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 Charles J. Williams, of Iowa, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Iowa.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent 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. 838.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert R. Summerhays, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

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 Robert R. Summerhays, of Louisiana, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

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. 893.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alan D. Albright, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The 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 Alan D. Albright, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, David Perdue, Chuck Grassley, Jeff Flake, Todd Young, Richard Burr, Tom Cotton, Tim Scott, Steve Daines, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, John Thune, John Kennedy, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

SECURE ELECTIONS ACT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, yesterday Facebook, Google, and Twitter removed hundreds of pages, groups, and accounts of Iranian and Russian individuals who had coordinated attacks to try to influence our election. Earlier this week, conservative think tanks, Republican groups, and Senate official sites were targeted by Russian hackers. Today, the Democratic National Committee just detected and announced what it believes was a sophisticated attack to try to hack into its database system—very similar to the attack Hillary Clinton's campaign had during the 2016 election time period. Today, we postponed in the Senate a committee debating election security.

Clearly, states such as Russia, Iran, North Korea, and others are trying to influence our elections. They demonstrated the capability, the willingness, and the intent to come after us to try to influence us. They are looking for vulnerabilities in States, not to necessarily pick one candidate over another but to sow chaos and use information against us.

These same nation states are also pursuing independent hackers—not necessarily working for their government at all but just individual hackers who are willing to be hired to do whatever these nation states want them to do or to hack in and get information and then sell that information to a nation state that might be interested in it.

Election security is not a partisan issue; it is a democracy issue. We should take the security of our next election seriously, just as we take the security of our infrastructure, our banking system, our power and electrical grid, and our water seriously. Those are areas that need to be secured. I am disappointed that there was yet another delay in working through that on election security. But I do appreciate the work of the Rules Committee and what they are doing to continue to refine this.

I do anticipate that in the days ahead, we will have a hearing on this issue, and it will move to this floor for final passage. The bill that is being debated is pretty straightforward.

It requires voter-verified paper audit trails. In order to receive any kind of Federal funding, they have to have some way to audit their elections.

It requires that all States that take Federal money to help them in their election systems also conduct post-election audits that are determined by the States. It is not a reason for the Federal Government to step in and tell the States how to do that; that is uniquely a role of the States.

It requires communication between the States and the Federal Government on election infrastructure breaches. There are ways to do that, to honor the States' authority to run their elections but still understand that we have vulnerability nationwide if any one State is vulnerable. I heard the arguments on the bill and on information sharing, but I would say that it is clear that an attack on any one State, on any one county, could jeopardize the integrity of our Nation's election security system.

I have heard that States may not need to conduct their own post-election audits. It has been kind of a ''trust us; things will work out fine.'' The challenge I have with that is that five States in the United States right now and as of this election coming up in November will not be able to even do a post-audit election on their systems. Nine additional States have some counties within their States that cannot do a post-election audit. So the problem with ''trust me'' is that there is no way to be able to verify on the back side. I get ''trust me'' but no verification.

The bill that is coming through, the Secure Elections Act that AMY KLOBUCHAR from Minnesota and I are working so hard to work through the system, allows the States to run their own election systems and allows for the flexibility that the States absolutely need in the vendors they choose to use and all the details they choose on that, but it requires the simple ability to audit their systems after it is over so that no nation state, no group of hackers can stand up and say ''We did it'' and there is no way to be able to prove them wrong. Audits are not recounts; audits just give voters confidence that the vote they cast was counted.

To be clear, we have advanced a tremendous amount since the 2016 time period. The Department of Homeland Security has done a lot to help protect our system. States have stepped up significantly to protect their systems, but there is more to go.

The DHS now has security clearances for election officials or has the capability to have an immediate security conversation with every single State in the United States. That is important because in 2016 that didn't occur, and the threat against the United States could not be communicated to the States sometimes for months, sometimes for over a year. That has been fixed.

There has been cyber assistance that has been offered to every single State, and many of those States have taken it. The DHS has been able to work with individual States and to check their systems to make sure they are secure, and it has been able to provide filters so as to filter out malicious hackers on top of their already consistent filters that are there. This is to provide a kind of belt-and-suspenders protection for their election systems.

The DHS has already given priority to any requests from any State that asks for election assistance. The DHS will literally take people off of other assignments in order to get those individuals to the election officials of any State that asks for it, and all requests from every State that has asked for additional assistance have been fulfilled.

Recently, the DHS also ran what it called the ''Tabletop the Vote 2018.'' It ran a national cyber exercise in order to practice how this would work, what would work, and what vulnerabilities there would be. The DHS received tremendous feedback from the States as it did the exercise. It participated with the States and found out where they could share information. The DHS has set up a tremendous resource for election day itself so as to watch out for malicious attacks during election day and the runup to the election and to make sure it has rapid communication.

None of that existed in 2016. That is real progress, but we have to get some of these legislative solutions in place as well. At the end of the day, States are going to control their elections, but I don't expect every State in the United States to protect itself against a foreign attack. It is the Federal Government's responsibility to step in and help protect our systems. We are trying to hit this balance with the Secure Elections Act, wherein the States would run their elections, the Federal Government would do its part, and the American people would do their part by stepping up to vote and have confidence in knowing their votes actually count.

Congress needs to pass this legislation. We need to move it across the committee line and across this floor because the election issues that we are facing right now are not going away and are not getting easier, and States could use our help. It is about time we stepped up and did it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his unwavering commitment to elevating the urgent need for all of us to take action on climate change.

Since 2012, Senator WHITEHOUSE has given over 200 speeches on climate change—faithfully, passionately, intellectually—and has warned us of what is to come if we don't get our act together. So I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE. I am proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with him in the fight to save this Earth. This is on all of us.

The facts are in. The science is irrefutable. Climate change is real. It is real, and it is happening every single day all around us. It is not made up. It is not a Chinese hoax. It is the most existential threat our world has ever known, and we are not doing enough to stop it. That is why I wanted to be here tonight to stand with my friend and my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE to ring the alarm. It is time for us to wake up.

As I think about the consequences of inaction, I can't help but reflect on the financial crisis that nearly destroyed our global economy 10 years ago. Millions of hard-working people lost their jobs, millions lost their homes, and millions lost their savings. The financial crisis nearly tore apart the global economy for a whole variety of reasons, but the failure to act on credible, verifiable data is what nearly destroyed our economy.

It didn't have to happen. We could have prevented it. Yet here we are again, ignoring clear and blatant warnings of another financial disaster in the making. The evidence is mounting every single day with fires blazing out of control, extreme storms and hurricanes, rising sea levels, and warming oceans. Our planet is in danger, which means our economy is in danger.

Recent data show that a major climate-related disaster could trigger a global financial crisis, the likes of which our economy has never seen. Now, I don't say that to predict some kind of doomsday disaster. This is a real and present threat to our global economy, and here is why: The driving cause of climate change is emissions of carbon dioxide, methane, and other greenhouse gases from humans in their burning of fossil fuels. We are causing this every day.

Scientists estimate that humans can only burn so much more carbon before causing a global temperature rise of 2 degrees. A 2-degree rise in temperatures would be devastating—rising sea levels, droughts, famine. Yet, as of today, the worldwide oil and gas industry has carbon reserves that already far exceed the amount of carbon we can burn to stay under the 2-degree temperature rise.

So what does that actually mean?

All of these carbon resources will become less and less valuable as the environmental costs of burning carbon become more and more severe. That will devastate the global coal, oil, and gas industries. One estimate is that 82 percent of all coal reserves, 49 percent of global gas reserves, and 33 percent of global oil reserves could go unused. Some experts predict that we will cause the value of fossil fuel companies to be cut in half, with the U.S. potentially losing its entire oil and gas industry. That could make the 2008 financial crisis look like a walk in the park. That is what is at stake for our global system.

What about here at home?

Listen to this: Rising sea levels and spreading flood plains appear likely to destroy billions of dollars in property and to displace millions of people. ''The economic losses and social disruption may happen gradually, but they are likely to be greater in total than those experienced in the housing crisis and Great Recession.''

Who wrote that? Freddie Mac, the government-sponsored company that is responsible for buying millions of mortgages every year. That is not

some partisan view; that is a cold-eyed assessment of the likely damage that climate change will cause to our economy and to our citizens.

Another recent study, conducted by the Union of Concerned Scientists, found that over the next 30 years, 311,000 homes will be in danger of being flooded every 2 weeks—311,000. That means more than half a million Americans could have their homes inundated with water multiple times every single month. Think about the financial toll the constant flooding will take on these families and the homes. Well, after being bombarded with saltwater over and over again, a coastal property meltdown would be inevitable.

Yet here is what gives me comfort and why I am inspired to work with Senator WHITEHOUSE and why I am inspired by his work and why I had to be here tonight. We can prevent this crisis, but only if we act. It is going to take public-private partnerships, CEOs, and Members of Congress to work together to prepare for the worst. That means companies need to begin including the risk of climate change in their investment and risk management practices.

Climate change can be an economic opportunity if we act boldly and decisively, which is something I know Senator WHITEHOUSE will address shortly. If we fail to act, it will be a financial catastrophe as well as an environmental catastrophe, and it will put the 2008 financial crisis to shame. We know it is coming; we need the political will to do something about it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am so grateful to join my colleague today, Senator WARREN, to discuss the financial and economic risks that are posed by climate change.

You have just heard the Senator from my neighboring State of Massachusetts lay out a powerful case. Given the gravity of these risks and given our recent experience of the 2008 financial crisis, we should be doing everything we can to prevent another economic meltdown.

We know exactly what we need to do to mitigate these economic threats. We need to transition from polluting fossil fuels to clean, renewable energy. We can do this simply by giving renewables a fair market chance against the gigantic public subsidies on which the fossil fuel industry float. Put a price on carbon emissions so the price of the polluting product reflects its pollution costs to society. That is the economics 101 answer.

The problem is that fossil fuel behemoths are desperate to duck the costs of their pollution. They want to protect this massive market failure. Why do you suppose they are the biggest special interest political force in the world? It is to do that work. Look over in the House, where just recently an army of fossil fuel lobbyists and front groups pushed through an industry-scripted resolution and declared, falsely, that pricing carbon would be bad for the American economy. All but eight House Republicans voted the way the industry instructed—for a resolution that was, for them, politically correct in a polluter-obedient kind of way but was factually false.

Today, in my 217th ''Time to Wake Up'' climate change speech, I am going to relate recent testimony by a respected Nobel Prize-winning economics professor, Joseph Stiglitz. Unlike all of that cheap political chicanery around the House resolution, Professor Stiglitz' report was presented under oath and was subject to cross-examination. Fat chance the climate deniers would ever let themselves get cross-examined under oath. Truth is kryptonite for them.

Stiglitz' report came out in Juliana v. United States—a case in which the plaintiffs were children who sued the U.S. Government for violating their constitutional rights through a knowing failure to protect them from the costs of unlimited carbon emissions.

Here is what Stiglitz' testimony states:

> [The U.S. Government's] continuing support and perpetuation of a national fossil-fuel based energy system and continuing delay in addressing climate change is saddling and will continue to saddle Youth Plaintiffs with an enormous cost burden, as well as tremendous risks.

Obviously, when Stiglitz talks about ''youth plaintiffs,'' his testimony actually covers all of the children and future generations who will bear the terrible, foreseeable costs of climate havoc.

In particular, Stiglitz notes that ''rising sea levels will lead to massive reductions in property value,'' just as Senator WARREN and Freddie Mac have warned, and children and future generations will have to ''bear the enormous cost of relocating the people and infrastructure that are now on this [inundated] land.''

Of all places, the State of Kentucky has a report that warns that its population might rise because people will have to flee coastal States. Even the leader's own State recognizes this coastal problem.

This testimony echoes other warnings that I have related in recent speeches about this looming coastal property value crash—warnings we hear from sources as diverse as Freddie Mac, as the Union of Concerned Scientists, through insurance trade publications, and now from this Nobel Prize-winning economist. Peer-reviewed research also shows a gap emerging between coastal and inland property values, which is what you would expect as an early warning signal.

Stiglitz' report, however, isn't doom and gloom. It actually shows that economic gains result from a wise transition to sustainable energy sources.

Stiglitz writes:

> Retrofitting the global economy for a climate change would help to restore aggregate demand and growth. . . . Climate policies, if well designed and implemented, are consistent with growth, development, and poverty reduction. The transition to a low carbon economy is potentially a powerful, attractive, and sustainable growth story, marked by higher resilience, more innovation, more livable cities, robust agriculture, and stronger ecosystems.

Think about that. The fossil fuel industry and its phony front groups have cooked up a phony hobgoblin of economic harm, which just so happens to protect the industry they serve at the expense of everyone else.

Here is a Nobel Prize-winning economist telling us that shifting to renewable energy would actually help us grow the economy. The need for this transition is also echoed in the warnings, which I have spoken about and which Senator WARREN just so eloquently spoke about, of a carbon bubble and crash.

Why is it that the clean energy economy grows? The same reason the economy grew when we went from horse and buggy to automobile or landline to cell phones. The key word is ''innovation.'' As Professor Stiglitz says, we get more innovation as we manage this transaction.

Renewable energy, electric cars, battery storage, carbon capture, energy efficiency, low-carbon and zero-carbon fuels—these are technologies of the future, promising millions of great jobs. The question is whether these will be American technologies and American jobs or whether China, Germany, Japan, and other countries will win the transition to a low-carbon economy.

Growth will not just come from new jobs; it will come from lower costs. Stiglitz notes this: ''Many energy efficiency technologies actually have a negative cost to implement.'' Now, you have to be an economist to use the phrase ''negative cost.'' Negative cost, obviously, is ''economics-ese'' for ''that's a good thing.''

The reverse case is the Trump administration's recent decision to freeze fuel economy standards for cars. That is a bad thing. It will cost American consumers hundreds of billions of dollars more at the pump. It is no surprise that all of that extra cost for consumers in gas money goes to Big Oil, which has the Trump administration obediently in its pocket.

Stiglitz's testimony estimates the total benefits to the U.S. economy from shifting away from fossil energy sources at around $1 trillion by 2050—$1 trillion by 2050. As I said, a $1 trillion negative cost is a good thing. It is a really good thing, and if we weren't completely in tow to the fossil fuel industry around here, we would be striving for it.

Stiglitz recommends the policies to get us to that low-carbon economy. First, he says we must put a price on carbon. He testifies that putting a price on carbon could be beneficial to the economy all by itself. He says:

[A] carbon tax . . . could substitute for other more distortionary taxes. If governments made such a substitution, the aggregate cost of curtailing carbon emissions could be even less than zero, providing net benefits to the economy.

Second, he testifies that we must end the enormous, gigantic subsidies we grant to the fossil fuel industry. Here is what he says:

The full amount of post-tax subsidies in the U.S. [to the fossil fuel industry] has been estimated at nearly $700 billion per year, more than half of the Federal government's forecasted deficit for the next fiscal year. Eliminating all fossil fuel subsidies (implicit and explicit, many of which go to large corporations) could, therefore, both curtail fossil-fuel production, through forcing companies to bear more of the true costs of fossil-fuel production, and substantially reduce our national deficit in one fell swoop.

For the record, Stiglitz adds that ''equity would also be improved with corporations paying more and individuals, such as Youth Plaintiffs and Affected Children, benefiting.''

Of course, around here, corporate interests get better service than the American people, so that observation doesn't count for much, but there it is.

There is one last bit of Stiglitz's testimony that is important. I quote him again: ''The more time that passes, the more expensive it becomes to address climate change.''

Time is not our friend. This doesn't get better or go away. Every day we delay is a missed opportunity. Every day we delay bears a cost, and we have been delaying—we are good at that—for decades.

James Hansen appeared before this body 30 years ago—three decades ago—to sound the alarm about climate change in a hearing called by Senator John Chafee. Stiglitz cites a 40-year-old report—four decades—to President Carter that subsidies to the fossil fuel industry were stifling competition from solar.

For decades, the fossil fuel industry has jerked Congress's chain to keep anything from happening. Even now, their mischief is visible in the hobgoblin about economic harm.

By the way, it is not just Nobel Prize-winning economist Joseph Stiglitz who says that pricing carbon emissions would be a good thing. Economists across the political spectrum agree. Just last month, economic researchers at Columbia University found that even if you look only at the pure economic effects, a carbon fee is a winner.

Here is a $50-per-ton carbon fee, and here is a $75-per-ton carbon fee, and both show growth compared to the status quo in the economy. You have to roll them back through the payroll tax, which is something we can do, to see this added growth effect from a carbon fee.

Remember, this growth—that is only the tax effects. This doesn't count the health benefits of a cleaner planet; this doesn't count the environmental benefits of a healthier planet. Both are huge. They are not even counted here. This is just the tax effects.

These carbon pricing ideas are a winner on their own, and it becomes a win-win-win when you add the environmental and health benefits.

So who are we going to believe, the front groups paid by the fossil fuel industry? If there were Olympic medals in having a conflict of interest, these phonies would take the gold. Unfortunately, you would have to hose off the medals platform afterward.

On the other side, you have actual experts, honest experts—the ones cited by Senator WARREN, the economists I have mentioned here today, and many others—who all agree. They are all saying that we need to act now. They are all telling us that failure to act puts us in harm's way for serious economic disruption. They are all telling us that pricing carbon and ending fossil fuel subsidies will actually be a boon to the economy.

Our choice is clear. Going with the corrupt guys is not a good look, not when the day of reckoning comes. And warnings are more and more widespread and clear that a day of reckoning draws nigh.

So if you want, go with the oddballs and the fossil fuel flunkies, not the Nobel Prize winners; go with the scripted disinformation, not the sworn testimony; go with the industry protecting a $700 billion subsidy, not the actual scientists; and good luck looking your grandchildren in the eye.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

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

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor this evening to spend a couple of minutes talking about the nomination of Judge Brett Kavanaugh to the U.S. Supreme Court.

We know that the debate has been engaged now for a number of weeks and that the American people are part of that debate. I have already expressed my views about the process that led to his nomination. I have very strong views about it. I think it was a corrupt bargain between at least two—if not the only two—far-right organizations and the administration to choose from a list of only 25 individuals to serve on the Supreme Court. In other words, if you are not on the list of 25 chosen by those groups or at least certainly ratified by those groups, you cannot be nominated to the Supreme Court.

But tonight I am here to talk about a different set of questions. One is more specific and one is broader, but both are important. I will deal with the broader question at some length, but I will raise the more specific question first; that is, the question of a particular aspect of the Judge's record.

I happen to serve as the ranking member of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, and I am alarmed at some of the judge's opinions regarding older Americans and Americans with disabilities. I will be walking through some of those cases at a different time, but I have a series of questions that I think are important to have answers to as they relate to his views and the potential opinions he would write that affect older Americans and individuals with disabilities.

Because there has been a failure so far to turn over records of his tenure in the White House—documents that some believe number in the millions of pages—it is very difficult to ascertain or even to formulate questions that relate to just these two topics, among many, the two topics being his views on Americans with disabilities and the laws that protect Americans with disabilities and, of course, his views on programs and policies that relate to older Americans.

Today I have written to Chairman GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and Ranking Member FEINSTEIN, to demand that the Judiciary Committee obtain and share with me and my staff all documents related to older adults and people with disabilities. The Judiciary Committee is attempting to move forward with Judge Kavanaugh's hearing before—before—we have seen and had a chance to review his entire record. Without Judge Kavanaugh's full record to review and without all of the documents being made available to the committee and, therefore, to the Senate, no Senator can fulfill his or her constitutional duty to provide meaningful advice and consent about this nominee for the highest Court in the land and, I would argue, the most powerful—or at least the most important—Court in the world.

This duty could not be more important than it is at this moment.

Yesterday, as so many Americans know, it was a very sad day for the country and one of the saddest days in the history of our Republic for two reasons. The President's former attorney, Michael Cohen, pleaded guilty to breaking campaign finance laws at the President's direction, according to his statement under oath in open court—that statement of Mr. Cohen.

Meanwhile, Paul Manafort, the President's campaign manager, was convicted by a jury on eight counts of tax and bank fraud.

Why is that relevant to this discussion about the Supreme Court? I think it is pretty simple. Serious crimes have been committed by close associates of the President. That President has now nominated Judge Kavanaugh to sit on our highest Court, and that particular nominee, Judge Kavanaugh, has views on Executive power and the power of any President to take action. These views must be thoroughly reviewed. That takes not just a review of the record that we have now; I would argue that to fully examine those views, we have to look at his whole record.

How can any Senator—how can even the Judiciary Committee—conduct that kind of thorough review when we might have literally millions of pages of documents that are not being made available to the Judiciary Committee and, by extension, to the Senate itself? I don't know how we can complete that kind of an inquiry just on those questions—questions of the power of the President and questions on Executive power more broadly.

So because of what happened yesterday, we are now in uncharted waters, probably territory that very few Americans have ever walked through. I don't want to make any historical comparisons because they are never entirely accurate, but I think it is safe to say that we are in uncharted territory. So under these circumstances, it is more important than ever that our courts, up to and including the Supreme Court, act as independent arbiters in our democracy.

Any Supreme Court nominee, of course, warrants close, careful, and thorough scrutiny. In this case, this nominee, whose views on Executive power I would argue are extreme, and a nominee who has questioned whether the President can be subpoenaed—of course, that nominee, in this context but even outside this context should be the subject of thorough examination. And because of what happened yesterday, the nominee should receive the most substantial, the toughest scrutiny on a range of questions but, in particular, those that relate to Executive power.

I will quote just a few lines from a 1998 Law Review article written by Judge Kavanaugh. He said: ''Congress should give back to the President the full power to act when he believes that a particular independent counsel is 'out to get him.' ''

He went on to say later: ''The President should have absolute discretion . . . whether and when to appoint an independent counsel.''

So that is just one brief reference in one Law Review article. There are other examples we could cite, obviously Executive power—the power of the President generally but, in particular, the power of a President in the context of an independent counsel, what we now call a special counsel—being involved.

These questions are substantial. We know that Judge Kavanaugh, before he was, in fact, Judge Kavanaugh, was a member of a prior administration where he served both as White House Staff Secretary and White House Counsel. Therein lies a lot of information in those documents about his time there, when he assuredly would have expressed opinions on a range of questions, maybe a series of statements or evidence in the record about his views on Executive power, in addition to what he may have said in a speech or in a Law Review article or otherwise.

So I believe it would be an abrogation of our constitutional responsibility to move forward on the Kavanaugh nomination without his full—without his full—record set forth for the Judiciary Committee before the hearing begins. And if there are millions of pages still to review, we should give Judiciary Committee members the time to review those documents, formulate questions, and prepare for the hearing.

There is no rule or no law that says this hearing has to begin the day after Labor Day or even a few days after Labor Day. I would think that the Senate would want to have the full record—or as close to the full record as possible—before those hearings begin, especially because we have a particularly urgent set of circumstances or set of facts—in light of what happened yesterday with the two individuals in two different courts of law—which could make as a live issue, potentially, these questions of the exercise of Executive power, especially because we have a nominee who has expressed views on those issues. I don't think what I am outlining is in any way unreasonable. Taking a few extra weeks to review that record should be the subject of bipartisan support.

So I believe Judge Kavanaugh's full record must be made available for review. I also believe the Senate must be given adequate opportunity to review it, and I think because of the facts and circumstances that are presented with this nominee, with this Presidency, and with this set of facts, the stakes could not be higher. We don't want to be finding out down the road in the midst of a confirmation hearing—or even after the confirmation hearing or even after, potentially, a confirmation vote—that there are documents in the record that were not brought to the full light of scrutiny that have a bearing on his views that relate to these fundamental issues of Executive power. If a legislative branch of government, in this case the U.S. Senate and, in particular, the Judiciary Committee—if a legislative branch of government in that circumstance doesn't discharge its duty to obtain and to review and then to formulate questions about issues so fundamental as Executive power and the power of the President, especially in the context of a special counsel investigation, I am not sure what the role of the Senate would be in the absence of that kind of review.

So I think this is fundamental. It has nothing to do with a point of view or a party or a position; this is fundamental to the process of having a full review of the record.

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. 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 proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

SOUTH SUDAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, several of the warring parties in the South Sudanese civil war, including President Kiir and the leader of the main opposition party, Riek Machar, recently signed a power-sharing deal to ostensibly bring to an end a conflict that has resulted in hundreds of thousands of deaths and the largest refugee crisis in Africa. Today in South Sudan, there are nearly 200,000 people sheltering at UN peacekeeping bases, 4.5 million people have been forcibly displaced, and an estimated 7 million people are in need of humanitarian aid. Several ceasefires have been negotiated and broken by both sides since the conflict began in December 2013, and the United States has invested well over $3 billion in humanitarian aid to help the people of South Sudan who have been largely abandoned by their political leaders.

Unfortunately, the viability of the recent power-sharing deal and the prospects for a broader peace agreement remain in question. What we do know is that decades of corruption, marginalization, political manipulation, and human rights atrocities led to the most recent iteration of catastrophic violence in South Sudan, and it will take decades for the country to fully recover, but there is at least one action that President Kiir should take today that would have immediate benefits: the release of all political prisoners, journalists, academics, and others who have been detained as a result of peacefully exercising their right to free expression.

One such individual is Peter Biar Ajak. Mr. Ajak was resettled in Philadelphia in January 2001 as a teenage refugee of the Sudanese civil war and one of the 40,000 ''Lost Boys'' left homeless by that conflict. Remarkably, he went on to earn a master's degree from Harvard and is now a doctoral candidate at Cambridge. Mr. Ajak has been a courageous and vocal critic of the failed peace process in South Sudan, particularly the role of President Kiir and opposition leader Machar, who for years have put amassing wealth and power for themselves far above the welfare and rights of the South Sudanese people. It is this criticism that his supporters believe led to his arrest and imprisonment on July 28 by the South Sudan National Security Service, NSS.

While the charges against him have not been publicly confirmed, Mr. Ajak

is allegedly being charged with treason and other crimes against the state and has reportedly been denied access to a lawyer. Reports suggest he is one of several dozen detainees being held by the NSS at the infamous Blue House prison in Juba.

Mr. Ajak's detention is consistent with a pattern of abuses by the NSS, which has been implicated in the arbitrary arrest and detention of journalists, national staff of the United Nations, academics, civil society activists, and young business leaders like Kerbino Wol; the forced disappearance of human rights lawyers and members of the political opposition, such as Dong Samuel Luak and Aggrey Idri, respectively; and other human rights violations and denials of due process. Although President Kiir has previously announced that he would release all political prisoners and his government has committed under a recent deal to release detainees, human rights monitors continue to report that dozens of people remain detained without charge at the Blue House and other detention sites in the capital.

No matter what documents are signed to move the country beyond its civil war, true peace and stability will not be achieved if the government continues to repress free speech and arrest, detain, and forcibly disappear journalists, politicians, academics, and members of civil society. If and when the U.S. government is again called on to support the government of South Sudan and to help rebuild its security services, their actions in this conflict—and their treatment of people like Peter Biar Ajak—will not be forgotten. I urge all Senators to join me in calling for the immediate release of Mr. Ajak and other prisoners of conscience and accountability for the perpetrators of such abuses.

TRIBUTE TO CLARA AYER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on behalf of all Vermonters, I want to honor Clara Ayer of East Montpelier, VT, who will this month be inducted into the Vermont Agricultural Hall of Fame, in recognition of her status as an emerging leader in the Vermont agriculture community. Clara is a proud 2010 alumna of Cornell University with a degree dairy science who, after graduation, went to work for Yankee Farm Credit. She began working full time at Fairmount Farm, a third-generation dairy farm, alongside her brother Ricky in 2014. Clara is married to Dana Ayer, and the couple has a little boy, Carson. She is a well-respected advocate for agriculture, both in Montpelier and Washington, DC.

In addition to her membership in several dairy-related organizations, Clara also promotes dairy to young people, through a ''Life on the Farm'' summer camp, through educational field trips by the local elementary school, and through the formation of a Dairy 4–H Club. As Clara has provided exceptional service to the Vermont dairy community, further described in her well-deserved nomination to the Vermont Agricultural Hall of Fame, I ask unanimous consent that the citation of her nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME 2018 INDUCTEE CLARA AYER

Clara is a third-generation dairy farmer and family farm advocate. She works alongside her family at Fairmount Farm, where she wears many hats from overseeing human resources for their staff of fifty employees, to bookkeeping, to marketing, and events management. She plays an active role in shaping agricultural policy through her advocacy at the Vermont Statehouse, and in Washington D.C. as part of her work as an Agri-Mark Young Cooperator and member of the National Milk Producers' Federation. She currently serves as the secretary of the Vermont Holstein Association, and is a delegate of both Vermont and New England Dairy Promotion. Clara also created and manages a ''Life on the Farm'' summer camp for youth, which offers kids the opportunity to experience agriculture through fun, educational on-farm activities. Clara graduated from Cornell University in 2010 with a B.A. in Dairy Science. She and her husband Dana are excited to be raising their two-year-old son, Carson, on the family farm.

TRIBUTE TO BOB FOSTER

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on behalf of all Vermonters, I would like to honor Bob Foster of Middlebury, VT, who this month will be inducted into the Vermont Agricultural Hall of Fame in recognition of more than 30 years of outstanding service to Vermont agriculture. For as long as I have served in this body and especially in my work on the U.S. Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I have often looked to Bob for input and advice. In addition being a partner in an iconic fifth-generation Vermont dairy, Bob's leadership in Vermont has been extraordinary. During his 37 years of service on the Agri-Mark Dairy Cooperative Board, the co-op has become a critical resource for many Vermont dairy farms and a mainstay of the Vermont economy. Bob is an innovator, taking risks and leading the way in Vermont for bio-digesters and sustainable value-added products and working nationally on renewable energy as an adviser to the 25X25 effort. The extent of his service on local, State, and national leadership teams is exceptional and is further described in his well-deserved nomination to the Vermont Agricultural Hall of Fame, I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be printed in the RECORD.

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

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME LIFETIME ACHIEVEMENT: 30+ YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO VERMONT AGRICULTURE. ROBERT FOSTER, MIDDLEBURY

Robert is a partner in Foster Brothers Farm, a fifth-generation dairy, who served on the Agrimark Board of Directors for 37 consecutive years, before retiring in 2015. He also chairs the University of Vermont, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences' Board of Advisors. Sustainability has always been one of Robert's passions. Foster Brothers Farm was the first in the state to install and operate a methane digester. Robert is also co-owner and operator of Vermont Natural Ag Products, a sustainable business which supplies wholesale products, formulated from cow, horse and poultry compost, to the horticultural, agricultural, and turf industries. He currently serves on the Board of Directors for The Soil Health Institute. Within the Agrimark Co-op, Robert has been a champion for renewable energy and sustainability, helping to pioneer the Vital Capital Index, which helps member farms measure and manage their impact on their community, the environment and their bottom line. He has been a tireless advocate for Vermont agriculture, and a mentor and leader to young farmers, over the course of his prestigious career. Together with his wife, Nancy, he has three grown daughters; Robin Cole, Jennifer Foster, and Heather Foster-Provencher, and six grandchildren.

TRIBUTE TO BETH KENNETT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on behalf of all Vermonters, I want to honor Beth Kennett of Rochester, VT, who this month will be inducted into the Vermont Agricultural Hall of Fame in recognition of her multifaceted leadership of agriculture in the Green Mountain State. Beth, with her husband, Bob, and their family, have for many years run a multigenerational diversified dairy farm in the White River Valley. I have often looked to Beth for her advice and insights into Vermont agriculture. She has been a strong leader on many fronts, including serving on the USDA Farm Service Agency State Committee, as founding member of the Connecticut River Watershed Farmers Alliance, as founding member of the White River Partnership, and especially as a leader in agritourism in Vermont, nationally and internationally.

Beth's induction into the Vermont Agricultural Hall of Fame is well earned, and I ask unanimous consent that her nomination for this honor be printed in the RECORD.

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

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE BETH KENNETT

Beth is a dairy farmer and innkeeper who helped forge the path for Vermont's agritourism industry. For more than 30 years, she has helped educate Vermont farmers, government officials, and the public about the economic, social, and educational benefits of agri-tourism. As the former president of Vermont Farms!, she has traveled and spoken both nationally and internationally to build awareness for agri-tourism and create new opportunities for Vermont farmers. Her tireless outreach and desire to educate has enabled many farms to diversify and realize the economic advantages of connecting directly with the public. Since 1984, Beth, her husband Bob, and three generations of her family have opened their home for farm stays, providing educational, hands-on vacations for thousands of domestic and international guests.

TRIBUTE TO DICK SEARS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, it is my honor to recognize a true friend of Vermont, State Senator Dick Sears of Bennington, who has been named by FiscalNote as the sixth most productive State senator in the United States.

Senator Sears, who was first elected in 1992, and as cited by FiscalNote, has sponsored 314 bills and has a 60 percent bill passage success rate. This recognition of Senator Sears' effectiveness comes as no surprise in Vermont, where he is respected and is a fixture on the nightly news during the legislative session.

In the Vermont Senate Judiciary Committee, where Senator Sears serves as chair, he has acted courageously on issues including civil rights, marriage equality, human trafficking, and adoption. He himself highlights his work on corrections and criminal justice reform, as well as his successful involvement in the 2010 rewrite of sex offender laws, as major accomplishments; yet he also attributes his success in these important issue areas to teamwork.

In addition to chairing the judiciary committee, Senator Sears also serves on the appropriations committee, the joint fiscal committee, is vice chair of the joint legislative child protection oversight committee, is vice chair of the joint legislative justice committee, and is a member of the legislative committee on judicial rules and the legislative council committee.

Clearly, Senator Sears is a legislator who deserves recognition, yet doesn't seek recognition. In honor of Senator Sears' outstanding accomplishments, I ask that the article by Christie Wisniewski from the July 31 edition of the Bennington Banner, ''Sears ranked 6th in productivity for U.S. state senators,'' be printed into the RECORD.

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

BENNINGTON BANNER, JULY 31, 2018

SEARS RANKED 6TH IN PRODUCTIVITY FOR U.S. STATE SENATORS

This story by Christie Wisniewski was published by the Bennington Banner on July 31.

BENNINGTON.—State Sen. Dick Sears of Bennington is the sixth most productive state senator in the United States, according to an analysis released Monday by a Washington, D.C.-based software startup. Each year, FiscalNote creates a list of the top 10 state senators using ''unique data analytics software,'' the company said in a press release. The list ranks all senators and representatives in accordance with their legislative productivity, which is defined as how successful the legislator is at sponsoring and steering bills through each stage of the legislative process.

This research also ranks the quality, endurance and substantiveness of the bills each legislator sponsored and introduced. For example, legislators score higher if they sponsor a higher number of bills and if their bills make it further in the legislative process. A bill that is enacted is weighted more than a bill that does not make it past the Senate floor. Finally, legislators score higher if their bills are substantive a bill that attempts meaningful change rather than a memorial or commendation.

Sears, a Democrat, was first elected in 1992. Since then, he has sponsored 314 bills and has a 60–percent bill passage success rate.

''I'm just flabbergasted,'' Sears said of the report. ''[I'm] really humbled and pleased, quite frankly.''

Sears was the only state senator from New England to make the top 10.

State Sen. Brian Campion, who is running for re-election alongside his district mate Sears as a team, lauded Sears for his dedication to the county.

''Bennington County was once the forgotten kingdom of Vermont, but Dick has helped us rid ourselves of that title,'' Campion said. ''He's incredibly hard working, and I'm lucky to have him as a mentor and district mate.''

According to the National Conference of State Legislatures website, there are 7,383 legislators across the United States.

''To be ranked in the top 10 of state senators is an amazing thing,'' Sears said. ''. . . I've worked well with various administrations over the years and sponsored some really tough bills.''

Sears has worked successfully with four different Vermont governors and sponsored bills dealing with civil rights, marriage equality, human trafficking, adoption, and other issues. He views his work with reforming state corrections and criminal justice laws—especially with juvenile justice—as a ''major accomplishment'' and also sees his involvement with the 2010 ''complete rewrite'' of sex offender laws as a success.

However, Sears doesn't want to take all the credit for the bills that have passed under his watch.

''Like anything else, you never do it alone,'' he said.

Rep. Timothy R. Corcoran II of Bennington also believes Sears' recognition is well-deserved.

''Dick has always lived by his convictions and never backed down when he faced opposition to issues that weren't universally accepted,'' Corcoran said. ''Bennington County has been extremely lucky to have him represent us up in Montpelier.''

Corcoran commended Sears' willingness to fight for Bennington County, ''whether it's been PFOA, helping to secure Amtrak bus service funding, fighting for the Vermont Veterans Home, or just securing funds for Bennington County in general.''

''Dick has always stepped up to the plate and delivered,'' Corcoran added. ''Congratulations Dick; job well done.''

TRIBUTE TO ENID WONNACOTT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, on behalf of all Vermonters, I would like to honor Enid Wonnacott of Huntington, VT, who this month will be inducted into the Vermont Agricultural Hall of Fame in recognition of her more than 30 years of agricultural leadership in Vermont and the Nation. Enid became the executive director of the Northeast Organic Farming Association of Vermont, NOFA–VT, in 1987, the same year that I became chairman of the U.S. Senate Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry. Enid has been a national leader in advancing the importance of organic agriculture. She provided important technical and advocacy support as I worked on the National Organic Standards Act as part of the 1990 farm bill—which has in turn resulted in making organic agriculture a $60 billion annual industry—with Vermont as a leader. Thirty years later, Enid continues to provide advice on organic agriculture and nutrition issues.

Enid Wonnacott's many accomplishments are presented in detail in her much deserved nomination to the Vermont Agricultural Hall of Fame.

I ask unanimous consent to have the nomination printed in the RECORD.

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

VERMONT AGRICULTURAL HALL OF FAME 2018 INDUCTEE ENID WONNACOTT

Enid has served as the Executive Director of The Northeast Organic Farming Association of Vermont (NOFA–VT) since 1987. Over the course of her tenure, thanks to her leadership, Vermont's organic industry has grown immensely, from just 57 certified farms in 1990, to more than 700, today. Enid has worked tirelessly to help ensure all Vermonters have access to local, organic foods, and began a pioneering farm share program more than 20 years ago to provide subsidized farm shares for low-income Vermonters. As the National Organic Program was developed, Enid worked to implement a national certification program that kept the needs of Vermont's family farms at the forefront. Over the past three decades, she has nurtured and guided more than 70 staff and 20 interns, secured consistent grant and donor funding, and led NOFA–VT to become a national leader in organic advocacy, food access, and farm to school education. She has made an indelible mark on both the local, and national, organic movement. Enid grew up in Weybridge, and has lived on a small farmstead in Huntington with her husband, Harry, and children, Lila and Eli, for the past thirty years.

NOMINATION OF LYNN JOHNSON

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, these are incredibly harmful and traumatic times for immigrants and refugees in America. Perhaps there is not greater example of the damaging immigration policies of this administration than the so called zero-tolerance policy that led to the cruel and needless separation of thousands of children from their parents.

Separating a child from his or her parents has lasting, harmful, and traumatizing impacts. These separations have been shown to increase anxiety and depression among children that have already experienced significant trauma in their home countries and along their journey to the United States. Best practices in child welfare promote keeping children and their parents safely together, unless removal is in the child's best interest.

While the Department of Justice ended the family separation policy after an incredible outcry from the public and experts in children's health and well-being, the damage is far from over. The administration is now undergoing a court-supervised process to reunify separated children and families. Significant and self-inflicted obstacles remain in this reunification process, and I and my Senate colleagues will

continue to doggedly press the Departments of Justice, Homeland Security, and Health and Human Services until every child is safely in the custody of a parent, relative, or other guardian and to ensure nothing like this happens again.

Hundreds of children still remain in government custody, scared and unsure if they will ever see their parents again. Children who were separated from their parents or arrive on their own are placed in the custody of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which falls under the Administration for Children and Families, ACF, within the Department of Health and Human Services. The President has nominated Lynn Johnson of Colorado to fill the role of head of ACF. If confirmed by the Senate, Ms. Johnson has one of the most important jobs in public service, and that is ensuring the safety and well-being of these vulnerable children and working toward their reunification.

I voted against Ms. Johnson's nomination when it came before the Senate Finance Committee due to the sheer volume of unanswered questions and false or misleading answers from this administration regarding its family separation policies. Tonight, I had the opportunity to discuss my concerns with Ms. Johnson and secure her commitment to changing the way things are done in the Administration for Children and Families.

Ms. Johnson committed to enacting and enforcing policies that prevent Office of Refugee Resettlement grantees and facilities from engaging in activities that are not consistent with best practices for children including prohibiting solitary confinement for punitive purposes or behavioral modification; prohibiting the distribution of psychotropic medications or sedatives absent the informed, written consent of a parent or guardian, except in the case of well-documented emergencies; prohibiting arbitrary restraint policies; prohibiting any security measures that are not necessary for the protection of minors or others, such as denying them access to drinking water or preventing them from making private phone calls; and guaranteeing the maintenance of confidentiality of information disclosed by children to therapists and counselors in the context of a therapeutic/treatment relationship.

In addition, Ms. Johnson committed to ensuring ORR and its supported grantees and facilities allow any separated child to call a parent or legal guardian as frequently as the child wishes—if there are documented safety concerns, calls may be monitored by staff with the child, but otherwise, children must be able to contact a parent or legal guardian as they wish. If the parent/legal guardian is in the custody of the Department of Homeland Security, the two agencies must establish a process to accept children's calls and connect them to their parents; and conducting a full review within 90 days of the oversight, staffing, training, medication, and licensing policies for ORR-funded facilities and issue a report to Congress describing the oversight of these facilities and the actions ACF will take to address oversight and program shortcomings. The review must include the extent and adequacy of policies related to post-release services; legal services; and health, including reproductive health, to ensure that they are consistent with constitutional protections. In the event the full review cannot be completed within 90 days, ACF will provide the summary of their work at that point, with a timeline and guarantee that the full report will be soon available.

I am grateful for these commitments and will hold Ms. Johnson to them if she is ultimately confirmed by the full Senate.

REMEMBERING CHRISTOPHER COUSINS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in 2010, Bangor Daily News journalist Christopher Cousins wrote a touching essay on a fishing trip he had taken with his young son to the Maine lake where he and his father had fished throughout his childhood. It was his first trip back since his father's death 3 years earlier.

That remarkable essay exploring the special bond between father and child and the powerful link between fond memories of the past and hopes for the future took on added poignancy on August 15 when Chris passed away at age 42. At this difficult time, I offer my deepest condolences to his wife, Jen, and his sons, Caleb and Jacob.

As a husband and father, Chris was devoted to his family. As a consummate journalist who worked for several Maine newspapers, he was devoted to the best ideals of his profession. His work covered a wide range of subjects, but it consistently demonstrated a commitment to the truth and to providing his readers with the information that is the lifeblood of democracy.

Chris joined the Bangor Daily News in 2009, covering local news in southern Penobscot and Somerset Counties with a keen understanding of the issues that concern the people of Maine. In 2010, he covered the Maine Gubernatorial race with extraordinary energy and insight.

In 2013, Chris became State house bureau chief for his newspaper. Always tenacious and unfailingly fair, he earned the respect of politicians on both sides of the aisle and throughout the halls of government. His work ethic, skill as a writer, and belief in accountability led to a better understanding of the complex and often contentious issues that confront our State.

Chris's passing is a great loss to the people of Maine, his many friends, and his colleagues at the Bangor Daily News. It is a heartbreaking loss to his wonderful family, and I hope they will find comfort in knowing that his contributions and accomplishments truly made a difference to people throughout Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, today we remember the life of Christopher ''Chris'' Cousins, who passed away suddenly last week at the age of 42. Chris was a political reporter for the Bangor Daily News and recently named by the Maine Center for Public Interest Reporting as one of the most respected journalists in Maine. Chris was well-liked by all who met him, and he leaves behind his wife, Jen; two sons, Caleb and Lucas; his mother; sister Jen Cousins; and many other family members and friends. He will be greatly missed by his colleagues, his readers, his friends, and all who knew him and his work.

Chris was a consummate professional who embodied the best ideals of journalism. He was devoted to the truth, tenaciously pursued the stories most important to the people of Maine, and had a passion for the communities he served. Chris's death leaves a hole in Maine journalism that will not be easily filled.

Chris began his journalism career at the Advertiser Democrat in Norway, ME, then joined the Times Record in the early 2000s as a reporter and city editor. He left the Times Record to join the State House News Service before moving to the Bangor Daily News in 2009, where he began covering southern Penobscot and Somerset Counties. Chris quickly moved on to politics, covering the 2010 Maine Governor race, and by 2013, he was appointed State house bureau chief.

Those who worked with Chris remember him for his storytelling abilities, his laugh, and exceptional abilities as a journalist. Chris had a huge heart and also fought for the truth from government leaders at the State house, holding them accountable without being caustic. Maine is a better place because of Chris and his relentless pursuit of the truth on behalf of Maine people.

For me, Chris's political coverage shined when he covered people. Chris was an incredible storyteller, and he was such a great journalist because he got to know the people involved. No assignment was ever too much for him, and his standard response was, ''I am not afraid.'' That fearlessness resulted in clear stories that his editors loved, heartfelt narratives that his readers could relate to, and more passionate articles from his coworkers.

Chris exemplified what so many aspire to be: respected by their peers, a loving husband and father, and a great friend. We have much to be thankful for in Maine because of Chris's dedication and service to the State and our Nation, and he will be deeply missed by so many.

TRIBUTE TO STEVEN HILDRETH

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in order to honor the achievements of Steven A. Hildreth, Specialist in Missile Defense, Congressional Research Service, CRS, on the

occasion of his retirement from the Service on August 31, 2018.

Steve Hildreth served Congress with distinction for more than 32 years at the Library of Congress as a Specialist in U.S. and Foreign National Security Programs for the Congressional Research Service. He earned a bachelor's degree from Brigham Young University in Provo, UT, a master's degree in international relations from Georgetown University in Washington, DC, graduate work at Johns Hopkins University School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, DC, and a master's degree in national security strategy from the National War College in Washington, DC.

Steve is recognized throughout Congress, the military services, the defense community, and the arms control community as an expert in U.S. nuclear weapons and ballistic missile defense, arms control, military space, and nonproliferation issues. He wrote extensively on missile defense programs, from the Strategic Defense Initiative in the 1980s through the current guided-missile defense and Aegis programs. He also assisted the House Armed Services Committee, after the first gulf war, with assessments of the effectiveness of the Patriot system in taking down Iraqi scud missiles. In that capacity, he assisted Congress in 8 hours of testimony, leading a group of CRS researchers in providing open source analysis of the international aftermath of the September 11, 2001, terror attacks before the 9/11 Commission. Halfway through, the staff director for the Commission told Steve, ''I never believed in open source analysis until today.''

Steve also exercised true leadership at CRS. For 9 years, he led the Central Research Unit in the Foreign Affairs, Defense, and Trade Division of CRS, where he created and managed an extensive internship program and oversaw many of the research experts of the Service.

Steve published many influential CRS reports on such subjects as challenges to the United States in space, Iran's ballistic missile and space launch programs, long-range ballistic missile defense in Europe, ballistic missile defense in the Asia-Pacific region, ballistic missile defense, and offensive arms reductions, cyber warfare, and the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Long before I thought of running for office, I worked on national security issues for the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In that capacity, I always found Steve's expertise valuable. As a Senator, I have continued to utilize Steve's analysis and insights. I am grateful for his service and wish him the best as he begins a new journey.

TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN MIGUEL COSIO

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor a great American and steadfast Air National guardsman.

Capt. Miguel ''Mike'' E. Cosio has distinguished himself through his professional character and dedication by serving this Nation in uniform. A leader and expert communicator, he has provided distinguished service to our country while assigned to the National Capitol Region.

As an Air legislative liaison in the National Guard Bureau Office of Legislative Liaison from May 2016 to August 2018, Captain Cosio performed his duties well and without reservation. His strategic thinking and foresight contributed to the completion of numerous high-level tasks and engagements between Congress and the National Guard. During this assignment, Captain Cosio conducted more than 50 congressional engagements to provide Members insight into the worsening trend of substance misuse and the critical role of the National Guard's counterdrug program in effectively combating this epidemic. He also actively engaged Members of Congress regarding the growth of the State Partnership Program, a vital driver in strengthening our alliances overseas. In addition to those meetings, he organized dozens of direct engagements between Air National Guard senior leaders and Members of Congress, which were essential in conveying important information on behalf of the Department of Defense and building trust and understanding.

After serving in this vital role for the past 2 years, Captain Cosio will move to his next assignment: deploying in support of our Nation's defense as a true citizen-airman. Mike, his wife, Traci, and their two children have sacrificed much as a family in service to our Nation. I am thankful for Mike's service and his work with my office over the past 2 years on issues important to the State of New Hampshire and the country. I salute this American patriot whose selfless service has kept our country safe and strong.

Thank you.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD SHRIBER

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and thank Donald Shriber for his more than 30 years of public service. In addition to being an outstanding public servant who has dedicated his career to government service, Donald is also a proud Marylander. At the end of the month, Donald will retire from the Federal Government after a distinguished career at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and in the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate.

Donald began his career with the CDC as the head of the agency's Washington, DC, office and went on to lead policy and communications for CDC's important work in global health. Donald leaves a legacy of deep engagement in public health policy and a cadre of colleagues mentored to think creatively to solve complex public health challenges. Before starting at the CDC, Donald began his policy career on Capitol Hill, working in the House and Senate on healthcare and public health-related legislation. He served as a senior adviser to the legendary John Dingell, writing laws that continue to have a major impact on public health and healthcare today.

During his tenure at CDC, Donald was awarded two prestigious Presidential Rank Awards for his leadership. A steady hand during a public health emergency, Donald helped advise four CDC Directors, three Acting Directors, and countless administration officials over three administrations through complex policy discussions during some of the biggest public health challenges of the 21st century, including 9/11, the anthrax attacks of 2001, SARS, Hurricane Katrina, the H1N1 flu pandemic, and the Ebola epidemic.

Among his many contributions to the agency, the one most appreciated by many of his colleagues has been his thoughtful mentorship to the next generation of CDC leaders. Always a voice of wisdom, Donald is a reliable source of thoughtful strategic advice and novel approaches to public health policy. He challenged the agency to think about how policies in all areas of government can affect public health, and he made the agency stronger by working to leverage those areas across government to improve public health.

Today, I want to recognize Donald for his career at the CDC, his dedication to public service, and a lifetime of work that has truly made a difference to the health of our Nation and around the world. On behalf of the U.S. Congress, his fellow Marylanders, and a grateful nation, I want to thank Donald for the important work he has done and wish him the very best in his next phase of life.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GRACE SHORE

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize and congratulate Grace Shore, CEO of the Macomb County Chamber of Commerce. Grace is being honored for her lifetime achievements and her 40 years of service to the Macomb Chamber and to Macomb County, upon her induction into the Macomb Hall of Fame. During her tenure with the chamber, Grace has been a champion for businesses throughout Macomb County and an advocate for improving the community where she has spent most of her life.

Grace has been with the Macomb Chamber for 40 years and was named its CEO in 1991. Since then, Macomb has grown economically and cemented itself as a key economic player in the region. During her tenure, Grace has implemented many programs to help bolster Macomb's economy. A recent program was ''Shop Local Macomb'' during the 2017 holiday season, a campaign that encouraged residents to

visit stores in their local community in order to ensure that their holiday shopping made an impact close to home.

In her role as CEO, Grace has brought innovative thinking, new programs, and the ability to create partnerships with local governments and stakeholders, turning the Macomb Chamber into a catalyst for economic development, and allowing it to provide member organizations with a number of economic development initiatives, networking opportunities, and professional development seminars. All of these achievements have earned the Macomb Chamber the respect of its peers, not just in the region, but around Michigan. Grace's hard work and efforts have culminated in the Macomb Chamber being recognized twice with the Outstanding Chamber of the Year Award from the Michigan Association of Chamber Professionals. Grace has also been previously named the Michigan Chamber Professional of the Year by the Michigan Association of Chamber Professionals.

The Macomb Chamber has two branch organizations that work side-by-side with it: the Macomb Foundation and Macomb Advocacy for Business. The Macomb Foundation hosts events such as the annual Macomb Hall of Fame and the Athena Award with the aim of expanding the role Macomb County plays in Michigan's economy and to support the many community and nonprofit groups throughout Macomb County. Macomb Advocacy's mission is to educate member organizations and the public on policy and political issues, as well as candidates, to make Macomb a better place for businesses and residents alike.

In the 40 years that Grace has been with the Chamber of Commerce, Macomb has diversified from its manufacturing heritage and grown into a high-tech corridor. While it still stays true to its industrial roots, it now has many defense and technology companies within its borders and continues to present more opportunities every day. I would like to congratulate Grace on reaching the momentous milestone of 40 years with the Macomb Chamber of Commerce and on being inducted into the Macomb Hall of Fame. I ask my colleagues to join me today in honoring Ms. Grace Shore for her lifetime of contributions to Macomb County and the economic development of the surrounding region.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) reported that on today, August 22, 2018, he has signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK):

S. 717. An act to promote pro bono legal services as a critical way in which to empower survivors of domestic violence.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Report to accompany S. 994, A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for the protection of community centers with religious affiliation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–325).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CORKER for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

*Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Jamaica.

Nominee: Donald Ray Tapia.

Post: Ambassador to Jamaica.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee: Capito For West Virginia, 5,200, 3/25/2013; Flake PAC, 5,000, 4/02/2013; Andrew Walter For Congress, 2,600, 8/26/2013; Andrew Tobin For Congress, 2,600, 10/28/2013; National Rep Sentonal Com, 15,000, 10/31/13; National Rep Sentorial Com, 6,413, 11/07/13; NRSC, 15,000, 11/02/2013; Jeff Flake For Senate, 5,200, 11/19/2013; RNC, 70,000, 2014; Tom Cotton For Senate, 5,200, 3/19/2014; Flake PAC, 5,000 3/31/2014; Corey Gardner For Senate, 5,200, 6/06/2014; Andy Tobin For Congress, 2,700, 4/20/2015; Marco Rubio for President, 2,700, 4/21/2015; Portman For Senate, 2,700, 4/24/2015; Salmon For Congress, 2,700, 6/10/2015; Carly For President, 2,700, 8/26/2015; Joe Heck For Senate, 2,700, 9/18/2015; Marco Rubio For President, 2,700, 11/03/2015; Chris Christie For President, 2,700, 11/25/2015; Marco Rubio For President, 2,700, 12/10/2015; Conservative Solutions PAC, 50,000, 2/22/2016; Biggs For Congress, 2,500, 3/31/2016; Friends of John McCain, 5,400, 5/03/2016; Trump Victory, 25,000, 6/14/2016; Trump Victory, 25,000, 6/28/2016; Volunteers For Nehlen, 1,000, 7/10/2016; Trump Victory, 25,000, 8/03/2016; Ken Bennett For Congress, 2,500, 8/12/2016; Kiehne For Congress, 2,500, 8/18/2016; Marco Rubio For Senate, 2,700, 9/24/2016; Marco Rubio For Senate, 2,700, 9/24/2016; Paul Babeu For Congress, 5,000, 9/24/2016; Winning Women s Committee, 10,000, 9/29/2016; Trump Victory, 25,000, 6/28/2016; Trump Victory, 5,000, 11/01/2016; Trump Make America Great, 752, 11/26/2016; Comstock For Congress, 966, 12/08/2016; Josh Mandel For Senate, 5,400, 2/08/2017; Regan, 5,100, 3/7/17; Marsha Blackburn Victory Fund, 5,400, 3/30/2017; Roger Wicker For Senate, 5,400, 4/05/2017; Paul Ryan, 5,400, 4/25/17; Team Ryan, 12,500, 4/25/17; NRCC, 7,100, 4/25/17; RGA, 25,000, 5/5/17; AZ Republican Party, 25,000, 5/12/17; George P. Bush, 5,000, 6/29/17; Steve Smith For Congress, 5,400, 6/26/2017; RGA, 25,000, 9/25/17; Trump Victory, 94,600, 10/3/2017; Donald Trump For President, 5,400, 10/06/2017; RNC, 94,600, 10/06/2017; Jeff Flake, 2,600, 11/7/17; Steve Ferrara, 5,000, 11/8/17; RGA, 25,000, 12/6/17; Martha McSally, 5,400, 1/19/18; Moses Sanchez, 3,175, 2/7/18; Matt Rosendale, 2,700, 2/14/18;Andy Biggs, 2,700, 2/22/18; NRSC, 5,000, 2/28/18; Schweikert, 5,000, 3/29/18; Schweikert Victory, 5,000, 3/29/18; Rick Scott, 5,400, 4/5/18; RAGA, 1,569.77, 4/11/18; Debbie Lesko, 2,700, 4/13/18; NRSC, 24,700, 5/13/18; Justin Olson, 2,000, 5/25/18.

1. Spouse: N/A.

2. Children and Spouses: Tim & Sheri Tapia—none. Londa & Will Perkins—none.

3. Parents: Jessie Joseph Tapia—deceased; Constance Geraldine Snapp—deceased.

4. Grandparents: Thorthon Snapp—deceased; Myrtle Snapp—deceased; Jospeh Tapia—deceased; Maria Medina Tapia—deceased.

5. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

6. Sisters and Spouses: Jessie Jane Cordell, none.

---

*Michael A. Hammer, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Nominee: Michael A. Hammer.

Post: Democratic Republic of Congo.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: none.

2. Spouse: none.

Children and Spouses: Monika Hammer, Mikael Hammer, Brynia Hammer: none.

4. Parents: Magdalena Altares: Michael Peter Hammer, deceased.

5. Grandparents: Alberto and Magdalena Altares, deceased; Edward Hammer, deceased; Lilly Steinlauf, deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: N/A.

7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

---

*Dereck J. Hogan, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Moldova.

Nominee: Dereck J. Hogan.

Post: Moldova.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $0.

2. Spouse: $0.

3. Children and Spouses: Hannah Hogan (daughter): $0.

4. Parents: Father, Eric Hogan: $0; Mother, Michaele Hogan (deceased).

5. Grandparents: Vernon Jackson: $0; other grandparents, deceased.

6. Brothers and Spouses: Kyle Hogan: $25, 2008, Barack Obama.

7. Sisters and Spouses: Tahra Tibbs: $0.

---

*Philip S. Kosnett, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Kosovo.

Nominee: Philip Scott Kosnett.

Post: KOSOVO.

(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

1. Self: $100.00, 2/2016, ACTBLUE.

2. Spouse: Jan Alison Kosnett $38.50, 2/2016, ACTBLUE.

3. Children and Spouses: Alexander Kosnett (son): $5.00, 11/2016, ACTBLUE. Nicole Kosnett (daughter) none.

4. Parents: Barbara Kosnett (mother); none; Lawrence Kosnett (father). none (deceased).
5. Grandparents: Louis Kosnett—none (deceased); Mary Kosnett—none (deceased); Dorothy Hain—none (deceased); Russell Hain—none (deceased).
6. Brother and Spouse: Jeffrey Kosnett (brother), none; Deborah Kosnett (sister-in-law), none.
7. Sisters and Spouses: n/a.

---

*John Cotton Richmond, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, with the rank of Ambassador at Large.
Nominee: John Cotton Richmond.
Post: U.S. Ambassador-at-Large for Trafficking in Persons.
Nominated: July 9, 2018.
(The followings a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)
Contributions, amount, date, and donee:
1. Self: None.
2. Spouse: Linda Marie Richmond, None.
3. Children and Spouses: Grace-Lauren Richmond, none; James Cotton Richmond, none; Alden Mount Richmond, none.
4. Parents: George Mount Richmond II & Kate Emily Richmond, $120.00, 2016, Clinton & Kaine Campaign.
5. Grandparents: George Mount Richmond—deceased; Elizabeth Richmond—deceased; Ronald Cotton—deceased; Edith Cotton—deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Matthew Mount Richmond, none; Randy Scott Hyde, $50.00, 2016, Clinton & Kaine Campaign.
7. Sisters and Spouses.

---

*Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Ghana.
Nominee: Stephanie Sanders Sullivan.
Post: Chief of Mission Republic of Ghana.
(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)
Contributions, Amount, Date, and Donee:
1. Self: N/A.
2. Spouse: N/A.
3. Children and Spouses: Daniel Wood Sullivan, N/A; Scott Webster Sullivan, N/A.
4. Parents: N/A (deceased).
5. Grandparents: N/A (deceased).
6. Brothers and Spouses: Philip Elliott Sanders, N/A; Thomas Hillman Sanders and Janice DiNezza Sanders, N/A.
7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

---

*Judy Rising Reinke, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Montenegro.
Nominee: Judy Rising Reinke.
Post: Podgorica, Montenegro.
(The following is a list of all members of my immediate family and their spouses. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)
Contributions, amount, date, and donee:
1. Self: none.
2. Spouse: Edwin J. Reinke: $50, 5/5/2015, ActBlue; $50, 2/29/2016, ActBlue.
3. Children and Spouses: Katherine R. Reinke: none.
4. Parents: Harry N. Rising, Jr., deceased; Jeanne K. Rising, deceased.
5. Grandparents: Katherine Schneider, deceased; John W. Schneider, deceased; Margaret M. Reinke, deceased; Edwin J. Reinke, II, deceased.
6. Brothers and Spouses: Harry N. Rising III, none; Rebecca Rising, none.
7. Sisters and Spouses: N/A.

---

*David Hale, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be an Under Secretary of State (Political Affairs).

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Ami J. Abou-Bakr and ending with Emily Yu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 31, 2018.

*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. BROWN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):
S. 3362. A bill to provide grants to communities affected by substance use disorder to enable those communities to plan for and implement full-service community schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. HIRONO, and Ms. STABENOW):
S. 3363. A bill to support States in their work to end preventable morbidity and mortality in maternity care by using evidence-based quality improvement to protect the health of mothers during pregnancy, childbirth, and in the postpartum period and to reduce neonatal and infant mortality, to eliminate racial disparities in maternal health outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:
S. 3364. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a refundable first-time homebuyer tax credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN:
S. 3365. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for middle-income housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):
S. 3366. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to diabetes outpatient self-management training services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE:
S. 3367. A bill to amend certain transportation-related reporting requirements to improve congressional oversight, reduce reporting burdens, and promote transparency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. GRAHAM):
S. 3368. A bill to reduce global fragility and violence by improving the capacity of the United States to reduce and address the causes of violence, instability, and fragility, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:
S. Res. 612. A resolution designating September 2018 as ''National Child Awareness Month'' to promote awareness of charities that benefit children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States and recognizing the efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LEAHY):
S. Res. 613. A resolution requesting a report on the observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedom in Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):
S. Res. 614. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Coya Knutson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JONES, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. REED, and Mr. CORKER):
S. Res. 615. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Aretha Franklin and the contributions of Aretha Franklin to music, civil rights, and the City of Detroit; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional

Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, supra.

S. 974

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 974, a bill to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the timely entry of lower-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products.

S. 1050

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1050, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Chinese-American Veterans of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated service during World War II.

S. 1109

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1109, a bill to amend title VIII of the Public Health Service Act to extend advanced education nursing grants to support clinical nurse specialist programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1437

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1437, a bill to modernize voter registration, promote access to voting for individuals with disabilities, protect the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 1553

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1553, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl analogues as schedule I controlled substances.

S. 2072

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2072, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to take action to eliminate human exposure to asbestos, and for other purposes.

S. 2127

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2127, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States merchant mariners of World War II, in recognition of their dedicated and vital service during World War II.

S. 2221

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2221, a bill to repeal the multi-State plan program.

S. 2823

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2823, a bill to modernize copyright law, and for other purposes.

S. 2990

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2990, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act to further the conservation of prohibited wildlife species.

S. 3029

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3029, a bill to revise and extend the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act (PREEMIE Act).

S. 3140

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3140, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to provide for the establishment of a trust for the benefit of all unpaid cash sellers of livestock, and for other purposes.

S. 3201

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3201, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend certain morale, welfare, and recreation privileges to certain veterans and their caregivers, and for other purposes.

S. 3257

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3257, a bill to impose sanctions on foreign persons responsible for serious violations of international law regarding the protection of civilians during armed conflict, and for other purposes.

S. 3332

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3332, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the inclusion of certain fringe benefit expenses for which a deduction is disallowed in unrelated business taxable income.

S. 3359

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3359, a bill to posthumously award a Congressional Gold Medal to Aretha Franklin in recognition of her contributions of outstanding artistic and historical significance to culture in the United States.

S. RES. 481

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 481, a resolution calling upon the leadership of the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to dismantle its labor camp system, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 525

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 525, a resolution designating September 2018 as National Democracy Month as a time to reflect on the contributions of the system of government of the United States to a more free and stable world.

S. RES. 577

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 577, a resolution strongly recommending that the United States renegotiate the return of the Iraqi Jewish Archive to Iraq.

AMENDMENT NO. 3691

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3691 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3702

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3702 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3704

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3704 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3707

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3707 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3720

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska

(Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3720 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3731

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3731 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3735

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3735 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3751

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3751 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3793

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3793 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3801

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3801 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3802

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3802 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3825

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3825 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3843

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3843 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3857

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3857 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3862

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3862 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3864

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3864 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3869

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 3869 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3871

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3871 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3878

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3878 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3887

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3887 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3893

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3893 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3911

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3911 intended to be proposed to H.R. 6157, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 612—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2018 AS ''NATIONAL CHILD AWARENESS MONTH'' TO PROMOTE AWARENESS OF CHARITIES THAT BENEFIT CHILDREN AND YOUTH-SERVING ORGANIZATIONS THROUGHOUT THE UNITED STATES AND RECOGNIZING THE EFFORTS MADE BY THOSE CHARITIES AND ORGANIZATIONS ON BEHALF OF CHILDREN AND YOUTH AS CRITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 612

Whereas millions of children and youth in the United States represent the hopes and the future of the United States;

Whereas numerous individuals, charities benefitting children, and youth-serving organizations that work with children and youth collaborate to provide invaluable services to enrich and better the lives of children and youth throughout the United States;

Whereas raising awareness of, and increasing support for, organizations that provide access to health care, social services, education, the arts, sports, and other services will result in the development of character in, and the future success of, the children and youth of the United States;

Whereas the month of September, as the school year begins, is a time when parents, families, teachers, school administrators, and communities increase focus on children and youth throughout the United States;

Whereas the month of September is a time for the people of the United States to highlight, and be mindful of, the needs of children and youth;

Whereas private corporations and businesses have joined with hundreds of national and local charitable organizations throughout the United States in support of a month-long focus on children and youth; and

Whereas designating September 2018 as ''National Child Awareness Month'' would recognize that a long-term commitment to children and youth is in the public interest and will encourage widespread support for

charities and organizations that seek to provide a better future for the children and youth of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 2018 as ''National Child Awareness Month''—

(1) to promote awareness of charities that benefit children and youth-serving organizations throughout the United States;

(2) to recognize the efforts made by those charities and organizations on behalf of children and youth as critical contributions to the future of the United States; and

(3) to recognize the importance of meeting the needs of at-risk children and youth, including children and youth who—

(A) have experienced homelessness;

(B) are in the foster care system;

(C) have been victims, or are at risk of becoming victims, of child sex trafficking;

(D) have been impacted by violence;

(E) have experienced trauma; and

(F) have serious physical and mental health needs.

SENATE RESOLUTION 613—REQUESTING A REPORT ON THE OBSERVANCE OF AND RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS AND FUNDAMENTAL FREEDOM IN SAUDI ARABIA

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 613

Whereas, in July 2018, the Government of Saudi Arabia detained prominent women rights activists Samar Badawi and Nassima al-Sada;

Whereas the United States Department of State presented Ms. Badawi with the 2012 International Women of Courage Award in recognition of her efforts with regard to the discriminatory male guardianship system in Saudi Arabia;

Whereas the Department of State has declined to express solidarity with the Government of Canada, which reacted appropriately to news of the detention of Ms. Badawi and Ms. al-Sada in expressing that it was ''gravely concerned about additional arrests of civil society and women's rights activists'' and calling upon ''Saudi authorities to immediately release them and all other peaceful human-rights activists'';

Whereas the Government of Saudi Arabia reacted disproportionately to criticism by the Government of Canada by taking extreme retaliatory measures, including—

(1) expelling the Ambassador of Canada to Saudi Arabia and recalling the Ambassador of Saudi Arabia to Canada;

(2) ordering the return of citizens of Saudi Arabia living in Canada, including more than 1,000 medical students;

(3) shutting off new bilateral trade and investment with Canada; and

(4) terminating direct commercial flights on Saudi Arabian air carriers between Saudi Arabia and Canada;

Whereas Canada is an indispensable ally in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization that shares the commitment of the United States to equal rights and the rule of law and, in defense of shared interests and values, Canada has fought and sacrificed alongside the United States in each of the World Wars and has contributed to Missions of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization in Afghanistan, the Balkans, Libya, and Central and Eastern Europe;

Whereas the arrest of Ms. Badawi and Ms. al-Sada, as well as the ongoing detention of countless others such as blogger Raif Badawi and human rights lawyer Waleed Abu al-Khair, is part of a disturbing pattern of human rights violations committed by the Government of Saudi Arabia, which are documented in more than 50 pages of the 2017 Human Rights Report of the Department of State;

Whereas, among the human rights violations by the Government of Saudi Arabia documented in that report, are unlawful killings, torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, restrictions on freedom of expression, violence and official gender discrimination against women, and criminalization of same-sex sexual activity;

Whereas the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees assesses that airstrikes carried out by Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates in Yemen accounted for 80 percent of all civilian casualties from December 2017 to May 2018 in the 5 governorates of Yemen most affected by fighting; and

Whereas section 502B(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(a)(2)) states that ''no security assistance may be provided to any country the government of which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) it is the sense of the Senate that—

(A) the President should offer public support to Canada by calling upon the Government of Saudi Arabia to release Samar Badawi, Nassima al-Sada, Raif Badawi, Waleed Abu al-Khair, and all other peaceful human rights activists, journalists, and religious minorities held in detention by that Government on dubious charges; and

(B) the arrest of women's rights activists and their supporters since May 2018 is contrary to the stated goals of the Government of Saudi Arabia; and

(2) the Senate requests, pursuant to section 502B(c)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2304(c)(1)), that the Secretary of State submit to Congress a statement, as required by that section, setting forth all the available information about observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedom in Saudi Arabia.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, an unrelenting government crackdown on the women's rights movement is taking place in Saudi Arabia. This is the subject of a Senate resolution, of which I am an original cosponsor, introduced today by Senator MERKLEY.

It is widely known that Saudi Arabia has a long history of subjugating and discriminating against women and girls. Today, despite talk of reform, Saudi authorities continue to arbitrarily arrest and detail women's rights activists and supporters, including Samar Badawi, recipient of the 2012 International Women of Courage Award; Nassima al-Sadah, an Eastern Province activist, and Nouf Abdelaziz, an activist and writer, among others.

The latest crackdown, which began in May, has resulted in the arrest of more than a dozen women's rights activists, with many more also barred from traveling abroad.

Many people erroneously equate the recent lifting of the ban on female drivers in Saudi Arabia as indicative of increased government support for women's rights in the country. To the contrary, the government has arrested some of the same women activists who campaigned for the right to drive only a short time ago.

We and others often deplore the arbitrary arrests, denial of fundamental rights and liberties, and execution of prisoners in Iran for ''crimes'' that would be protected speech under international law; yet, we see similar abuses in Saudi Arabia and the systematic persecution of women by Saudi authorities without a commensurate level of international outcry.

Arbitrary arrests of peaceful activists, regardless of cause or country, is not acceptable. Freedom of speech and peaceful dissent are critical underpinnings of human rights activism around the globe and must be consistently defended. Women's rights are human rights.

I urge all Senators to stand up against attacks of fundamental rights and liberties, in all countries and for all people, including those fighting for the rights of women in Saudi Arabia.

SENATE RESOLUTION 614—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF COYA KNUTSON

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

S. RES. 614

Whereas Cornelia Genevive Gjesdal ''Coya'' Knutson was born on August 22, 1912, in Edmore, North Dakota;

Whereas Coya Gjesdal graduated from Concordia College in Moorhead, Minnesota, with majors in English and Music and a minor in Education;

Whereas Coya Gjesdal married Andy Knutson in 1940 and later adopted a son;

Whereas Coya Knutson was involved in her community, working as a teacher, volunteering, establishing a medical clinic, and serving on the Red Lake County Welfare Board;

Whereas Coya Knutson was elected to the House of Representatives of Minnesota in 1950;

Whereas State Representative Knutson supported health and education initiatives and sponsored the first clean air bill in Minnesota, which prohibited smoking in some public places;

Whereas, in 1954, Coya Knutson won a seat in the House of Representatives of the United States, despite having lost the nomination of her party to a man;

Whereas Coya Knutson became the first woman elected to Congress from Minnesota;

Whereas Congresswoman Knutson became the first woman to be appointed to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Congresswoman Knutson sponsored legislation that eventually led to expanded school lunch assistance, the first Federal student loan program, and the first appropriations for research on cystic fibrosis;

Whereas Congresswoman Knutson's husband did not support her career and reportedly wrote a public letter in 1958 ordering her to return to Minnesota to ''make a home for [her] son and husband'';

Whereas the story of the letter was taken up by the national press, with newspapers

across the United States running the headline ''Coya, Come Home'';

Whereas Coya Knutson lost reelection in 1958 to a man whose campaign slogan was ''A Big Man for a Man-Sized Job'';

Whereas Coya Knutson eventually divorced her husband, moved permanently to Washington, D.C., and was appointed by President Kennedy to be the liaison officer in the Office of Civil Defense at the Department of Defense, where she served until 1970;

Whereas Coya Knutson retired from politics and moved back to Minnesota to live with her son and his family until her death in 1996 at 82 years of age; and

Whereas Coya Knutson was a trailblazer and an inspiration who was devoted to her community, State, and country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate honors the life and legacy of Coya Knutson, whose dedication to overcoming exceptional odds and devotion to the well-being of the United States shall serve as an inspiration for generations of individuals in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 615—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ARETHA FRANKLIN AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ARETHA FRANKLIN TO MUSIC, CIVIL RIGHTS, AND THE CITY OF DETROIT

Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JONES, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. WARREN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DONNELLY, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. REED, and Mr. CORKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 615

Whereas Aretha Franklin was born on March 25, 1942, in Memphis, Tennessee;

Whereas Aretha Franklin moved to Detroit, Michigan, in 1946, at the age of 4;

Whereas Aretha Franklin began a career singing gospel at the New Bethel Baptist Church in Detroit, Michigan;

Whereas Aretha Franklin traveled with Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., across the country as Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., preached nonviolence in the movement for civil rights;

Whereas Aretha Franklin was an active supporter of the civil rights movement and her song ''Respect'' became an anthem for the civil rights movement and the women's movement;

Whereas Aretha Franklin is most known for her powerful songs such as ''Respect'', ''(You Make Me Feel Like) A Natural Woman'', ''Spanish Harlem'', and ''Think'';

Whereas Aretha Franklin was known as the ''Queen of Soul'' and on January 3, 1987, became the first woman inducted into the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame;

Whereas Aretha Franklin has won 18 Grammy Awards and sold over 75,000,000 records worldwide;

Whereas Aretha Franklin was inducted into the Michigan Women's Hall of Fame in 2001, the United Kingdom's Music Hall of Fame in 2005, and the Gospel Music Association's Gospel Music Hall of Fame in 2012;

Whereas in June 2017 the City of Detroit honored Aretha Franklin with a key to the City and renamed a segment of Madison Avenue in downtown Detroit ''Aretha Franklin Way'';

Whereas Aretha Franklin was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom on November 9, 2005;

Whereas Aretha Franklin received honorary degrees for her contributions to the arts from Harvard University, Princeton University, Yale University, Brown University, Berklee College of Music, the New England Conservatory of Music, University of Michigan, Wayne State University, and Bethune-Cookman College;

Whereas Aretha Franklin inspired a generation of artists and enthralled the world with powerful music; and

Whereas Aretha Franklin passed away on August 16, 2018, at the age of 76 at her home in Bloomfield Hills, Michigan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate celebrates the life and legacy of Aretha Franklin and the iconic contributions of Aretha Franklin to music, arts, and civil rights.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 3928. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3929. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3930. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3931. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3932. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3933. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3934. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3935. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3936. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3937. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3938. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3939. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3940. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3941. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3942. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3943. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3944. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3945. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3946. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3947. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3948. Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3949. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3950. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3951. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3952. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3953. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3954. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr . MURPHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms . SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms.

WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3955. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3956. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3957. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3958. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3959. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3960. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3961. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3962. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3963. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3964. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3965. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3966. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3967. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3968. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3969. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3970. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3971. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3972. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3973. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3974. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3975. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3976. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3977. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3978. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3979. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3980. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3981. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3982. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3983. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3984. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3985. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3986. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3987. Mr. SASSE (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3988. Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3989. Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3990. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3699 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SHELBY) to the amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3991. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3992. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3993. Mr. LEAHY proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3699 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SHELBY) to the amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra.

SA 3994. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3995. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3996. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3997. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3998. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3999. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4000. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 4001. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr . MARKEY)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1322, to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants, and for other purposes.

SA 4002. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1142, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

SA 4003. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 3928. Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be used to grant, deny, or revoke access, or eligibility for access, to classified information except in compliance with the Constitution of the United States and in accordance with the processes and procedures under—

(1) Executive Orders 12968 and 13467, as such Executive Orders were in effect on August 15, 2018;

(2) part 147 of title 32, Code of Federal Regulations, as such part was in effect on August 15, 2018; and

(3) applicable department and agency regulations that govern access to classified information and due process requirements.

SA 3929. Mr. MERKLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, or by any other Act, may be obligated or expended to construct or operate any Family Residential Center or other family detention center or facility for immigrants.

SA 3930. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall utilize $5,000,000 of amount appropriated under this title to establish an emergency fund to be available for purchases of the overdose reversal drug, naloxone by States that are at risk for exhausting State resources for such purchases.

SA 3931. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 254, line 5, strike ''funds'' and all that follows through ''specified,'' on line 7, and insert ''$2,000,000,000 to the accounts specified under section 4002 of the ACA''.

SA 3932. Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 219, line 22, strike ''$334,000,000'' and insert ''$454,000,000''.

SA 3933. Ms. HEITKAMP (for herself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. From amounts appropriated under this title, under the heading ''Maternal and Child Health'', up to $1,000,000 shall be used for awarding grants for the purchase and implementation of telehealth services, including pilots and demonstrations for the use of electronic health records or other necessary technology and equipment (including ultra sound machines or other technology and equipment that is useful for caring for pregnant women) to coordinate obstetric care between pregnant women living in rural areas and obstetric care providers.

SA 3934. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title III of this division for procurement may be used to procure BLU–137 ordnance until the Secretary of Defense submits to the congressional defense committees a written certification that—

(1) the bid contract for procurement of such ordnance has been awarded to the lowest bidders;

(2) the bid contract for procurement of such ordnance has been awarded to two or more offerors in order to maintain price competition and assured supply for all future task orders under the contract.; and

(3) no awardee is under the ownership, control, or influence of—

(A) any foreign person; or

(B) any individual subject to sanctions by the United States.

SA 3935. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be used to procure any oil products from any refinery that currently receives more than 20 percent of its crude oil from Russia.

SA 3936. Mr. TOOMEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be used for the planning, design, or construction of electric or heat generation, or for obtaining electric or heating services, for medical facilities at military installations in Germany if the fuel used for such generation is only natural gas.

SA 3937. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. HHS STUDY AND REPORT ON REDUCING IMPROPER MEDICAID PAYMENTS.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study on ways to improve the data sharing between the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services and the Social Security Administration in order to reduce improper payments under the Medicaid program.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Secretary determines appropriate.

(c) WITHHOLD OF FUNDS UNTIL STUDY INITIATED.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Secretary of Health and Human Services under this division may be obligated or expended until the Secretary initiates the study under subsection (a).

SA 3938. Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCAIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION C—DEFENDING AMERICAN SECURITY FROM KREMLIN AGGRESSION

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This division may be cited as the ''Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this division is as follows:

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President should immediately marshal and support a whole-of-government response by Federal agencies to address the threat posed by the Government of the Russian Federation and to work to prevent interference by that Government and other foreign state actors in United States institutions and democratic processes;

(2) the President should publicly call for the Government of the Russian Federation to return Crimea to the control of the Government of Ukraine, end its support for separatist violence in eastern Ukraine, end its occupation of and support for separatists on the territory of Georgia and Moldova, and cease enabling the brutal regime of Bashar al-Assad in Syria to commit war crimes;

(3) the President should unequivocally condemn and counter the ongoing interference in United States institutions and democratic processes by the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, his government, and affiliates of his government;

(4) the conclusion of the United States intelligence community and law enforcement agencies and other United States Government officials that the Russian Federation has perpetrated, and continues to perpetrate, such interference, is correct;

(5) the United States should continue to participate actively as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization by—

(A) upholding the Organization's core principles of collective defense, democratic rule of law, and peaceful settlement of disputes;

(B) boosting coordination and deterrence capacity among member countries; and

(C) supporting accession processes of prospective member countries who meet the obligations of membership.

(6) Congress reiterates its strong support for the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 9511), which allows for congressional review of an action to waive the application of sanctions under the provisions of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44; 131 Stat. 886) relating to the Russian Federation or a licensing action that significantly alters United States foreign policy with regard to the Russian Federation; and

(7) sanctions imposed with respect to the Russian Federation have been most effective when developed and coordinated in close consultation with the European Union.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON CRIMEA.

It is the policy of the Unites States that—

(1) the United States will never recognize the illegal annexation of Crimea by the Russian Federation, similar to the 1940 Welles Declaration in which the United States refused to recognized the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States;

(2) Crimea is part of the sovereign territory of Ukraine;

(3) Crimea is part of Ukraine and the United States rejects attempts to change the status, demographics, or political nature of Crimea;

(4) the United States reaffirms its unwavering support for democracy, human rights, and the rule of law for all individuals in Crimea, including non-Russian ethnic groups and religious minorities;

(5) the United States condemns all human rights violations against individuals in Crimea, and underscores the culpability of the Government of the Russian Federation for such violations while the territory of Crimea is under illegal Russian occupation;

(6) the United States, in coordination with the European Union, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and members of the international community, should prioritize efforts to prevent the further consolidation of illegal occupying powers in Crimea, reaffirm unified opposition to the actions of the Russian Federation in Crimea, and secure the human rights of individuals there; and

(7) the United States welcomes the sanctions that have been imposed and maintained as of the date of the enactment of this Act by the United States and the European Union against persons engaged in furthering the illegal occupation of Crimea by the Russian Federation.

TITLE I—MATTERS RELATING TO NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Subtitle A—Opposition of the Senate to Withdrawal From NATO

SEC. 101. OPPOSITION OF THE SENATE TO WITHDRAWAL FROM NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY.

The Senate opposes any effort to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington, D.C., April 4, 1949.

SEC. 102. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.

No funds authorized or appropriated by any Act may be used to support, directly or indirectly, any efforts on the part of any United States Government official to take steps to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington, D.C., April 4, 1949, until such time as the Senate passes, by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of Members, a resolution advising and consenting to the withdrawal of the United States from the treaty.

SEC. 103. AUTHORIZATION FOR SENATE LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT SENATE IN OPPOSITION TO WITHDRAWAL FROM THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY.

The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the Senate in initiating or intervening in any judicial proceedings in any Federal court of competent jurisdiction, on behalf of the Senate, in order to oppose any withdrawal of the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty in the absence of the passage by the Senate of a resolution described in section 102.

SEC. 104. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

The Senate Legal Counsel shall report as soon as practicable to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate with respect to any judicial proceedings which the Senate Legal Counsel initiates or in which it intervenes pursuant to this title.

Subtitle B—Strengthening the NATO Alliance

SEC. 111. REPORT ON NATO ALLIANCE RESILIENCE AND UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC POSTURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees providing an assessment of the threats and challenges facing the NATO alliance and United States diplomatic posture.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A review of current and emerging United States national security interests in the NATO area of responsibility.

(2) A review of current United States political and diplomatic engagement and political-military coordination with NATO and NATO member states.

(3) Options for the realignment of United States engagement with NATO to respond to new threats and challenges presented by the Government of the Russian Federation to the NATO alliance, as well as new opportunities presented by allies and partners.

(4) The views of counterpart governments, including heads of state, heads of government, political leaders, and military commanders in the region.

SEC. 112. EXPEDITED NATO EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES TRANSFER PROGRAM.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report with recommendations regarding the need for and suitability of transferring excess defense articles under this section to countries in the NATO alliance, with particular emphasis on the foreign policy benefits as it pertains to those member states currently purchasing defense articles or services from the Russian Federation.

(b) PERIOD FOR REVIEW BY CONGRESS OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR EDA TRANSFER TO NATO MEMBERS.—During the 30-calendar day period following submission by the Secretary of Defense of the report required under subsection (a), the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review the recommendations included in the report.

(c) TRANSFER AUTHORITY.—The President is authorized to transfer such excess defense articles in a fiscal year as the Secretary of Defense recommends pursuant to this section to countries for which receipt of such articles was justified pursuant to the annual congressional presentation documents for military assistance programs, or for which receipt of such articles was separately justified to Congress, for such fiscal year.

(d) LIMITATIONS ON TRANSFERS.—The President may transfer excess defense articles under this section only if—

(1) such articles are drawn from existing stocks of the Department of Defense;

(2) funds available to the Department of Defense for the procurement of defense equipment are not expended in connection with the transfer;

(3) the President determines that the transfer of such articles will not have an adverse impact on the military readiness of the United States;

(4) with respect to a proposed transfer of such articles on a grant basis, the President determines that the transfer is preferable to a transfer on a sales basis, after taking into account the potential proceeds from, and likelihood of, such sales, and the comparative foreign policy benefits that may accrue to the United States as the result of a transfer on either a grant or sales basis; and

(5) the President determines that the transfer of such articles will not have an adverse impact on the national technology and industrial base and, particularly, will not reduce the opportunities of entities in the national technology and industrial base to sell new or used equipment to the countries to which such articles are transferred.

(e) TERMS OF TRANSFERS.—

(1) NO COST TO RECIPIENT COUNTRY.—Excess defense articles may be transferred under this section without cost to the recipient country.

(2) PRIORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the delivery of excess defense articles under this section to member countries of NATO that still purchase defense goods and services from the Russian Federation and pledge to decrease such purchases shall be given priority to the maximum extent feasible over the delivery of such excess defense articles to other countries.

(3) TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED COSTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), funds available to the Department of Defense may not be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of this section.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The President may provide for the transportation of excess defense articles without charge to a country for the costs of such transportation if—

(i) it is determined that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so;

(ii) the recipient is a NATO member state currently purchasing defense goods and services from the Russian Federation that has pledged to reduce such purchases;

(iii) the total weight of the transfer does not exceed 50,000 pounds; and

(iv) such transportation is accomplished on a space available basis.

SEC. 113. APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

TITLE II—MATTERS RELATING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Subtitle A—Public Diplomacy Modernization

SEC. 201. AVOIDING DUPLICATION OF PROGRAMS AND EFFORTS.

The Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs of the Department of State shall—

(1) identify opportunities for greater efficiency of operations, including through improved coordination of efforts across public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department; and

(2) maximize shared use of resources between, and within, such public diplomacy bureaus and offices in cases in which programs, facilities, or administrative functions are duplicative or substantially overlapping.

SEC. 202. IMPROVING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION OF PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall—

(1) conduct regular research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities of the Department, including through the routine use of audience research, digital analytics, and impact evaluations, to plan and execute such programs and activities; and

(2) make the findings of the research and evaluations conducted under paragraph (1) available to Congress.

(b) DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall appoint a Director of Research and Evaluation in the Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources for the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT.—The appointment of a Director of Research and Evaluation pursuant to paragraph (1) shall not result in an increase in the overall full-time equivalent positions within the Department.

(3) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Director of Research and Evaluation shall—

(A) coordinate and oversee the research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs of the Department of State—

(i) to improve public diplomacy strategies and tactics; and

(ii) to ensure that programs are increasing the knowledge, understanding, and trust of the United States amon relevant target audiences;

(B) report to the Director of Policy and Planning in the Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources under the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs of the Department;

(C) routinely organize and oversee audience research, digital analytics, and impact evaluations across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department;

(D) support embassy public affairs sections;

(E) share appropriate public diplomacy research and evaluation information within the Department and with other Federal departments and agencies;

(F) regularly design and coordinate standardized research questions, methodologies, and procedures to ensure that public diplomacy activities across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices are designed to meet appropriate foreign policy objectives; and

(G) report biannually to the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy, through the Commission's Subcommittee on Research and Evaluation established pursuant to subsection (f), regarding the research and evaluation of all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(4) GUIDANCE AND TRAINING.—Not later than one year after the appointment of the Director of Research and Evaluation pursuant to paragraph (1), the Director shall create guidance and training for all public diplomacy officers regarding the reading and interpretation of public diplomacy program evaluation findings to ensure that such findings and lessons learned are implemented in the planning and evaluation of all public diplomacy programs and activities throughout the Department.

(c) PRIORITIZING RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of Policy, Planning, and Resources shall ensure that research and evaluation, as coordinated and overseen by the Director of Research and Evaluation, supports strategic planning and resource allocation across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(2) ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES.—Amounts allocated for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy programs and activities pursuant to subsection (a) shall be made available to be disbursed at the direction of the Director of Research and Evaluation among the research and evaluation staff across all public diplomacy bureaus and offices of the Department.

(3) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs of the Department of State should coordinate the human and financial resources that support the Department's public diplomacy and public affairs programs and activities;

(B) proposals or plans related to resource allocations for public diplomacy bureaus and offices should be routed through the Office of the Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy and Public Affairs for review and clearance; and

(C) the Department should allocate, for the purposes of research and evaluation of public diplomacy activities and programs pursuant to subsection (a)—

(i) 3 to 5 percent of program funds made available under the heading ''EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS''; and

(ii) 3 to 5 percent of program funds allocated for public diplomacy programs under the heading ''DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR PROGRAMS''.

(d) LIMITED EXEMPTION.—Chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act'') shall not apply to collections of information directed at foreign individuals conducted by, or on behalf of, the Department of State for the purpose of audience research, monitoring, and evaluations, and in connection with the Department's activities conducted pursuant to the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.), the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2451 et seq.), section 1287 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note), or the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.).

(e) LIMITED EXEMPTION TO THE PRIVACY ACT.—The Department shall maintain, collect, use, and disseminate records (as such term is defined in section 552a(a)(4) of title 5, United States Code) for research and data analysis of public diplomacy efforts intended for foreign audiences. Such research and data analysis shall be reasonably tailored to meet the purposes of this subsection and shall be carried out with due regard for privacy and civil liberties guidance and oversight.

(f) ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY.—

(1) SUBCOMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH AND EVALUATION.—The Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy shall establish a Subcommittee for Research and Evaluation to monitor and advise on the research and evaluation activities of the Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors.

(2) REPORT.—The Subcommittee for Research and Evaluation established pursuant to paragraph (1) shall submit an annual report to Congress in conjunction with the Commission on Public Diplomacy's Comprehensive Annual Report on the performance of the Department and the Broadcasting Board of Governors in carrying out research and evaluations of their respective public diplomacy programming.

(3) REPEAL OF SUNSET.—Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) is hereby repealed.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AUDIENCE RESEARCH.—The term ''audience research'' means research conducted at the outset of a public diplomacy program or campaign planning and design on specific audience segments to understand the attitudes, interests, knowledge, and behaviors of such audience segments.

(2) DIGITAL ANALYTICS.—The term ''digital analytics'' means the analysis of qualitative and quantitative data, accumulated in digital format, to indicate the outputs and outcomes of a public diplomacy program or campaign.

(3) IMPACT EVALUATION.—The term ''impact evaluation'' means an assessment of the changes in the audience targeted by a public diplomacy program or campaign that can be attributed to such program or campaign.

(4) PUBLIC DIPLOMACY BUREAUS AND OFFICES.—The term ''public diplomacy bureaus and offices'' means the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, the Bureau of Public Affairs, the Bureau of International Information Programs, the Office of Policy, Planning, and Resources, the Global Engagement Center, and the public diplomacy functions within the regional and functional bureaus.

Subtitle B—Other Matters

SEC. 211. DEPARTMENT OF STATE RESPONSIBILITIES WITH RESPECT TO CYBERSPACE POLICY.

(a) OFFICE OF CYBERSPACE AND THE DIGITAL ECONOMY.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (g) as subsection (h); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (f) the following:

''(g) OFFICE OF CYBERSPACE AND THE DIGITAL ECONOMY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established, within the Department of State, an Office of Cyberspace and the Digital Economy (referred to in this subsection as the 'Office'). The head of the Office shall have the rank and status of ambassador and shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

''(2) DUTIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of the Office shall perform such duties and exercise such powers as the Secretary of State shall prescribe, including implementing the United States international cyberspace policy strategy issued by the Department of State in March 2016 pursuant to section 402 of the Cybersecurity Act of 2015 (division N of Public Law 114–113; 129 Stat. 2978).

''(B) DUTIES DESCRIBED.—The principal duties and responsibilities of the head of the Office shall be—

''(i) to serve as the principal cyber policy official within the senior management of the Department of State and as the advisor to the Secretary of State for cyber issues;

''(ii) to lead the Department of State's diplomatic cyberspace efforts, including efforts relating to international cybersecurity, Internet access, Internet freedom, digital economy, cybercrime, deterrence and international responses to cyber threats, and other issues that the Secretary assigns to the Office;

''(iii) to promote an open, interoperable, reliable, unfettered, and secure information and communications technology infrastructure globally;

''(iv) to represent the Secretary of State in interagency efforts to develop and advance cyberspace policy described in subparagraph (A);

''(v) to coordinate cyberspace efforts and other relevant functions, including countering terrorists' use of cyberspace, within the Department of State and with other components of the United States Government;

''(vi) to act as a liaison to public and private sector entities on relevant cyberspace issues;

''(vii) to lead United States Government efforts to establish a global deterrence framework;

''(viii) to develop and execute adversary-specific strategies to influence adversary decisionmaking through the imposition of costs and deterrence strategies;

''(ix) to advise the Secretary and coordinate with foreign governments on external responses to national security level cyber incidents, including coordination on diplomatic response efforts to support allies threatened by malicious cyber activity, in conjunction with members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and other like-minded countries;

''(x) to promote the adoption of national processes and programs that enable threat detection, prevention, and response to malicious cyber activity emanating from the territory of a foreign country, including as such activity relates to the United States' European allies, as appropriate;

''(xi) to promote the building of foreign capacity to protect the global network with the goal of enabling like-minded participation in deterrence frameworks;

''(xii) to promote the maintenance of an open and interoperable Internet governed by the multi-stakeholder model, instead of by centralized government control;

''(xiii) to promote an international regulatory environment for technology investments and the Internet that benefits United States economic and national security interests;

''(xiv) to promote cross border flow of data and combat international initiatives seeking to impose unreasonable requirements on United States businesses;

''(xv) to promote international policies to protect the integrity of United States and international telecommunications infrastructure from foreign-based, cyber-enabled threats;

''(xvi) to serve as the interagency coordinator for the United States Government on engagement with foreign governments on

cyberspace and digital economy issues described in the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018;

''(xvii) to promote international policies to secure radio frequency spectrum for United States businesses and national security needs;

''(xviii) to promote and protect the exercise of human rights, including freedom of speech and religion, through the Internet;

''(xix) to build capacity of United States diplomatic officials to engage on cyber issues;

''(xx) to encourage the development and adoption by foreign countries of internationally recognized standards, policies, and best practices; and

''(xxi) to promote and advance international policies that protect individuals' private data.

''(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—The head of the Office should be an individual of demonstrated competency in the fields of—

''(A) cybersecurity and other relevant cyber issues; and

''(B) international diplomacy.

''(4) ORGANIZATIONAL PLACEMENT.—

''(A) INITIAL PLACEMENT.—During the 4-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018, the head of the Office shall report to the Under Secretary for Political Affairs or to an official holding a higher position than the Under Secretary for Political Affairs in the Department of State.

''(B) SUBSEQUENT PLACEMENT.—After the conclusion of the 4-year period referred to in subparagraph (A), the head of the Office shall report to—

''(i) an appropriate Under Secretary; or

''(ii) an official holding a higher position than Under Secretary.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to preclude—

''(A) the Office from being elevated to a Bureau within the Department of State; or

''(B) the head of the Office from being elevated to an Assistant Secretary, if such an Assistant Secretary position does not increase the number of Assistant Secretary positions at the Department above the number authorized under subsection (c)(1).''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Office of Cyberspace and the Digital Economy established under section 1(g) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956, as added by subsection (a)—

(1) should be a Bureau of the Department of State headed by an Assistant Secretary, subject to the rule of construction specified in paragraph (5)(B) of such section 1(g); and

(2) should coordinate with other bureaus of the Department of State and use all tools at the disposal of the Office to combat activities taken by the Russian Federation, or on behalf of the Russian Federation, to undermine the cybersecurity and democratic values of the United States and other nations.

(c) UNITED NATIONS.—The Permanent Representative of the United States to the United Nations should use the voice, vote, and influence of the United States to oppose any measure that is inconsistent with the United States international cyberspace policy strategy issued by the Department of State in March 2016 pursuant to section 402 of the Cybersecurity Act of 2015 (division N of Public Law 114–113; 129 Stat. 2978).

SEC. 212. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Broadcasting Board of Governors and its grantee networks have a critical mission to inform, engage, and connect people around the world in support of freedom and democracy; and

(2) those networks must adhere to professional journalistic standards and integrity and not engage in disinformation activities.

TITLE III—CHEMICAL WEAPONS NONPROLIFERATION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Chemical Weapons Nonproliferation Act of 2018''.

SEC. 302. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The international norm against the use of chemical weapons has severely eroded since 2012. At least 4 actors between 2012 and the date of the enactment of this Act have used chemical weapons: Syria, North Korea, the Russian Federation, and the Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant in Iraq and Syria.

(2) On March 4, 2018, the Government of the Russian Federation knowingly used novichok, a lethal chemical agent, in an attempt to kill former Russian military intelligence officer Sergei Skripal and his daughter Yulia, in Salisbury, United Kingdom.

(3) On June 27, 2018, the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (in this title referred to as the ''OPCW''), during its Fourth Special Session of the Conference of the States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention, voted favorably in adopting a decision to ''put in place arrangements to identify the perpetrators of the use of chemical weapons in the Syrian Arab Republic by identifying and reporting on all information potentially relevant to the origin of those chemical weapons in those instances in which the OPCW Fact-Finding Mission in Syria determines or has determined that use or likely use occurred, and cases for which the OPCW–UN Joint Investigative Mechanism has not issued a report; and decide[d] also that the Secretariat shall provide regular reports on its investigations to the Council and to the United Nations Secretary-General for their consideration''.

(4) The Government of the Russian Federation attempted to impede the adoption of the identification mechanism in the Fourth Special Session of the Conference of the States Parties to the Chemical Weapons Convention, and has repeatedly worked to degrade the OPCW's ability to identify chemical weapons users.

(5) The Government of the Russian Federation has shown itself to be unwilling or incapable of compelling the President of Syria, Bashar al-Assad, an ally of the Russian Federation, to stop using chemical weapons against the civilian population in Syria.

(6) The United States remains steadfast in its commitment to its key ally the United Kingdom, its commitment to the mutual defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and its commitment to the Chemical Weapons Convention.

(7) Thirty-four countries, including the United States, have joined the International Partnership against Impunity for the use of Chemical Weapons, which represents a political commitment by participating countries to hold to account persons responsible for the use of chemical weapons.

SEC. 303. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It shall be the policy of the United States—

(1) to protect and defend the interests of the United States, allies of the United States, and the international community at large from the continuing threat of chemical weapons and their proliferation;

(2) to maintain a steadfast commitment to the Chemical Weapons Convention and the OPCW;

(3) to promote and strengthen the investigative and identification mechanisms of the OPCW through the provision of additional resources and technical equipment to better allow the OPCW to detect, identify, and attribute chemical weapons attacks;

(4) to pressure the Government of the Russian Federation to halt its efforts to degrade the international efforts of the United Nations and the OPCW to investigate chemical weapons attacks and to designate perpetrators of such attacks by—

(A) highlighting within international fora, including the United Nations General Assembly and the OPCW, the repeated efforts of the Government of the Russian Federation to degrade international efforts to investigate chemical weapons attacks; and

(B) consulting with allies and partners of the United States with respect to methods for strengthening the investigative mechanisms of the OPCW;

(5) to examine additional avenues for investigating, identifying, and holding accountable chemical weapons users if the Government of the Russian Federation continues in its attempts to block or hinder investigations of the OPCW; and

(6) to punish the Government of the Russian Federation for, and deter that Government from, any chemical weapons production and use through the imposition of sanctions, diplomatic isolation, and the use of the mechanisms specified in the Chemical Weapons Convention for violations of the Convention.

SEC. 304. REPORT ON USE OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Legal Adviser of the Department of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report that includes an assessment of—

(1) whether the certification of the noncompliance of the Russian Federation with the Chemical Weapons Convention in the report of the Department of State entitled ''Adherence to and Compliance with Arms Control, Nonproliferation, and Disarmament Agreements and Commitments'', submitted to Congress pursuant to section 403 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act (22 U.S.C. 2593a), and dated April 2018, is a legal determination of the use of chemical weapons by the Government of the Russian Federation;

(2) whether the mandatory sanctions required by the Chemical and Biological Weapons and Warfare Elimination Act of 1991 (22 U.S.C. 5601 et seq.) have been imposed with respect to the Russian Federation; and

(3) whether the Government of the Russian Federation has taken any steps to avoid additional sanctions required by that Act within the 3-month period specified in section 307(b)(1) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 5605(b)(1)) after a determination of the use of chemical weapons under section 306(a)(1) of that Act (22 U.S.C. 5604(a)(1)).

SEC. 305. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State $30,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2019 through 2023, to be provided to the OPCW as a voluntary contribution pursuant to section 301(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2221(a)) for the purpose of strengthening the OPCW's investigative and identification mechanisms for chemical weapons attacks.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts authorized to be appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 306. CHEMICAL WEAPONS CONVENTION DEFINED.

In this title, the term ''Chemical Weapons Convention'' means the Convention on the

Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, done at Geneva September 3, 1992, and entered into force April 29, 1997.

TITLE IV—INTERNATIONAL CYBERCRIME PREVENTION ACT

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''International Cybercrime Prevention Act''.

SEC. 402. PREDICATE OFFENSES.

Part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1956(c)(7)(D)—

(A) by striking ''or section 2339D'' and inserting ''section 2339D''; and

(B) by striking ''of this title, section 46502'' and inserting '', or section 2512 (relating to the manufacture, distribution, possession, and advertising of wire, oral, or electronic communication intercepting devices) of this title, section 46502''; and

(2) in section 1961(1), by inserting ''section 1030 (relating to fraud and related activity in connection with computers) if the act indictable under section 1030 is felonious,'' before ''section 1084''.

SEC. 403. FORFEITURE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2513 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 2513. Confiscation of wire, oral, or electronic communication intercepting devices and other property

''(a) CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The court, in imposing a sentence on any person convicted of a violation of section 2511 or 2512, or convicted of conspiracy to violate section 2511 or 2512, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed and irrespective of any provision of State law, that such person forfeit to the United States—

''(A) such person's interest in any property, real or personal, that was used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate the commission of such violation; and

''(B) any property, real or personal, constituting or derived from any gross proceeds, or any property traceable to such property, that such person obtained or retained directly or indirectly as a result of such violation.

''(2) FORFEITURE PROCEDURES.—Pursuant to section 2461(c) of title 28, the provisions of section 413 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853), other than subsection (d) thereof, shall apply to criminal forfeitures under this subsection.

''(b) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The following shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States in accordance with provisions of chapter 46 and no property right shall exist in them:

''(A) Any property, real or personal, used or intended to be used, in any manner, to commit, or facilitate the commission of a violation of section 2511 or 2512, or a conspiracy to violate section 2511 or 2512.

''(B) Any property, real or personal, constituting, or traceable to the gross proceeds taken, obtained, or retained in connection with or as a result of a violation of section 2511 or 2512, or a conspiracy to violate section 2511 or 2512.

''(2) FORFEITURE PROCEDURES.—Seizures and forfeitures under this subsection shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46, relating to civil forfeitures, except that such duties as are imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in section 981(d) shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 119 is amended by striking the item relating to section 2513 and inserting the following:

''2513. Confiscation of wire, oral, or electronic communication intercepting devices and other property.''.

SEC. 404. SHUTTING DOWN BOTNETS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1345 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting ''**and abuse**'' after ''**fraud**'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting ''or'' after the semicolon; and

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

''(D) violating or about to violate section 1030(a)(5) of this title where such conduct has caused or would cause damage (as defined in section 1030) without authorization to 100 or more protected computers (as defined in section 1030) during any 1-year period, including by—

''(i) impairing the availability or integrity of the protected computers without authorization; or

''(ii) installing or maintaining control over malicious software on the protected computers that, without authorization, has caused or would cause damage to the protected computers;''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', a violation described in subsection (a)(1)(D),'' before ''or a Federal''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) A restraining order, prohibition, or other action described in subsection (b), if issued in circumstances described in subsection (a)(1)(D), may, upon application of the Attorney General—

''(1) specify that no cause of action shall lie in any court against a person for complying with the restraining order, prohibition, or other action; and

''(2) provide that the United States shall pay to such person a fee for reimbursement for such costs as are reasonably necessary and which have been directly incurred in complying with the restraining order, prohibition, or other action.''.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1345 and inserting the following:

''1345. Injunctions against fraud and abuse.''.

SEC. 405. AGGRAVATED DAMAGE TO A CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE COMPUTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1030 the following:

''§ 1030A. Aggravated damage to a critical infrastructure computer

''(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful, during and in relation to a felony violation of section 1030, to knowingly cause or attempt to cause damage to a critical infrastructure computer, if such damage results in (or, in the case of an attempted offense, would, if completed, have resulted in) the substantial impairment—

''(1) of the operation of the critical infrastructure computer; or

''(2) of the critical infrastructure associated with such computer.

''(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall, in addition to the term of punishment provided for the felony violation of section 1030, be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

''(c) CONSECUTIVE SENTENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

''(1) a court shall not place any person convicted of a violation of this section on probation;

''(2) except as provided in paragraph (4), no term of imprisonment imposed on a person under this section shall run concurrently with any term of imprisonment imposed on the person under any other provision of law, including any term of imprisonment imposed for the felony violation of section 1030;

''(3) in determining any term of imprisonment to be imposed for the felony violation of section 1030, a court shall not in any way reduce the term to be imposed for such violation to compensate for, or otherwise take into account, any separate term of imprisonment imposed or to be imposed for a violation of this section; and

''(4) a term of imprisonment imposed on a person for a violation of this section may, in the discretion of the court, run concurrently, in whole or in part, only with another term of imprisonment that is imposed by the court at the same time on that person for an additional violation of this section, if such discretion shall be exercised in accordance with any applicable guidelines and policy statements issued by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994 of title 28.

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the terms 'computer' and 'damage' have the meanings given the terms in section 1030; and

''(2) the term 'critical infrastructure' means systems and assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that the incapacity or destruction of such systems and assets would have catastrophic regional or national effects on public health or safety, economic security, or national security, including voter registration databases, voting machines, and other communications systems that manage the election process or report and display results on behalf of State and local governments.''.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1030 the following:

''1030A. Aggravated damage to a critical infrastructure computer.''.

SEC. 406. STOPPING TRAFFICKING IN BOTNETS; FORFEITURE.

Section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (7), by adding ''or'' at the end; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) intentionally traffics in the means of access to a protected computer, if—

''(A) the trafficker knows or has reason to know the protected computer has been damaged in a manner prohibited by this section; and

''(B) the promise or agreement to pay for the means of access is made by, or on behalf of, a person the trafficker knows or has reason to know intends to use the means of access to—

''(i) damage a protected computer in a manner prohibited by this section; or

''(ii) violate section 1037 or 1343;'';

(2) in subsection (c)(3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''(a)(4) or (a)(7)'' and inserting ''(a)(4), (a)(7), or (a)(8)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''(a)(4), or (a)(7)'' and inserting ''(a)(4), (a)(7), or (a)(8)''; and

(3) in subsection (e)—

(A) in paragraph (11), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) the term 'traffic', except as provided in subsection (a)(6), means transfer, or otherwise dispose of, to another as consideration for the receipt of, or as consideration for a promise or agreement to pay, anything of pecuniary value.'';

(4) in subsection (g), in the first sentence, by inserting '', except for a violation of subsection (a)(8),'' after ''of this section''; and

(5) by striking subsections (i) and (j) and inserting the following:

''(i) CRIMINAL FORFEITURE.—

''(1) The court, in imposing sentence on any person convicted of a violation of this section, or convicted of conspiracy to violate this section, shall order, in addition to any other sentence imposed and irrespective of any provision of State law, that such person forfeit to the United States—

''(A) such person's interest in any property, real or personal, that was used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate the commission of such violation; and

''(B) any property, real or personal, constituting or derived from any gross proceeds, or any property traceable to such property, that such person obtained, directly or indirectly, as a result of such violation.

''(2) The criminal forfeiture of property under this subsection, including any seizure and disposition of the property, and any related judicial or administrative proceeding, shall be governed by the provisions of section 413 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 853), except subsection (d) of that section.

''(j) CIVIL FORFEITURE OF PROPERTY USED IN THE COMMISSION OF AN OFFENSE.—

''(1) Any personal property, including any Internet domain name or Internet Protocol address, that was used or intended to be used to commit or to facilitate the commission of any violation of this section, or a conspiracy to violate this section shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States, and no property right shall exist in such property.

''(2) Seizures and forfeitures under this subsection shall be governed by the provisions of chapter 46 relating to civil forfeitures, except that such duties as are imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury under the customs laws described in section 981(d) shall be performed by such officers, agents, and other persons as may be designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General.''.

TITLE V—COMBATING ELECTION INTERFERENCE

SEC. 501. PROHIBITION ON INTERFERENCE WITH VOTING SYSTEMS.

Section 1030(e) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by adding ''or'' at the end; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) that—

''(i) is part of a voting system; and

''(ii)(I) is used for the management, support, or administration of a Federal election; or

''(II) has moved in or otherwise affects interstate or foreign commerce;'';

(2) in paragraph (11), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (12), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) the term 'Federal election' means any election (as defined in section 301(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(1))) for Federal office (as defined in section 301(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (52 U.S.C. 30101(3))); and

''(14) the term 'voting system' has the meaning given the term in section 301(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(b)).''.

SEC. 502. INADMISSIBILITY OF ALIENS SEEKING TO INTERFERE IN UNITED STATES ELECTIONS.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—Section 101(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(53) The term 'improper interference in a United States election' means conduct by an alien that—

''(A)(i) violates Federal criminal, voting rights, or campaign finance law; or

''(ii) is under the direction of a foreign government; and

''(B) interferes with a general or primary Federal, State, or local election or caucus, including—

''(i) the campaign of a candidate; and

''(ii) a ballot measure, including—

''(I) an amendment;

''(II) a bond issue;

''(III) an initiative;

''(IV) a recall;

''(V) a referral; and

''(VI) a referendum.''.

(b) IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN UNITED STATES ELECTIONS.—Section 212(a)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(3)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(H) IMPROPER INTERFERENCE IN A UNITED STATES ELECTION.—Any alien who is seeking admission to the United States to engage in improper interference in a United States election, or who has engaged in improper interference in a United States election, is inadmissible.''.

TITLE VI—SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Subtitle A—Expansion of Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act

SEC. 601. IMPOSITION OF ADDITIONAL SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 2 of subtitle A of title II of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9521 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 235, 236, 237, and 238 as sections 239A, 239B, 239D, and 239E, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 234 the following:

''SEC. 235. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS WITH CERTAIN RUSSIAN POLITICAL FIGURES AND OLIGARCHS.

''On and after that date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018, the President shall impose the sanctions described in section 224(b) with respect to—

''(1) political figures, oligarchs, and other persons that facilitate illicit and corrupt activities, directly or indirectly, on behalf of the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, and persons acting for or on behalf of such political figures, oligarchs, and persons;

''(2) Russian parastatal entities that facilitate illicit and corrupt activities, directly or indirectly, on behalf of the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin;

''(3) family members of persons described in paragraph (1) or (2) that derive significant benefits from such illicit and corrupt activities; and

''(4) persons, including financial institutions, engaging in significant transactions with persons described in paragraph (1), (2), or (3).

''SEC. 236. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS RELATED TO INVESTMENTS IN ENERGY PROJECTS SUPPORTED BY RUSSIAN STATE-OWNED OR PARASTATAL ENTITIES OUTSIDE OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

''On and after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018, the President shall impose five or more of the sanctions described in section 239A with respect to a person if the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the person knowingly, on or after such date of enactment, invests in an energy project outside of the Russian Federation—

''(1) that is supported by a Russian parastatal entity or an entity owned or controlled by the Government of the Russian Federation; and

''(2) the total value of which exceeds or is reasonably expected to exceed $250,000,000.

''SEC. 237. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO SUPPORT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF CRUDE OIL RESOURCES IN THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall impose five or more of the sanctions described in section 239A with respect to a person if the President determines that the person knowingly, on or after the date of the enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018, sells, leases, or provides to the Russian Federation goods, services, technology, financing, or support described in subsection (b)—

''(1) any of which has a fair market value of $1,000,000 or more; or

''(2) that, during a 12-month period, have an aggregate fair market value of $5,000,000 or more.

''(b) GOODS, SERVICES, TECHNOLOGY, FINANCING, OR SUPPORT DESCRIBED.—Goods, services, technology, financing, or support described in this subsection are goods, services, technology, financing or support that could directly and significantly contribute to the Russian Federation's—

''(1) ability to develop crude oil resources located in the Russian Federation; or

''(2) production of crude oil resources in the Russian Federation, including any direct and significant assistance with respect to the construction, modernization, or repair of infrastructure that would facilitate the development of crude oil resources located in the Russian Federation.

''(c) APPLICABILITY.—The requirement to impose sanctions under subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the maintenance of projects that are ongoing as of the date of the enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018.

''(d) REQUIREMENT TO ISSUE GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Energy, shall issue regulations—

''(1) clarifying how the exception under subsection (c) will be applied; and

''(2) listing specific goods, services, technology, financing, and support covered by subsection (b).

''SEC. 238. PROHIBITION ON AND SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS RELATING TO NEW SOVEREIGN DEBT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018, the President shall—

''(1) prescribe regulations prohibiting United States persons from engaging in transactions with, providing financing for, or

in any other way dealing in Russian sovereign debt issued on or after the date that is 180 days after such date of enactment; and

''(2) exercise all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of one or more of the Russian financial institutions specified in subsection (b) if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

''(b) RUSSIAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SPECIFIED.—The Russian financial institutions specified in this subsection are the following:

''(1) Vnesheconombank.

''(2) Sberbank.

''(3) VTB Bank.

''(4) Gazprombank.

''(5) Bank of Moscow.

''(6) Rosselkhozbank.

''(7) Promsvyazbank.

''(8) Vnesheconombank.

''(c) RUSSIAN SOVEREIGN DEBT DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'Russian sovereign debt' means—

''(1) bonds issued by the Central Bank, the National Wealth Fund, or the Federal Treasury of the Russian Federation, or agents or affiliates of any of those entities, with a maturity of more than 14 days;

''(2) foreign exchange swap agreements with the Central Bank, the National Wealth Fund, or the Federal Treasury of the Russian Federation with a duration of more than 14 days; and

''(3) any other financial instrument, the duration or maturity of which is more than 14 days, that—

''(A) the President determines represents the sovereign debt of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

''(B) is issued by a Russian financial institution specified in subsection (b).

''SEC. 239. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO TRANSACTIONS WITH THE CYBER SECTOR OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

''On and after the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018, the President shall impose five or more of the sanctions described in section 239A with respect to any person, including any financial institution, that the President determines—

''(1) engages in significant transactions with any person in the Russian Federation that has the capacity or ability to support or facilitate malicious cyber activities; or

''(2) is owned or controlled by, or acts or purports to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person that engages in significant transactions described in paragraph (1).''.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—Section 239A(a) of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking ''or 233(a)'' each place it appears and inserting ''233(a), 236, 237, or 239''.

(c) TERMINATION.—Section 239B(c) of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), is amended by striking ''or 234'' and inserting ''234, 235, 236, 237, 238, or 239''.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION AND PENALTIES.—Part 2 of subtitle A of title II of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9521 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 239A, as redesignated by subsection (a)(1), the following:

''SEC. 239C. IMPLEMENTATION AND PENALTIES.

''(a) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this part.

''(b) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of this part or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out this part shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.''.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act is amended by striking the items relating to sections 235 through 238 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 235. Sanctions with respect to transactions with certain Russian political figures and oligarchs.

''Sec. 236. Sanctions with respect to transactions related to investments in energy projects supported by Russian state-owned or parastatal entities outside of the Russian Federation.

''Sec. 237. Sanctions with respect to support for the development of crude oil resources in the Russian Federation.

''Sec. 238. Prohibition on and sanctions with respect to transactions relating to new sovereign debt of the Russian Federation.

''Sec. 239. Sanctions with respect to transactions with the cyber sector of the Russian Federation.

''Sec. 239A. Sanctions described.

''Sec. 239B. Exceptions, waiver, and termination.

''Sec. 239C. Implementation and penalties.

''Sec. 239D. Exception relating to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

''Sec. 239E. Rule of construction.''.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Part 2 of subtitle A of title II of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9521 et seq.), as amended by this section, is further amended—

(1) in section 231, by striking subsection (e); and

(2) by striking ''section 235'' each place it appears and inserting ''section 239A''.

(g) GUIDANCE.—The President shall, in a prompt and timely way, publish guidance on the implementation of this subtitle and the amendments made by this subtitle and any regulations prescribed pursuant to this subtitle or any such amendment.

SEC. 602. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW AND CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF SANCTIONS UNDER THE SERGEI MAGNITSKY RULE OF LAW ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2012.

Section 216(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Russia Sanctions Review Act of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 9511(a)(2)(B)(i)) is amended—

(1) in subclause (II), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in subclause (III), by striking ''; and'' and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(IV) the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (title IV of Public Law 112–208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note); and''.

Subtitle B—Coordination With the European Union

SEC. 611. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON COORDINATION WITH ALLIES WITH RESPECT TO SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that the President should—

(1) continue to uphold and seek unity with European and other key partners with respect to sanctions implemented with respect to the Russian Federation, which have been effective and instrumental in countering the aggression of the Russian Federation;

(2) engage to the fullest extent possible with governments that are partners of the United States with regard to closing loopholes, including the allowance of extended prepayment for the delivery of goods and commodities and other loopholes, in multilateral and unilateral restrictive measures against the Russian Federation, with the aim of maximizing alignment of those measures; and

(3) increase efforts to vigorously enforce compliance with sanctions in place as of the date of the enactment of this Act with respect to the Russian Federation in response to the crises in Ukraine and Syria, cyber intrusions and attacks, and human rights violators in the Russian Federation.

SEC. 612. OFFICE OF SANCTIONS COORDINATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a), as amended by section 211, is further amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (i); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

''(h) OFFICE OF SANCTIONS COORDINATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established, within the Department of State, an Office of Sanctions Coordination (referred to in this subsection as the 'Office').

''(2) HEAD.—The head of the Office shall—

''(A) have the rank and status of ambassador;

''(B) be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and

''(C) report to the Under Secretary for Political Affairs.

''(3) DUTIES.—The head of the Office shall—

''(A) serve as the principal advisor to the senior management of the Department and the Secretary regarding the role of the Department in the development and implementation of sanctions policy, including sanctions with respect to the Russian Federation, Iran, North Korea, and other countries;

''(B) represent the United States in diplomatic and multilateral fora on sanctions matters;

''(C) consult and closely coordinate with the European Union to ensure the maximum effectiveness of sanctions imposed by the United States and the European Union with respect to the Russian Federation;

''(D) advise the Secretary directly and provide input with respect to all activities, policies, and programs of all bureaus and offices of the Department relating to the implementation of sanctions policy; and

''(E) serve as the principal liaison of the Department to other Federal agencies involved in the design and implementation of sanctions policy.

''(4) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection may be construed to preclude—

''(A) the Office from being elevated to a Bureau within the Department; or

''(B) the head of the Office from being elevated to level of an Assistant Secretary.''.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing the efforts of the Office of Sanctions Coordination established under the amendments made by subsection (a) to coordinate sanctions policy with the European Union.

SEC. 613. REPORT ON COORDINATION OF SANCTIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPEAN UNION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the following:

(1) A description of each instance, during the period specified in subsection (b)—

(A) in which the United States has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the Russian Federation, but in which the European Union has not imposed corresponding sanctions; and

(B) in which the European Union has imposed sanctions with respect to a person for activity related to the Russian Federation, but in which the United States has not imposed corresponding sanctions.

(2) An explanation for the reason for each discrepancy between sanctions imposed by the European Union and sanctions imposed by the United States described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(b) PERIOD SPECIFIED.—The period specified in this subsection is—

(1) in the case of the first report submitted under subsection (a), the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date the report is submitted; and

(2) in the case of a subsequent such report, the 180-day period preceding the submission of the report.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle C—Reports Relating to Sanctions With Respect to the Russian Federation

SEC. 621. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

(2) SENIOR FOREIGN POLITICAL FIGURE.—The term ''senior foreign political figure'' has the meaning given that term in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (or any corresponding similar regulation or ruling).

SEC. 622. UPDATED REPORT ON OLIGARCHS AND PARASTATAL ENTITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Section 241 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44; 131 Stat. 922) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively;

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

''(b) UPDATED REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Defending American Security from Kremlin Aggression Act of 2018, the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence and the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an updated report on oligarchs and parastatal entities of the Russian Federation that builds on the report submitted under subsection (a) on January 29, 2018, and that includes the matters described in paragraphs (1) through (5) of subsection (a).''; and

(3) in subsection (c), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking ''The report required under subsection (a)'' and inserting ''The reports required by subsections (a) and (b)''.

SEC. 623. REPORT ON THE PERSONAL NET WORTH AND ASSETS OF VLADIMIR PUTIN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a detailed report on the personal net worth and assets of the President of the Russian Federation, Vladimir Putin, including—

(1) the estimated net worth and known sources of income of Vladimir Putin and his family members, including assets, investments, bank accounts, other business interests, and relevant beneficial ownership information; and

(2) an identification of the most significant senior foreign political figures and oligarchs in the Russian Federation, as determined by their closeness to Vladimir Putin.

(b) FORM OF REPORT.—The report required under subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 624. REPORT ON SECTION 224 OF THE COUNTERING AMERICA'S ADVERSARIES THROUGH SANCTIONS ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the persons that the President has determined under section 224(a)(1)(A) of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9524(a)(1)(A)) knowingly engaged, on or after August 2, 2017, and before the date of the report, in significant activities undermining cybersecurity against any person, including a democratic institution or government on behalf of the Government of the Russian Federation.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall contain the following:

(1) A list of the persons described in subsection (a).

(2) A description of diplomatic efforts to work with governments and democratic institutions in other countries the cybersecurity of which the President determines has been undermined by the Government of the Russian Federation.

(c) UPDATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update to the report required by subsection (a).

SEC. 625. REPORT ON SECTION 225 OF THE COUNTERING AMERICA'S ADVERSARIES THROUGH SANCTIONS ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the foreign persons that the President has determined under section 4(b)(1) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8923(b)(1)), as amended by section 225 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44; 131 Stat. 910), have knowingly, on or after August 2, 2017, and before the date of the report, made a significant investment in a special Russian crude oil project.

(b) UPDATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update to the report required by subsection (a).

SEC. 626. REPORT ON SECTION 226 OF THE COUNTERING AMERICA'S ADVERSARIES THROUGH SANCTIONS ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the foreign financial institutions that the President has determined under section 5(a) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8924(a)), as amended by section 226 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44; 131 Stat. 910), have knowingly engaged, on or after August 2, 2017, and before the date of the report, in significant transactions involving significant investments in a special Russian crude oil project described in section 4(b)(1) of the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014.

(b) UPDATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update to the report required by subsection (a).

SEC. 627. REPORT ON SECTION 228 OF THE COUNTERING AMERICA'S ADVERSARIES THROUGH SANCTIONS ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the foreign persons that the President has determined under subsection (a) of section 10 of the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8909), as added by section 228 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (Public Law 115–44; 131 Stat. 911), have, on or after August 2, 2017, and before the date of the report—

(1) materially violated, attempted to violate, conspired to violate, or caused a violation of any license, order, regulation, or prohibition contained in or issued pursuant to any covered Executive order (as defined in subsection (f) of such section 10), the Support for the Sovereignty, Integrity, Democracy, and Economic Stability of Ukraine Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8901 et seq.), or the Ukraine Freedom Support Act of 2014 (22 U.S.C. 8921 et seq.); or

(2) facilitated a significant transaction or transactions, including deceptive or structured transactions, for or on behalf of—

(A) any person subject to sanctions imposed by the United States with respect to the Russian Federation; or

(B) any child, spouse, parent, or sibling of an individual described in subparagraph (A).

(b) UPDATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update to the report required by subsection (a).

SEC. 628. REPORT ON SECTION 233 OF THE COUNTERING AMERICA'S ADVERSARIES THROUGH SANCTIONS ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the foreign persons that the President has determined under section 233 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9527) have

made, on or after August 2, 2017, and before the date of the report, an investment of $10,000,000 or more (or any combination of investments of not less than $1,000,000 each, which in the aggregate equals or exceeds $10,000,000 in any 12-month period), or facilitates such an investment, if the investment directly and significantly contributes to the ability of the Russian Federation to privatize state-owned assets in a manner that unjustly benefits—

(1) officials of the Government of the Russian Federation; or

(2) close associates or family members of those officials.

(b) UPDATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update to the report required by subsection (a).

SEC. 629. REPORT ON SECTION 234 OF THE COUNTERING AMERICA'S ADVERSARIES THROUGH SANCTIONS ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that describes the foreign persons that the President has determined under section 234 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9528) have knowingly, on or after August 2, 2017, and before the date of the report, exported, transferred, or otherwise provided to Syria significant financial, material, or technological support that contributes materially to the ability of the Government of Syria to—

(1) acquire or develop chemical, biological, or nuclear weapons or related technologies;

(2) acquire or develop ballistic or cruise missile capabilities;

(3) acquire or develop destabilizing numbers and types of advanced conventional weapons;

(4) acquire significant defense articles, defense services, or defense information (as such terms are defined under the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2751 et seq.)); or

(5) acquire items designated by the President for purposes of the United States Munitions List under section 38(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(a)(1)).

(b) UPDATES.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the President shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an update to the report required by subsection (a).

Subtitle D—General Provisions

SEC. 631. EXCEPTION RELATING TO ACTIVITIES OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—This title and the amendments made by this title shall not apply with respect to activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed to authorize the imposition of any sanction or other condition, limitation, restriction, or prohibition, that directly or indirectly impedes the supply by any entity of the Russian Federation of any product or service, or the procurement of such product or service by any contractor or subcontractor of the United States or any other entity, relating to or in connection with any space launch conducted for—

(1) the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; or

(2) any other non-Department of Defense customer.

SEC. 632. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title or the amendments made by this title shall be construed—

(1) to supersede the limitations or exceptions on the use of rocket engines for national security purposes under section 1608 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. ''Buck'' McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113–291; 128 Stat. 3626; 10 U.S.C. 2271 note), as amended by section 1607 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 1100) and section 1602 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2582); or

(2) to prohibit a contractor or subcontractor of the Department of Defense from acquiring components referred to in such section 1608.

TITLE VII—OTHER MATTERS RELATING TO THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SEC. 701. DETERMINATION ON DESIGNATION OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION AS A STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.

(a) DETERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a determination of whether the Russian Federation meets the criteria for designation as a state sponsor of terrorism.

(2) FORM.—The determination required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex, if appropriate.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(2) STATE SPONSOR OF TERRORISM.—The term ''state sponsor of terrorism'' means a country the government of which the Secretary of State has determined is a government that has repeatedly provided support for acts of international terrorism, for purposes of—

(A) section 1754(c)(1)(A)(i) of the Export Control Reform Act of 2018;

(B) section 620A of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2371);

(C) section 40(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2780(d)); or

(D) any other provision of law.

SEC. 702. EXPANSION OF GEOGRAPHIC TARGETING ORDERS OF FINANCIAL CRIMES ENFORCEMENT NETWORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 5326 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) REPORTING BY TITLE INSURANCE COMPANIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall issue an order under subsection (a) requiring a domestic title insurance company to obtain, maintain, and report to the Secretary information on the beneficial owners of entities that purchase residential real estate in high-value transactions in which the domestic title insurance company is involved.

''(2) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) BENEFICIAL OWNER.—The term 'beneficial owner', with respect to an entity, means an individual who, directly or indirectly, owns 25 percent or more of the equity interests in the entity.

''(B) DOMESTIC TITLE INSURANCE COMPANY.—The term 'domestic title insurance company' has the meaning given that term in regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

''(C) HIGH-VALUE TRANSACTION.—The term 'high-value', with respect to a real estate transaction, has the meaning given that term in regulations prescribed by the Secretary based on the real estate market in which the transaction takes place.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to carry out the amendment made by subsection (a).

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to carry out the amendment made by subsection (a).

SEC. 703. EXTENSION OF LIMITATIONS ON IMPORTATION OF URANIUM FROM RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

Section 3112A(c) of the USEC Privatization Act (42 U.S.C. 2297h–10a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(A)—

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

(B) in clause (vii), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(viii) in calendar year 2021, 463,620 kilograms;

''(ix) in calendar year 2022, 456,930 kilograms;

''(x) in calendar year 2023, 449,810 kilograms;

''(xi) in calendar year 2024, 435,933 kilograms;

''(xii) in calendar year 2025, 421,659 kilograms;

''(xiii) in calendar year 2026, 421,659 kilograms;

''(xiv) in calendar year 2027, 394,072 kilograms;

''(xv) in calendar year 2028, 386,951 kilograms;

''(xvi) in calendar year 2029, 386,951 kilograms; and

''(xvii) in calendar year 2030, 375,791 kilograms.'';

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking the semicolon and inserting ''; or'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''; or'' and inserting a period; and

(C) by striking subparagraph (C);

(3) in paragraph (5)(A), by striking ''reference data'' and all that follows through ''2019'' and inserting the following: ''lower scenario data in the document of the World Nuclear Association entitled 'Nuclear Fuel Report: Global Scenarios for Demand and Supply Availability 2017–2035'. In each of calendar years 2022, 2025, and 2028''; and

(4) in paragraph (9), by striking ''December 31, 2020'' and inserting ''December 31, 2030''.

SEC. 704. ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL FUSION CENTER TO RESPOND TO THREATS FROM THE GOVERNMENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a National Fusion Center to Respond to Hybrid Threats, which shall focus primarily on such threats from the Government of the Russian Federation, and shall be chaired by senior United States Government officials from participating agencies (in this section referred to as the ''Center'').

(b) MISSION.—The primary missions of the Center are as follows:

(1) To serve as the primary organization in the United States Government to coordinate analysis and policy implementation across the United States Government in responding to hybrid threats posed by the Government of the Russian Federation to the national security, sovereignty, democracy, and economic activity of the United States and United States allies, including the following activities:

(A) Execution of disinformation, misinformation, and propaganda campaigns through traditional and social media platforms.

(B) Formation, infiltration, or manipulation of cultural, religious, educational, and political organizations or parties.

(C) Covert transfer of illicit money through shell corporations and financial institutions to facilitate corruption, crime,

and malign influence activities, including through political parties and interest groups.

(D) Coercive tactics and gray zone activities, including through para-military and para-police and security services and militias.

(E) Cyber and other non-traditional threats, including against public infrastructure, government institutions, or political organizations or actors.

(F) Use of energy resources or infrastructure to influence or constrain sovereign states and political actors.

(2) To synchronize the efforts of the Department of State, the Department of the Treasury, the Department of Defense, the Department of Homeland Security, the intelligence community, other relevant civilian United States Government agencies, and United States military combatant commands with respect to countering efforts by the Government of the Russian Federation to undermine the national security, political sovereignty, democratic institutions, and economic activity of the United States and its United States allies, including by—

(A) ensuring that each such element is aware of and coordinating on such efforts; and

(B) overseeing the development and implementation of comprehensive and integrated policy responses to such efforts.

(3) In coordination with the head of the Global Engagement Center established by section 1287 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note), to examine current and emerging efforts by malign state actors to use propaganda and disinformation operations, including—

(A) traditional media platforms such as television, radio, and print; and

(B) social media platforms and other Internet communication tools.

(4) To identify and close gaps across the departments and agencies of the Federal Government with respect to expertise, readiness, and planning to address the threats posed by the Government of the Russian Federation.

(c) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Center shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees every 180 days a report on threats posed by the Russian Federation to the national security, sovereignty, and economic activity of the United States and its allies.

(2) MATTERS INCLUDED.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall include, with respect to the period covered by the report, a discussion of the following:

(A) The nature, extent, and execution of the threats described in such paragraph.

(B) The ability of the United States Government to identify and defend against such threats.

(C) The progress of the Center in achieving its missions, including through coordination with other governments and multilateral organizations.

(D) Recommendations the Director determines necessary for legislative actions to improve the ability of the Center to achieve its missions.

(3) FORM.—Each report under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''intelligence community'' means an element of the intelligence community specified or designated under section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 705. COUNTERING RUSSIAN INFLUENCE FUND.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Countering Russian Influence Fund described in section 7070(d) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2017 (division J of Public Law 115–31; 131 Stat. 706), $250,000,000 for fiscal years 2020 and 2021.

(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Amounts in the Countering Russian Influence Fund shall be used in countries of Europe and Eurasia the Secretary of State has determined are vulnerable to malign influence by the Russian Federation to effectively implement, subject to the availability of funds, the following goals:

(1) To assist in protecting critical infrastructure and electoral mechanisms from cyberattacks.

(2) To combat corruption, improve the rule of law, and otherwise strengthen independent judiciaries and prosecutors general offices.

(3) To respond to the humanitarian crises and instability caused or aggravated by the invasions and occupations of Georgia, Moldova, and Ukraine by the Russian Federation.

(4) To improve participatory legislative processes and legal education, political transparency and competition, and compliance with international obligations.

(5) To build the capacity of civil society, media, and other nongovernmental organizations countering the influence and propaganda of the Russian Federation to combat corruption, prioritize access to truthful information, and operate freely in all regions.

(6) To assist the Secretary of State in executing the functions specified in section 1239(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 (Public Law 115–91; 10 U.S.C. 113 note) for the purposes of recognizing, understanding, exposing, and countering propaganda and disinformation efforts by foreign governments, in coordination with the relevant regional Assistant Secretary or Assistant Secretaries of the Department of State.

(c) REVISION OF ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH AMOUNTS MAY BE USED.—The Secretary of State may modify a goal described in subsection (b) if, not later than 15 days before revising such goal, the Secretary notifies the appropriate congressional committees of the revision.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia (authorized pursuant to section 601 of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Act of 1989 (22 U.S.C. 5461) and section 102 of the Freedom for Russia and Emerging Eurasian Democracies and Open Markets Support Act of 1992 (22 U.S.C. 5812)), and in consultation with the Administrator for the United States Agency for International Development, the Director of the Global Engagement Center of the Department of State, the Secretary of Defense, EUCOM, the Chairman of the Broadcasting Board of Governors, and the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, coordinate and carry out activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b).

(2) METHOD.—Activities to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) shall be carried out through—

(A) initiatives of the United States Government;

(B) Federal grant programs such as the Information Access Fund;

(C) nongovernmental or international organizations; or

(D) support exchanges with countries facing state-sponsored disinformation and pressure campaigns, particularly in Europe and Eurasia, provided that a portion of the funds are made available through a process whereby the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State solicits proposals from posts located in affected countries to counter state-sponsored disinformation and hybrid threats, promote democracy, and support exchanges with countries facing state-sponsored disinformation and pressure campaigns.

(3) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than April 1 of each year, the Secretary of State, acting through the Coordinator of United States Assistance to Europe and Eurasia, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the programs and activities carried out to achieve the goals described in subsection (b) during the preceding fiscal year.

(B) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by subparagraph (A) shall include, with respect to each program or activity described in that subparagraph—

(i) the amount of funding for the program or activity;

(ii) the goal described in subsection (b) to which the program or activity relates; and

(iii) an assessment of whether or not the goal was met.

(e) COORDINATION WITH GLOBAL PARTNERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to maximize impact, eliminate duplication, and speed the achievement of the goals described in subsection (b), the Secretary of State shall ensure coordination with—

(A) the European Union and its institutions;

(B) the governments of countries that are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or the European Union; and

(C) international organizations and quasi-governmental funding entities that carry out programs and activities that seek to accomplish the goals described in subsection (b).

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to or limit United States foreign assistance not provided using amounts available in the Countering Russian Influence Fund.

(g) EXPANSION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall expand the pilot program required under section 254(g) of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act (22 U.S.C. 9543(g)) to hire additional personnel within the Bureau for Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor to develop and implement programs focused on combating corruption, improving rule of law, and building capacity of civil society, political parties, and independent media.

(2) REPORT ON ENSURING ADEQUATE STAFFING FOR GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES.—Not later than 90 days afer the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report on implementation of the pilot program required under section 254(g) of the Countering Russian Influence in Europe and Eurasia Act of 2017 (22 U.S.C. 9543(g)).

SEC. 706. COORDINATING AID AND ASSISTANCE ACROSS EUROPE AND EURASIA.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the Government of the Russian Federation has applied, and continues to apply traditional uses of force, intelligence operations, cyber attacks, and influence campaigns, including through the use of corruption, disinformation, and cultural and social influence, which represent clear and present

threats to the countries of Europe and Eurasia;

(2) in response, governments in Europe and Eurasia should redouble efforts to build resilience within their institutions, political systems, and civil societies;

(3) the United States Government supports the democratic and rule of law-based institutions that the Government of the Russian Federation seeks to undermine, including the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and the European Union;

(4) the United States Government should continue to work with and strengthen such institutions, including the European Union, as a partner against aggression by the Government of the Russian Federation through the coordination of aid programs, development assistance, and other efforts to counter malign Russian influence;

(5) the United States Government should continue to work with the individual countries of Europe and Eurasia to bolster efforts to counter malign Russian influence in all its forms; and

(6) the United States Government should increase assistance and diplomatic efforts in Europe, including in European Union and NATO countries, to address threats to fundamental human rights and backsliding in rule of law protections, operating space for independent media and civil society, and other democratic institutions, whose strength is critical to defending against malign Russian influence over the long term.

SEC. 707. ADDRESSING ABUSE AND MISUSE BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION OF INTERPOL RED NOTICES AND RED DIFFUSIONS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The International Criminal Police Organization (in this section referred to as ''INTERPOL'') works to prevent and fight crime through enhanced cooperation and innovation on police and security matters, including counterterrorism, cybercrime, counternarcotics, and transnational organized crime.

(2) United States membership and participation in INTERPOL advanced the national security and law enforcement interests of the United States related to combatting terrorism, cybercrime, narcotics, and transnational organized crime.

(3) Article 2 of INTERPOL's Constitution states that the organization aims ''[t]o ensure and promote the widest possible mutual assistance between all criminal police authorities [. . .] in the spirit of the 'Universal Declaration of Human Rights' ''.

(4) Article 3 of INTERPOL's Constitution states that ''[i]t is strictly forbidden for the Organization to undertake any intervention or activities of a political, military, religious or racial character''.

(5) Some INTERPOL member countries have used the INTERPOL's processes, including the red notice and red diffusions mechanisms, for activities of a political character.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that the Government of the Russian Federation has abused and misused INTERPOL's red notice and red diffusion mechanisms for overtly political purposes and activities such as intimidating, harassing, and persecuting political opponents.

(c) CENSURE OF RUSSIAN ACTIVITY.—The Attorney General, in coordination with the Secretary of Homeland Secretary, shall use the voice and influence of the United States at INTERPOL to censure and sanction the abuse of INTERPOL mechanisms by the Government of the Russian Federation, including the suspension of the ability of the Government of the Russian Federation to use INTERPOL's red notice and red diffusion mechanisms.

(d) NO DENIAL OF SERVICES.—No United States person or foreign person that is the subject of a red notice or red diffusion requested by the Government of the Russian Federation shall be denied access to any United States Government services or programs because the person is the subject of such red notice or red diffusion, including requesting asylum, requesting a visa, or participating in a visa waiver program or the Transportation Security Administration's Trusted Traveler Program.

SEC. 708. REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR WAR CRIMES AND CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN SYRIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) In March 2016, Amnesty International issued a report stating, ''Syrian and Russian forces have been deliberately attacking health facilities in flagrant violation of international humanitarian law. But what is truly egregious is that wiping out hospitals appears to have become part of their military strategy.''.

(2) On September 21, 2017, Department of State Spokesperson Heather Nauert said, ''The United States is concerned by reports of airstrikes in Idlib province and northern Hama province on September 19 and 20 that killed at least three medical personnel and damaged a number of medical facilities, emergency equipment, and civil defense centers. These attacks fit an all-too-familiar pattern in which medical facilities and personnel—and the civilians they serve—are victims of strikes by the Syrian regime and its Russian allies.''.

(3) In February 2018, Syrian and Russian airstrikes in rebel-held areas killed 230 civilians and hit at least 9 medical facilities. In a statement on February 10, 2018, the office of Zeid Ra'ad al-Hussein, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, said the airstrikes ''may, depending on the circumstances, all constitute war crimes''.

(4) On March 6, 2018, the United Nations Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic noted, ''[I]n one particularly harmful attack on 13 November, the Russian Air Force carried out airstrikes on a densely populated civilian area in Atareb (Aleppo), killing at least 84 people and injuring another 150. Using unguided weapons, the attack struck a market, police station, shops, and a restaurant, and may amount to a war crime.''.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity attributable to the Government of the Russian Federation or paramilitary forces or contractors responsive to the direction of that Government during the operations of that Government in Syria—

(1) not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) not later than 180 days after the date on which the Secretary of State determines that the violence in Syria has ceased.

(c) ELEMENTS.—Each report required by subsection (b) shall include the following:

(1) A description of alleged war crimes and crimes against humanity described in subsection (b), including—

(A) any such alleged crimes that may violate the principle of medical neutrality and, if possible, an identification of the individual or individuals who engaged in or organized such crimes; and

(B) if possible, a description of the conventional and unconventional weapons used for such alleged crimes and the origins of such weapons.

(2) An assessment of whether such alleged crimes constitute war crimes or crimes against humanity, including genocide.

(3) A description and assessment by the Office of Global Criminal Justice of the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Department of Justice, and other appropriate Federal agencies, of programs that the United States Government has undertaken to ensure accountability for such alleged crimes, including programs—

(A) to train investigators within and outside of Syria on how to document, investigate, develop findings with respect to, and identify and locate alleged perpetrators of, such alleged crimes, including—

(i) the number of United States Government or contractor personnel currently designated to work full-time on such training; and

(ii) an identification of the authorities and appropriations being used to support such training; and

(B) to document, collect, preserve, and protect evidence of such alleged crimes, including support for Syrian, foreign, and international nongovernmental organizations, and other entities, including the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011 and the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Syrian Arab Republic of the United Nations.

(d) PROTECTION OF WITNESSES AND EVIDENCE.—In preparing the report required by subsection (b), the Secretary shall take due care to ensure that the identities of witnesses and physical evidence are not publicly disclosed in a manner that might place such witnesses at risk of harm or encourage the destruction of such evidence by the Government of the Russian Federation or the Government of Syria, violent extremist groups, anti-government forces, or any other combatants or participants in the conflict in Syria.

(e) FORM.—Each report required by subsection (b) may be submitted in unclassified or classified form, but shall include a publicly available annex.

(f) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Finance of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 709. REPORT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION IN SYRIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership a report that includes—

(1) an assessment of the willingness and capacity of the Government of the Russian Federation to ensure the removal of Iranian forces, Iran-aligned and Iran-directed militias and paramilitaries, and other armed group responsive to the direction of Iran, from the territory of Syria;

(2) a list of policies, actions, or activities that the Government of the Russian Federation would take if that Government were willing to ensure the removal of the forces, militias, paramilitaries, and other armed

groups described in paragraph (1) from the territory of Syria;

(3) a list of policies, actions, or activities that the Government of the Russian Federation would take to ensure the removal of the forces, militias, paramilitaries, and other armed groups described in paragraph (1) from the territory of Syria if that Government were capable of doing so;

(4) an assessment of whether any of the policies, actions, or activities described in paragraph (2) or (3) are being taken by the Government of the Russian Federation;

(5) an assessment of the specific commitments made by officials of the Government of the Russian Federation to officials of the Government of Israel with respect to the Golan Heights and the presence of the forces, militias, paramilitaries, and other armed groups described in paragraph (1) in the territory of Syria;

(6) an assessment of weapons, technologies, and knowledge directly or indirectly transferred by the Government of the Russian Federation to the regime of Bashar al-Assad, Lebanese Hezbollah, Iran, or Iran-aligned forces in Syria that threaten the security and qualitative military edge of Israel; and

(7) an assessment of whether the presence of Russian forces and Russian contractors in Syria limits the options of the Government of Israel in taking steps to ensure its security from threats emanating from the territory of Syria.

(b) FORM.—The report required by subsection (a) shall be submitted in an unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES AND LEADERSHIP DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''appropriate congressional committees and leadership'' means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Speaker, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 710. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON RESPONSIBILITY OF TECHNOLOGY COMPANIES FOR STATE-SPONSORED DISINFORMATION.

It is the sense of Congress that technology companies, particularly social media companies, share responsibility for ensuring that their platforms are free of disinformation sponsored by the Government of the Russian Federation and other foreign governments.

SA 3939. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On 148, line 18, strike the period and insert the following: ''(and an additional amount of $15,000,000, to be awarded to States for the purposes of providing instruction associated with pre-apprenticeship and apprenticeship programs).''.

SA 3940. Mr. PERDUE (for himself and Mr. ISAKSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than January 31, 2019, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report—

(1) comparing the cost expenditures of organic industrial depot maintenance of the E-8C Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System aircraft fleet versus contracted or non-organic maintenance; and

(2) comparing the cost variance and cost savings of different programmed depot maintenance cycles or procedures for the E-8C, including comparisons to such other platforms as the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

SA 3941. Mr. TILLIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2019 for the Department of Defense by this Act, not less than $10,000,000 shall be made available to such unis of the Armed Forces as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate for Marine Corps Special Operations Command (MARSOC) non-traditional suspension/resistance performance training in order to improve the overall readiness of such units through innovative intervention to minimize injury and assist with anti-fatigue performance training.

SA 3942. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The amount appropriated by title IV of this division under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' is hereby increased by $133,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for the Missile Defense Agency for Common Kill Vehicle Technology

(b) The amount appropriated by title IV of this division under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' is hereby decreased by $133,000,000, with the amount of the decrease to be applied against amounts otherwise appropriated by the heading for the Missile Defense Agency and available for Technology Maturation Initiatives.

SA 3943. Mr. SULLIVAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The amount appropriated by title III of this division under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'' is hereby increased by $39,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for upgrades of active electronically scanned array (AESA) radars for Aggressor Squadrons of the Air Force.

(b) The amount appropriated by title III of this division under the heading ''Aircraft Procurement, Air Force'' is hereby decreased by $39,000,000, with the amount of the decrease to be applied against amounts available for Combat Aircraft for C–135B Aircraft.

SA 3944. Mr. BURR (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 202 of division B, insert '', except for amounts obligated under section 3084 of the 21st Century Cures Act (Public Law 114–255), including any amendments made by such Act'' before the period.

SA 3945. Mr. PORTMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Not later than March 31, 2019, the Director of the Defense Logistics Agency shall submit to Congress a report on the production of military footwear and the production base for military footwear.

(b) The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Current and forecasted production requirements for combat and specialty military boots.

(2) An estimate of the surge production capacity requirements for combat and specialty military boots based upon existing inventory, war reserve materiel, and Defense Planning Guidance.

(3) An assessment of the costs and capacity of the current production base to meet current, forecasted, and surge requirements for combat and specialty military boots, and an assessment of the impact of any reduction in the size of the current production base on such costs and capacity.

(4) Such recommendations for actions to address deficiencies and vulnerabilities in the production base that the Director considers appropriate.

(5) Such other matters as the Director considers appropriate.

SA 3946. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every 90 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall certify to the

congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees that there are no known devices, components, subcomponents, or software embedded within or with access to any operational or business data or voice network of the Department of Defense, including intranets, that are produced by Huawei Technologies Company, ZTE Corporation, any subsidiary or affiliate of such entity, or any other Chinese telecommunication or technology entity.

(b)(1) If it is not possible to make a certification under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report detailing all instances of known devices, components, subcomponents, or software embedded within or with access to any operational or business data or voice network of the Department of Defense, including intranets, that are produced by Huawei Technologies Company, ZTE Corporation, any subsidiary or affiliate of such entity, or any other Chinese telecommunication or technology entity, and including a plan to excise such devices, components, subcomponents, or software within 30 days of the report.

(2) The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(c)(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the congressional defense committees and the congressional intelligence committees a report on the following:

(A) The threat that incorporating devices, components, subcomponents, or software produced by Chinese telecommunication or technology entities into operational or business data and voice networks of the Department of Defense poses to the national security of the United States.

(B) The extent to which Chinese telecommunications equipment and components are embedded within operational or business data and voice networks of the Department of Defense, and how many Chinese telecommunications technology components have been removed during the two-year period preceding the report.

(C) The prevalence of Chinese-origin telecommunications equipment available for sale on military installations of the United States.

(D) The privacy and security threats posed to members of the Armed Forces and their families by the use of Chinese-origin telecommunications devices, components, subcomponents, and software, including mobile phones, fitness monitors with tracking capabilities, routers, and other household components.

(2) The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

SA 3947. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division B insert the following:

SEC. ____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the limitation under paragraph (1) or (2)(B) of section 102(f) of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993.

SA 3948. Mrs. ERNST (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B insert the following:

SEC. ____. No funds made available by this Act may be used to support the guidance issued by the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of the Treasury entitled ''Waivers for State Innovation'' (80 Fed. Reg. 78131 (December 16, 2015)).

SA 3949. Mrs. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. In addition to a location near a United States Army Depot for a mobile small arms repair team under the pilot program on a mobile small arms repair team provided for by Senate Report 115–290 (115th Congress), such a teams may be provided for a location near an Army Arsenal.

SA 3950. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Of the funds appropriated under the heading ''Office of the Director'' under the heading ''National Institutes of Health'', $5,000,000 shall be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the ''Office of the Inspector General'' for oversight of grant programs and operations of the National Institutes of Health, including agency efforts to ensure the integrity of its grant application evaluation and selection processes, and shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available for oversight of the National Institutes of Health: *Provided*, That funds may be transferred from one specified activity to another with 15 days prior approval of the Committees of Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Inspector General shall consult with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before submitting to the Committees an audit plan for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 no later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 3951. Mr. HELLER (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under paragraph (2) under the heading ''VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING'' under title I, $2,000,000 may be used to carry out a pilot program for preparing members of the Armed Forces transitioning to civilian life to qualify for, and for assisting in placing them in, apprenticeship programs.

SA 3952. Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Navy shall submit to the congressional defense committees an addendum to the 30-year shipbuilding plan of the Navy that sets forth in detail the manner in which the Department of the Navy will take into account in such plan each of the following:

(1) Appropriate diversification among small-sized and medium-sized surface ships.

(2) Existing programs and designs in production of Armed Forces other than the Navy that could be used to achieve a Navy of 355 surface ships in a more expeditious and cost-effective manner than is currently contemplated by the plan.

(3) Capacity in the shipbuilding industry as of the date of the report.

SA 3953. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health and Human Services by this Act may be used to approve a new waiver of the Medicaid non-emergency medical transportation requirement pursuant to an application received by the Secretary on or after August 1, 2018, unless a State applying for a waiver of such required services certifies the State will—

(1) reinstate such services if the rate of or attendance at appointments for Medicaid-approved services declines; and

(2) provide a sufficient amount of financial resources from non-Federal funds previously used to provide required services to support non-emergency medical transportation under locally developed coordinated transportation plans (as required under section 5310 of title 49, United States Code) at service levels necessary to maintain the rate of and attendance at appointments for Medicaid-approved services.

(b) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Health and Human by this Act may be used to renew or continue a waiver issued pursuant to the conditions of subsection (a) if a State fails to maintain compliance with such conditions.

SA 3954. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr.

BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. The Secretary of Education may not use any funds provided under this Act to promulgate any regulation to repeal, rewrite, or amend title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to gainful employment) as added or amended by the final regulations published by the Department of Education on October 31, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 64889 et seq.).

SA 3955. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. The Secretary of Education may not use any funds provided under this Act to promulgate any regulation to repeal, rewrite, or amend title 34, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to borrower defense to repayment) as added or amended by the final regulations published by the Department of Education on November 1, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 75926 et seq.).

SA 3956. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division B, insert the following: ''*Provided further*, In carrying out drug prevention programs and activities to support safe and healthy schools as instructed in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), State educational agencies and local educational agencies receiving funds under part A or B of title IV of such Act, may target funding toward efforts aimed at reducing or eliminating the use of e-cigarette or electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS) or tobacco, as defined by the Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), among youths in schools.''.

SA 3957. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act and periodically thereafter, the Secretary of Education shall—

(1) work with States to identify and implement a process for increasing awareness of, and simplifying the application and certification process for, TEACH Grants under subpart 9 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070g et seq.);

(2) review and make appropriate changes to the procedures through which the service obligation of a recipient of a TEACH Grant is converted to a loan and a recipient engages in dispute resolution procedures;

(3) disseminate to recipients and make publicly available and accessible on the Department's website, clear, consistent information on program service requirements and the procedures related to grant to loan conversions, including—

(A) an explanation that recipients have an option to appeal a conversion or waiver decision under a TEACH Grant;

(B) how a recipient can initiate an appeal; and

(C) the specific criteria in considering the appeal;

(4) clarify that a teacher in a qualifying teaching position at a qualifying school that meets the TEACH Grant program service obligation requirements for all or part of one of the required 4 years of teaching and for the school year in which the teacher was initially hired, but for which such school fails to meet such requirements in subsequent years, shall be deemed to meet program service requirements for all of the subsequent years during which the teacher remains at such school;

(5) provide the full biennial report to Congress on the TEACH Grant program, as required under section 420P of the Higher Education Act of 1965, including copies of all previous reports required since the program's inception;

(6) make publicly available any analysis, findings, or results of any reviews by the Department of Education regarding erroneous or unfair conversions of TEACH Grants to loans; and

(7) direct the Commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics to add a school ID number to the data collected in the Teacher Cancellation Low Income Directory.

SA 3958. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

REPORT ON RACIAL DISPARITIES IN PREGNANCY-RELATED MORTALITY RATES

SEC. ____. Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall submit to Congress a report on racial disparities in pregnancy-related mortality rates, which shall—

(1) identify the causes of racial disparities in pregnancy-related mortality rates in the United States, and why such rates are higher among African American women, Hispanic women, Asian American women, American Indian women, Alaskan Native women, and Native Hawaiian women; and

(2) make recommendations for reducing—

(A) racial disparities in pregnancy-related mortality rates in the United States; and

(B) the overall pregnancy-related mortality rate in the United States.

SA 3959. Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. NELSON, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 200, line 14, strike the period and insert ''(and an additional amount of $50,000,000, to be used by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for the purpose of conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention).''.

SA 3960. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following: ''Provided further, That a prime contractor for a contract under a program under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 shall receive credit toward the subcontracting goals established through a subcontracting plan required under section 8(d) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)) for subcontractors that are small business concerns and qualified State or nonprofit entities with expertise in assisting students and borrowers under programs under such title IV.''.

SA 3961. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. FUNDING MODIFICATION OF THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) APPROPRIATION; TOTAL ALLOTMENT.—Section 2104(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (23) through (27);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (28) as paragraph (24); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (22) the following:

''(23) for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2026, such sums as are necessary to fund allotments to States under subsections (c) and (m); and''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2104 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd) is amended—

(1) in subsection (m)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''(27)'' and inserting ''(24)'';

(ii) in clause (i), by striking '', 2023,''; and

(iii) in clause (ii)(I)—

(I) by striking ''or 2024''; and

(II) by striking ''or (10), respectively'';

(B) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking ''(10), or (11)'' and inserting ''or (10)''; and

(ii) by striking ''2023,'';

(C) in paragraph (9)—

(i) by striking ''(10), or (11)'' and inserting ''or (10)''; and

(ii) by striking ''2023,'';

(D) by striking paragraph (10);

(E) by redesignating paragraph (11) as paragraph (10); and

(F) in paragraph (10), as so redesignated, by striking ''(28)'' each place it appears and inserting ''(24)''; and

(2) in subsection (n)(3)(A)—

(A) by striking ''fiscal years 2018 through 2022, or fiscal years 2024 through 2026'' and inserting ''fiscal years 2018 through 2026''; and

(B) by striking '', 2023''.

(c) REPEAL OF ONE-TIME APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023.—Section 3002(b) of the HEALTHY KIDS Act (Public Law 115—120) is amended by striking paragraph (2).

(d) CHILD ENROLLMENT CONTINGENCY FUND CAP.—Section 2104(n)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397dd(n)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking ''and'' after the semi-colon;

(B) in clause (ii)—

(i) by inserting ''and'' after ''2016,'';

(ii) by striking ''through 2022, and 2024 through 2026'' and inserting ''through 2019'';

(iii) by striking '', 2023, and 2027'';

(iv) by striking ''2015,'' and inserting ''2015, and''; and

(v) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(iii) for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2026 (and for the semi-annual allotment period for fiscal year 2027), only such sums as are necessary to enable the Secretary to make payments from the Fund to eligible States under paragraph (3) for such fiscal year or period.'';

(2) in subparagraph (B)—

(A) by inserting ''and'' after ''2016,'';

(B) by striking ''through 2022, and 2024 through 2026'' and inserting ''through 2019'';

(C) by striking ''2015,'' and inserting ''2015, and''; and

(D) by striking '', 2023, and 2027''; and

(3) in subparagraph (D), by inserting ''before fiscal year 2020'' after ''period''.

SA 3962. Mr. YOUNG submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CLARIFICATION OF AUTHORITY OF MILITARY COMMISSIONS ESTABLISHED UNDER CHAPTER 47A OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, TO PUNISH CONTEMPT.

(a) CLARIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter IV of chapter 47A of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 949o–1. Contempt

''(a) AUTHORITY TO PUNISH.—(1) With respect to any proceeding under this chapter, a judicial officer specified in paragraph (2) may punish for contempt any person who—

''(A) uses any menacing word, sign, or gesture in the presence of the judicial officer during the proceeding;

''(B) disturbs the proceeding by any riot or disorder; or

''(C) willfully disobeys a lawful writ, process, order, rule, decree, or command issued with respect to the proceeding.

''(2) A judicial officer referred to in paragraph (1) is any of the following:

''(A) Any judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review.

''(B) Any military judge detailed to a military commission or any other proceeding under this chapter.

''(b) PUNISHMENT.—The punishment for contempt under subsection (a) may not exceed confinement for 30 days, a fine of $1,000, or both.

''(c) REVIEW.—(1) A punishment under this section—

''(A) is not reviewable by the convening authority of a military commission under this chapter;

''(B) if imposed by a military judge, shall constitute a judgment, subject to review in the first instance only by the United States Court of Military Commission Review and then only by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit; and

''(C) if imposed by a judge of the United States Court of Military Commission Review, shall constitute a judgment of the court subject to review only by the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

''(2) In reviewing a punishment for contempt imposed under this section, the reviewing court shall affirm such punishment unless the court finds that imposing such punishment was an abuse of the discretion of the judicial officer who imposed such punishment.

''(3) A petition for review of punishment for contempt imposed under this section shall be filed not later than 60 days after the date on which the authenticated record upon which the contempt punishment is based and any contempt proceedings conducted by the judicial officer are served on the person punished for contempt.

''(d) PUNISHMENT NOT CONVICTION.—Punishment for contempt is not a conviction or sentence within the meaning of section 949m of this title. The imposition of punishment for contempt is not governed by other provisions of this chapter applicable to military commissions, except that the Secretary of Defense may prescribe procedures for contempt proceedings and punishments, pursuant to the authority provided in section 949a of this title.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter of IV of such chapter is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''949o–1. Contempt.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 950t of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (31); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (32) as paragraph (31).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall not be construed to affect the lawfulness of any punishment for contempt adjudged prior to the effective date of such amendments.

(d) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply with respect to conduct by a person that occurs on or after such date.

SA 3963. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ___. REASONABLE PRICE AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If any Federal agency or any non-profit entity using funds appropriated in this Act undertakes Federally funded health care research and development and is to convey or provide a patent for a drug, biologic, or other health care technology developed through such research, such agency or entity shall not make such conveyance or provide such patent until the entity (including a non-profit entity) that will receive such patent first agrees to a reasonable pricing agreement with the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the ''Secretary'') or the Secretary makes a determination that the public interest is served by a waiver of the reasonable pricing agreement provided in accordance with subsection (c).

(b) PROHIBITION OF DISCRIMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), any reasonable pricing formula that is utilized shall not result in discriminatory pricing for the drug, biologic, or other health care technology involved regardless of the number of bidders involved. In carrying out this subparagraph, the Secretary shall ensure that the Federal Government, with respect to the drug, biologic, or other health care technology involved, is charged an amount that is not more than the lowest amount charged to countries in the Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development for the same drug, biologic, or technology, that have the largest gross domestic product with a per capita income that is not less than half the per capita income of the United States.

(2) DISCRIMINATORY PRICING.—For the purposes of paragraph (1), a cost based reasonable pricing formula that is utilized shall be considered to result in discriminatory pricing if the contract for sale of the drug, biologic, or other health care technology places a limit on supply, or employs any other measure, that has the effect of—

(A) providing access to such drug, biologic, or technology on terms or conditions that are less favorable than the terms or conditions provided to a foreign purchaser (other than a charitable or humanitarian organization) of the drug, biologic, or technology; or

(B) restricting access to the drug, biologic, or technology under this section.

(c) WAIVER.—No waiver shall take effect under subsection (a) before the public is

given notice of the proposed waiver and provided a reasonable opportunity to comment on the proposed waiver. A decision to grant a waiver shall set out the Secretary's finding that such a waiver is in the public interest.

SA 3964. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Of the funds made available under this Act, not more than $1,000,000 shall be used by the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue a regulation requiring that direct-to-consumer prescription drug and biological product advertisements include an appropriate disclosure of pricing information with respect to such products.

SA 3965. Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. MURPHY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. GAO STUDY AND REPORT ON THE USE OF RESTRICTIVE EMPLOYMENT COVENANTS BY AGENCIES THAT PROVIDE HOME HEALTH SERVICES TO MEDICARE AND MEDICAID BENEFICIARIES.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States (in this section referred to as the ''Comptroller General'') shall conduct a study on the use of restrictive employment covenants by agencies that provide home health services to Medicare and Medicaid beneficiaries. Such study shall include an analysis of the following:

(1) The prevalence (and profile) of home health agencies that receive reimbursement for the provision of home health services under the Medicare and Medicaid programs and use restrictive employment covenants.

(2) The profile of workers at such agencies that are bound by such restrictive employment covenants, including the average wage of such workers and their employment status.

(3) The profile of the terms of such restrictive employment covenants, including geography and duration.

(4) Other items determined appropriate by the Comptroller General.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), together with recommendations for such legislation and administrative action as the Comptroller General determines appropriate.

SA 3966. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available in this division under the heading ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION, DEFENSE-WIDE'' for the Operational Energy Capability Improvement Fund, $15,000,000 shall be used to test and evaluate technologies that achieve operational energy capability improvement to support Naval Special Warfare and Marine Corps Expeditionary Warfare Center testing and tactical operations requirements.

SA 3967. Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be available directly or through a State (including through managed care contracts with a State) to a prohibited entity.

(b) PROHIBITED ENTITY.—The term ''prohibited entity'' means an entity, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and clinics—

(1) that, as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

(B) is an essential community provider described in section 156.235 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), that is primarily engaged in family planning services, reproductive health, and related medical care; and

(C) performs, or provides any funds to any other entity that performs abortions, other than an abortion performed—

(i) in the case of a pregnancy that is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(ii) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life endangering physical condition caused by, or arising from, the pregnancy itself; and

(2) for which the total amount of Federal grants to such entity, including grants to any affiliates, subsidiaries, or clinics of such entity, under title X of the Public Health Service Act in fiscal year 2016 exceeded $23,000,000.

(c) END OF PROHIBITION.—The definition in subsection (b) shall cease to apply to an entity if such entity certifies that it, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and clinics, will not perform, and will not provide any funds to any other entity that performs, an abortion as described in subsection (b)(1)(C).

SA 3968. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 1 day after enactment.

SA 3969. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in this Act shall go into effect 2 days after enactment.

SA 3970. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

The provisions in the Act shall go into effect 3 days after enactment.

SA 3971. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. CLEAN AIR REFUGEE ASSISTANCE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Clean Air Refugee Assistance Act of 2018''.

(b) ASSISTANCE.—In carrying out the Transitional Sheltering Assistance Program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency under section 403 of Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170b), the President may provide transitional shelter assistance to individuals living in an area where the air quality index is determined to be unhealthy for not less than 3 consecutive days as a result of a wildfire declared by the President to be a major disaster under section 401 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 5170) or declared to be a major disaster by the Governor of the State in which the individuals are located.

SA 3972. Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) Of the funds appropriated in this title under the heading ''REFUGEE AND ENTRANT ASSISTANCE'' and available for carrying out programs for victims of trafficking, not less than $500,000 shall be made available for carrying out section 702 of the Trafficking Awareness Training for Health Care Act of 2015 (title VII of Public Law 114–22) in a manner that complements and does not duplicate training activities carried out by the SOAR (Stop, Observe, Ask, Respond) to Health and Wellness Program of the Department of Health and Human Services.

(b) Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit to Congress a report on how the Department of Health and Human Services is carrying

out activities to develop, evaluate, and disseminate evidence-based best practices for training health professionals on identifying victims of human trafficking.

SA 3973. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Of the amount appropriated or otherwise made available by title VI of this division under the heading ''Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense'', up to $1,600,000 may be available for additional activities to counter the threat of fentanyl and its analogues from China through the following:

(1) Direct support to law enforcement operations in the form of additional analytic and cyber support.

(2) Expansion of counter-threat finance operations to increase access to financial intelligence for focused analysis of financial streams of fentanyl and its analogues.

SA 3974. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, detailing the circumstances in which the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services may be providing Medicare or Medicaid payments to, or otherwise funding, entities that process genome or exome data in the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation. The report shall outline the extent to which payments or other funding have been provided to such entities over the past 5 years, including amounts paid to each entity, and specific recommendations on steps to avoid payments in the future. In developing the report, the Secretary shall also coordinate with other relevant agencies, as determined by the Secretary, to examine the potential effect of allowing beneficiaries' genome or exome data to be processed in the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation on United States national security, United States intellectual property protections, HIPPA privacy protections, future biomedical development capabilities and competitiveness, and global competitiveness for United States laboratories.

SA 3975. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) In addition to amounts otherwise made available under this Act, there are appropriated $1,000,000 for the congenital heart disease program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading ''General Departmental Management'' under the heading ''Office of the Secretary'' in this title is hereby reduced by $1,000,000.

SA 3976. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. The Secretary shall prepare and submit to Congress, not later than September 24, 2018, a report specifying the process used by the Office of Refugee Resettlement in granting requests for congressional oversight visits to any facility in the United States in which unaccompanied alien children are housed or detained as a result of the policy described in the memorandum of the Attorney General entitled ''Zero-Tolerance for Offenses Under 8 U.S.C. 1325(a)'' dated April 6, 2018.

SA 3977. Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. MANCHIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The Secretary, prior to July 1, 2019, shall prepare and submit to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate a report that includes—

(1) a copy of the interagency agreement between the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Agriculture relating to the Civilian Conservation Centers;

(2) a list of all active Civilian Conservation Centers and contractors administering such Centers; and

(3) a cumulative record of the funding provided to Civilian Conservation Centers during the 10 years preceding the date of the report, including, for each Civilian Conservation Center—

(A) the funds allocated to the Civilian Conservation Center;

(B) the number of enrollment slots maintained, disaggregated by gender and by residential or nonresidential training type;

(C) the career technical training offerings available;

(D) the staffing levels and staffing patterns at the Civilian Conservation Center; and

''(E) the number of Career Technical Skills Training slots available.''.

SA 3978. Mr. PERDUE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be obligated or expended to provide aid to the Government of the People's Republic of China or a provincial or local government of the People's Republic of China.

(b)(1) Not later than December 31, 2018, and every December 31 thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a report on spending by Federal agencies relating to amounts—

(A) given by any Federal agency directly to the Government of the People's Republic of China or a provincial or local government of the People's Republic of China;

(B) spent directly by Federal agencies to fund programs associated with the aid to the Government of the People's Republic of China or a provincial or local government of the People's Republic of China; and

(C) spent by any Federal agency to fund programs that indirectly aid the Government of the People's Republic of China or a provincial or local government of the People's Republic of China.

(2) Each report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) The amounts spent by each Federal agency by program and funding stream.

(B) An accounting of the use of funds by the People's Republic of China by program.

(C) A description of the mechanisms for tracking the use of funds by the People's Republic of China.

(D) A description of the history of the programs and initiatives funded by such funds.

(3) The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

SA 3979. Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 199, line 3, strike the period and insert the following: '': *Provided further*, that of the funds made available under this heading, $1,000,000 shall be available through the Telehealth Network grant to fund awards that use evidence-based practices that promote school safety and individual health, mental health, and well-being by providing assessment and referrals for health, mental health, or substance use disorder services to students who may be struggling with behavioral or mental health issues and providing training and support to teachers, school counselors, administrative staff, school resource officers, and other relevant staff to identify, refer, and intervene to help students experiencing mental health needs or who are considering harming themselves or others.''.

SA 3980. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of

Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ANNUAL REPORTS ON THE READINESS OF THE ENLISTED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once each year thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on readiness of the enlisted members of the Armed Forces.

(b) ELEMENTS.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) shall include, for the one-year period ending on the date of such report, the following (which shall be disaggregated, when applicable, by members of the Armed Forces who have been deployed and by members who have not been deployed):

(1) The percentage of enlisted members who were diagnosed with a mental health disorder before joining the Armed Forces.

(2) The percentage of enlisted members who were diagnosed with a mental health disorder during their first year as a member of the Armed Forces.

(3) The percentage of individuals—

(A) who were discharged or released from service in the Armed Forces during their first year in such service; and

(B) whose discharge or release from service in the Armed Forces was under conditions that were dishonorable or other than honorable.

(4) The percentage of individuals who enlisted in the Armed Forces pursuant to a waiver to enlist, set forth by Armed Force.

(5) The reasons for the waivers described in paragraph (4), set forth by Armed Force.

(6) The percentage of enlisted members who committed suicide during their first year of service in the Armed Forces.

(7) The percentage of enlisted members who committee suicide during their third year of service in the Armed Forces.

SEC. _____. CENTRALIZED DATABASE ON CANDIDATES NOT ACCEPTED FOR ENLISTMENT IN THE ARMED FORCES.

Commencing not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish and maintain within the Department of Defense a centralized database on candidates who were not accepted for enlistment in the Armed Forces, including the reasons for non-acceptance.

SA 3981. Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BENNET, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. GARDNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Of the funds appropriated to the Department of Defense under the headings ''Operation and Maintenance, Air Force'' and ''Operation and Maintenance, Air National Guard'', not more than $45,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Air Force for payments to a local water authority located in the vicinity of an Air Force or Air National Guard base (including a base not Federally-owned), or to a State in which the local water authority is located, for the treatment of perfluorooctane sulfonic acid and perfluorooctanoic acid in drinking water from the water source and/or wells owned and operated by the local water authority undertaken to attain the Environmental Protection Agency Lifetime Health Advisory level for such acids: *Provided*, That the applicable Lifetime Health Advisory shall be the one in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the local water authority or State must have requested such a payment from the Air Force or National Guard Bureau not later than the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That the elevated levels of such acids in the water was the result of activities conducted by or paid for by the Department of the Air Force or the Air National Guard: *Provided further*, That such funds may be expended without regard to existing contractual provisions in agreements between the Department of the Air Force or the National Guard Bureau, as the case may be, and the State in which the base is located relating to environmental response actions or indemnification: *Provided further*, That, in order to be eligible for payment under this section, such treatment must have taken place after January 1, 2016, and the local water authority or State, as the case may be, must waive all claims for treatment expenses incurred before such date: *Provided further*, That any payment under this section may not exceed the actual cost of such treatment resulting from the activities conducted by or paid for by the Department of the Air Force: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may enter into such agreements with the local water authority or State as may be necessary to implement this section: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may pay, utilizing the Defense State Memorandum of Agreement, costs that would otherwise be eligible for payment under that agreement were those costs paid using funds appropriated to the Environmental Restoration Account, Air Force, established under section 2703(a)(4) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 3982. Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. YOUNG) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) In addition to amounts appropriated under the heading ''Children and Families Services Programs'' under the heading ''Administration for Children and Families'', there is appropriated $10,000,000 for purposes of carrying out title I of the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading ''children and Families Services Programs'' is hereby reduced by $10,000,000.

SA 3983. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION C—SECURE ELECTIONS ACT

SEC. _01. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Secure Elections Act''.

SEC. _02. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Appropriations, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Speaker, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) APPROPRIATE FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The term ''appropriate Federal entities'' means—

(A) the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(B) the Department of Defense;

(C) the Department, including the component of the Department that reports to the Under Secretary responsible for overseeing critical infrastructure protection, cybersecurity, and other related programs of the Department;

(D) the Department of Justice, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(E) the Commission; and

(F) the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the National Security Agency, and such other elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)) as the Director of National Intelligence determines are appropriate.

(3) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Election Assistance Commission.

(4) CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT.—The term ''cybersecurity incident'' has the meaning given the term ''incident'' in section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 148).

(5) DEPARTMENT.—The term ''Department'' means the Department of Homeland Security.

(6) ELECTION AGENCY.—The term ''election agency'' means any component of a State or any component of a county, municipality, or other subdivision of a State that is responsible for administering Federal elections.

(7) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT.—The term ''election cybersecurity incident'' means any cybersecurity incident involving an election system.

(8) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY THREAT.—The term ''election cybersecurity threat'' means any cybersecurity threat (as defined in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501)) to an election system.

(9) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY VULNERABILITY.—The term ''election cybersecurity vulnerability'' means any security vulnerability (as defined in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501)) that affects an election system.

(10) ELECTION SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ''election service provider'' means any person providing, supporting, or maintaining an election system on behalf of an election agency, such as a contractor or vendor.

(11) ELECTION SYSTEM.—The term ''election system'' means the following:

(A) Information technology infrastructure and systems used to maintain voter registration databases.

(B) Voting systems and associated infrastructure, which are generally held in storage but are located at polling places during early voting and on election day.

(C) Information technology infrastructure and systems used to manage elections, which may include systems that count, audit, and display election results on election night on behalf of State governments as well as for post-election reporting used to certify and validate election results.

(D) Such other systems the Secretary, in consultation with the Commission, may identify as central to the management, support, or administration of a Federal election.

(12) FEDERAL ELECTION.—The term ''Federal election'' means a general, special, primary, or runoff election for the office of President or Vice President, or of a Senator or Representative in, or Delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress that is conducted by an election agency.

(13) FEDERAL ENTITY.—The term ''Federal entity'' means any agency (as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States Code).

(14) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(15) SIGNIFICANT CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT.—The term ''significant cybersecurity incident'' is a cybersecurity incident that is, or a group of related cybersecurity incidents that together are, likely to result in demonstrable harm to the national security interests, foreign relations, or economy of the United States or to the public confidence, civil liberties, or public health and safety of the American people.

(16) SIGNIFICANT ELECTION CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT.—The term ''significant election cybersecurity incident'' means any significant cybersecurity incident involving an election system.

(17) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

(18) STATE ELECTION OFFICIAL.—The term ''State election official'' means—

(A) the chief State election official of a State designated under section 10 of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 (52 U.S.C. 20509); or

(B) in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of Northern Mariana Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands, a chief State election official designated by the State for purposes of this division.

(19) VOTING SYSTEM.—The term ''voting system'' has the meaning given the term in section 301(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081(b)).

SEC. __03. INFORMATION SHARING.

(a) DESIGNATION OF RESPONSIBLE FEDERAL ENTITY.—The Secretary shall have primary responsibility within the Federal Government for sharing information about election cybersecurity incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities with Federal entities and with election agencies.

(b) PRESUMPTION OF FEDERAL INFORMATION SHARING TO THE DEPARTMENT.—If a Federal entity receives information about an election cybersecurity incident, threat, or vulnerability, the Federal entity shall promptly share that information with the Department, unless the head of the entity (or a Senate-confirmed official designated by the head) makes a specific determination in writing that there is good cause to withhold the particular information.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF INFORMATION SHARING PLANS AND PROTOCOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish and maintain a communication plan and protocols to promptly share information related to election cybersecurity incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities.

(2) CONTENTS.—The communication plan and protocols required to be established under paragraph (1) shall require that the Department promptly share appropriate information with—

(A) the appropriate Federal entities;

(B) all State election officials;

(C) to the maximum extent practicable, all election agencies that have requested ongoing updates on election cybersecurity incidents, threats, or vulnerabilities; and

(D) to the maximum extent practicable, all election agencies that may be affected by the risks associated with the particular election cybersecurity incident, threat, or vulnerability.

(d) DEVELOPMENT OF STATE ELECTION CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT RESPONSE AND COMMUNICATION PLAN TEMPLATE.—The Secretary shall, in coordination with the Commission and the Election Infrastructure Government Coordinating Council, establish a template that a State may use when establishing a State election cybersecurity incident response and communication plan.

(e) TECHNICAL RESOURCES FOR ELECTION AGENCIES.—In sharing information about election cybersecurity incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities with election agencies under this section, the Department shall, to the maximum extent practicable—

(1) provide cyber threat indicators and defensive measures (as such terms are defined in section 102 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (6 U.S.C. 1501)), such as recommended technical instructions, that assist with preventing, mitigating, and detecting threats or vulnerabilities;

(2) identify resources available for protecting against, detecting, responding to, and recovering from associated risks, including technical capabilities of the Department; and

(3) provide guidance about further sharing of the information.

(f) DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW.—If the Department receives classified information about an election cybersecurity incident, threat, or vulnerability—

(1) the Secretary shall promptly submit a request for expedited declassification review to the head of a Federal entity with authority to conduct the review, consistent with Executive Order 13526 or any successor order, unless the Secretary determines that such a request would be harmful to national security; and

(2) the head of the Federal entity described in paragraph (1) shall promptly conduct the review.

(g) ROLE OF NON-FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The Department may share information about election cybersecurity incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities through a non-Federal entity.

(h) PROTECTION OF PERSONAL AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a Federal entity shares or receives information relating to an election cybersecurity incident, threat, or vulnerability, the Federal entity shall, within Federal information systems (as defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code) of the entity—

(A) minimize the acquisition, use, and disclosure of personal information of voters, except as necessary to identify, protect against, detect, respond to, or recover from election cybersecurity incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities;

(B) notwithstanding any other provision of law, prohibit the retention of personal information of voters, such as—

(i) voter registration information, including physical address, email address, and telephone number;

(ii) political party affiliation or registration information; and

(iii) voter history, including registration status or election participation; and

(C) protect confidential Federal and State information from unauthorized disclosure.

(2) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—Information relating to an election cybersecurity incident, threat, or vulnerability, such as personally identifiable information of reporting persons or individuals affected by such incident, threat, or vulnerability, shared by or with the Federal Government shall be—

(A) deemed voluntarily shared information and exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local provision of law requiring disclosure of information or records; and

(B) withheld, without discretion, from the public under section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local provision of law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(i) DUTY TO ASSESS POSSIBLE CYBERSECURITY INCIDENTS.—

(1) ELECTION AGENCIES.—If an election agency becomes aware of the possibility of an election cybersecurity incident, the election agency shall promptly—

(A) assess whether an election cybersecurity incident occurred;

(B) notify the State election official in accordance with any notification process established by the State election official; and

(C) notify the Department in accordance with subsection (j).

(2) ELECTION SERVICE PROVIDERS.—If an election service provider becomes aware of the possibility of an election cybersecurity incident, the election service provider shall promptly—

(A) assess whether an election cybersecurity incident occurred; and

(B) notify the relevant election agencies in accordance with subsection (k).

(j) INFORMATION SHARING ABOUT CYBERSECURITY INCIDENTS BY ELECTION AGENCIES.—If an election agency has reason to believe that an election cybersecurity incident has occurred with respect to an election system owned, operated, or maintained by or on behalf of the election agency, the election agency shall, in the most expedient time possible and without unreasonable delay, provide notification of the election cybersecurity incident to the Department in accordance with any notification process established by the Secretary.

(k) INFORMATION SHARING ABOUT CYBERSECURITY INCIDENTS BY ELECTION SERVICE PROVIDERS.—If an election service provider has reason to believe that an election cybersecurity incident may have occurred, or that an incident related to the role of the provider as an election service provider may have occurred, the election service provider shall—

(1) notify the relevant election agencies in the most expedient time possible and without unreasonable delay; and

(2) cooperate with the election agencies in providing the notifications required under subsections (i)(1) and (j).

(l) CONTENT OF NOTIFICATION BY ELECTION AGENCIES.—The notifications required under subsections (i)(1) and (j)—

(1) shall include an initial assessment of—

(A) the date, time, and time zone when the election cybersecurity incident began, if known;

(B) the date, time, and time zone when the election cybersecurity incident was detected;

(C) the date, time, and duration of the election cybersecurity incident;

(D) the circumstances of the election cybersecurity incident, including the specific election systems believed to have been accessed and information acquired; and

(E) planned and implemented technical measures to respond to and recover from the incident; and

(2) shall be updated with additional material information, including technical data, as it becomes available.

(m) SECURITY CLEARANCE.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary—

(1) shall establish an expedited process for providing appropriate security clearance to State election officials and designated technical personnel employed by State election agencies;

(2) shall establish an expedited process for providing appropriate security clearance to members of the Commission and designated technical personnel employed by the Commission; and

(3) shall establish a process for providing appropriate security clearance to personnel at other election agencies.

(n) PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.—Nothing in this division may be construed to provide a cause of action against a State, unit of local government, or an election service provider.

(o) ASSESSMENT OF INTER-STATE INFORMATION SHARING ABOUT ELECTION CYBERSECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Commission, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities and appropriate officials of State and local governments, shall conduct an assessment of—

(A) the structure and functioning of the Elections Infrastructure Information Sharing and Analysis Center for purposes of election cybersecurity; and

(B) other mechanisms for inter-state information sharing about election cybersecurity.

(2) COMMENT FROM ELECTION AGENCIES.—In carrying out the assessment required under paragraph (1), the Secretary and the Commission shall solicit and consider comments from all State election agencies.

(3) DISTRIBUTION.—The Secretary and the Commission shall jointly issue the assessment required under paragraph (1) to—

(A) all election agencies known to the Department and the Commission; and

(B) the appropriate congressional committees.

(p) CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—If an appropriate Federal entity has reason to believe that a significant election cybersecurity incident has occurred, the entity shall—

(1) not later than 7 calendar days after the date on which there is a reasonable basis to conclude that the significant election cybersecurity incident has occurred, provide notification of the significant election cybersecurity incident to the appropriate congressional committees; and

(2) update the initial notification under paragraph (1) within a reasonable period of time after additional information relating to the significant election cybersecurity incident is discovered.

SEC. __04. REQUIREMENT FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT RESPONSE PLANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new part:

"PART 7—REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTION ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 297. ELECTION CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT RESPONSE AND COMMUNICATION PLANS.

''No State may receive any grant awarded under this Act after the date of the enactment of this section unless such State has established a response and communication plan with respect to election cybersecurity incidents (as defined in section 2(7) of the Secure Elections Act). Nothing in this section shall prohibit a State from using funds awarded before the date of the enactment of this section for any use otherwise authorized by law.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 296 the following:

''PART 7—REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTION ASSISTANCE

''Sec. 297. Election cybersecurity incident response and communication plans.''.

SEC. __05. ELECTION CYBERSECURITY AND ELECTION AUDIT GUIDELINES.

(a) DEVELOPMENT BY TECHNICAL ADVISORY BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ADDITIONAL DUTIES.—Section 221(b)(1) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961(b)(2)) is amended by striking ''in the development of the voluntary voting system guidelines'' and inserting ''in the development of—

''(A) the voluntary voting system guidelines;

''(B) the voluntary election cybersecurity guidelines (referred to in this part as the 'election cybersecurity guidelines') in accordance with paragraph (3); and

''(C) the voluntary election audit guidelines (referred to in this part as the 'election audit guidelines') in accordance with paragraph (4).''.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Sections 202(1) and 207(3) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922(1) and 20927(3)) are each amended by striking ''voluntary voting system''.

(2) MEMBERSHIP AND RENAMING OF TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE.—

(A) MEMBERSHIP.—Section 221(c)(1) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961(c)(1)) is amended—

(i) by striking ''14'' and inserting ''19''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraphs (A) through (E) and inserting the following:

''(A) 2 Members of the Standards Board who are not affiliated with the same political party—

''(i) 1 of whom is a local election official; and

''(ii) 1 of whom is a State election official.

''(B) 2 Members of the Board of Advisors who are not affiliated with the same political party.

''(C) 2 Members of the Architectural and Transportation Barrier Compliance Board under section 502 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1972 (29 U.S.C. 792).

''(D) A representative of the Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers.

''(E) 2 representatives of the National Association of Secretaries of State selected by such Association who are not members of the Standards Board or Board of Advisors, and who are not of the same political party.

''(F) 2 representatives of the National Association of State Election Directors selected by such Association who are not members of the Standards Board or Board of Advisors, and who are not of the same political party.

''(G) A representative of the Department of Homeland Security who possesses technical and scientific expertise relating to cybersecurity and the administration of elections.

''(H) A representative of the Election Infrastructure Information Sharing and Analysis Center who possesses technical and scientific expertise relating to cybersecurity.

''(I) A representative of the National Association of State Chief Information Officers.

''(J) A representative of State election information technology directors selected by the National Association of State Election Directors.

''(K) A representative of a manufacturer of voting system hardware and software who possesses technical and scientific expertise relating to cybersecurity and the administration of elections.

''(L) A representative of a laboratory accredited under section 231(b) who possesses technical and scientific expertise relating to cybersecurity and the administration of elections.

''(M) A representative that is an academic or scientific researcher who possesses technical and scientific expertise relating to cybersecurity.

''(N) A representative who possesses technical and scientific expertise relating to the accessibility and usability of voting systems.''.

(B) RENAMING OF COMMITTEE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Section 221(a) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961(a)) is amended by striking ''Technical Guidelines Development Committee (hereafter in this part referred to as the 'Development Committee')'' and inserting ''Technical Advisory Board''.

(ii) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(I) Section 201 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20921) is amended by striking ''Technical Guidelines Development Committee'' and inserting ''Technical Advisory Board''.

(II) Section 221 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20921) is amended by striking ''Development Committee'' each place it appears and inserting ''Technical Advisory Board''.

(III) Section 222(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20962(b)) is amended—

(aa) by striking ''Technical Guidelines Development Committee'' in paragraph (1) and inserting ''Technical Advisory Board'',

(bb) by striking ''DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE'' in the heading and inserting ''TECHNICAL ADVISORY BOARD'', and

(IV) Section 271(e) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21041(e)) is amended by striking ''Technical Guidelines Development Committee'' and inserting ''Technical Advisory Board''.

(V) Section 281(d) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21051(d)) is amended by striking ''Technical Guidelines Development Committee'' and inserting ''Technical Advisory Board''.

(VI) The heading for section 221of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20961) is amended by striking ''**TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**'' and inserting ''**TECHNICAL ADVISORY BOARD**''.

(VII) The heading for part 3 of subtitle A of title II of such Act is amended by striking ''**TECHNICAL GUIDELINES DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**'' and inserting ''**TECHNICAL ADVISORY BOARD**''.

(VIII) The items relating to section 221 and part 3 of title II in the table of contents of such Act are each amended by striking ''Technical Guidelines Development Committee'' and inserting ''Technical Advisory Board''.

(b) GUIDELINES.—

(1) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES.—Section 221(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(3) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY GUIDELINES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The election cybersecurity guidelines shall contain guidelines for election cybersecurity, including standards for procuring, maintaining, testing, operating, and updating election systems.

''(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In developing the guidelines, the Technical Advisory Board shall—

''(i) identify the top risks to election systems;

''(ii) describe how specific technology choices can increase or decrease those risks; and

''(iii) provide recommended policies, best practices, and overall security strategies for identifying, protecting against, detecting, responding to, and recovering from the risks identified under subparagraph (A).

''(C) ISSUES CONSIDERED.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—In developing the election cybersecurity guidelines, the Technical Advisory Board shall consider—

''(I) applying established cybersecurity best practices to Federal election administration by States and local governments, including appropriate technologies, procedures, and personnel for identifying, protecting against, detecting, responding to, and recovering from election cybersecurity incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities;

''(II) providing actionable guidance to election agencies that seek to implement additional cybersecurity protections; and

''(III) any other factors that the Technical Advisory Board determines to be relevant.

''(D) RELATIONSHIP TO VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDELINES AND NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY CYBERSECURITY GUIDANCE.—In developing the election cybersecurity guidelines, the Technical Advisory Board shall consider—

''(i) the voluntary voting system guidelines; and

''(ii) cybersecurity standards and best practices developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, including frameworks, consistent with section 2(c) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272(c)).''.

(2) AUDIT GUIDELINES.—Section 221(b) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20961(b)), as amended by paragraph (1), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) ELECTION AUDIT GUIDELINES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The election audit guidelines shall include provisions regarding voting systems and statistical audits for Federal elections, including that—

''(i) each vote is cast using a voting system that allows the voter an opportunity to inspect and confirm the marked ballot before casting it (consistent with accessibility requirements); and

''(ii) each election result is determined by tabulating marked ballots, and prior to the date on which the winning Federal candidate in the election is sworn into office, election agencies within the State inspect a random sample of the marked ballots and thereby establish high statistical confidence in the election result.

''(B) ISSUES CONSIDERED.—In developing the election audit guidelines, the Technical Advisory Board shall consider—

''(i) specific types of election audits, including procedures and shortcomings for such audits;

''(ii) mechanisms to verify that election systems accurately tabulate ballots, report results, and identify a winner for each election for Federal office, even if there is an error or fault in the voting system;

''(iii) durational requirements needed to facilitate election audits in a timely manner that allows for confidence in the outcome of the election prior to the swearing-in of a Federal candidate, including variations in the acceptance of postal ballots, time allowed to cure provisional ballots, and election certification deadlines;

''(iv) the importance of manual (by hand, not device) inspections of original marked paper ballots to provide audits without serious vulnerabilities; and

''(v) any other factors that the Technical Advisory Board considers to be relevant.''.

(3) DEADLINES.—Section 221(b)(2) of such Act (52 U.S.C. 20961(b)(2)), as amended by this Act, is amended—

(A) by striking ''The Technical'' and inserting the following:

''(A) VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDELINES.—The Technical'';

(B) by striking ''this section'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A)''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY AND ELECTION AUDIT GUIDELINES.—

''(i) INITIAL GUIDELINES.—The Technical Advisory Board shall provide its initial set of recommendations under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1) to the Executive Director not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of the Secure Elections Act.

''(ii) PERIODIC REVIEW.—Not later than March 31, 2021, and once every 2 years thereafter, the Technical Advisory Board shall review and update the guidelines described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1).''.

(c) PROCESS FOR ADOPTION.—

(1) PUBLICATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS.—Section 221(f) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961(f)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''At the time the Commission'' and inserting the following:

''(1) VOLUNTARY VOTING SYSTEM GUIDELINES.—At the time the Commission''; and.

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) ELECTION CYBERSECURITY AND ELECTION AUDIT GUIDELINES.—The Technical Advisory Board shall—

''(A) provide a reasonable opportunity for public comment, including through Commission publication in the Federal Register, on the guidelines required under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(1), including a 45-day opportunity for public comment on a draft of the guidelines before they are submitted to Congress under section 223(a), which shall, to the extent practicable, occur concurrently with the other activities of the Technical Advisory Board under this section with respect to such guidelines; and

''(B) consider the public comments in developing the guidelines.''.

(2) ADOPTION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Part 3 of subtitle A of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20961 et seq.) is amended—

(i) by inserting ''**OF VOLUNTARY VOTING GUIDELINES**'' after ''**ADOPTION**'' in the heading of section 222; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 223. PROCESS FOR ADOPTION OF ELECTION CYBERSECURITY AND ELECTION AUDIT GUIDELINES.

''(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 calendar days after the date on which the Commission receives recommendations for the guidelines described in subparagraphs (B) or (C) of section 221(b)(1), the Commission shall consider the guidelines and submit the guidelines to the appropriate congressional committees.

''(2) MODIFICATION.—In considering the guidelines, the Commission may modify the guidelines if—

''(A) the Commission determines that there is good cause to modify the guidelines, consistent with the considerations established in paragraphs (3) or (4) of section 221(b) (as the case may be) and notwithstanding the recommendation of the Technical Advisory Board; and

''(B) the Commission submits a written justification of the modification to the Technical Advisory Board and the appropriate congressional committees.

''(b) DISTRIBUTION TO ELECTION AGENCIES.—The Commission shall distribute the guidelines described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 221(b)(1) to all election agencies known to the Commission.

''(c) PUBLICATION.—The Commission shall make the guidelines described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 221(b)(1) available on the public website of the Commission.

''(d) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—For purposes of this section, the term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

''(1) the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the majority leader, and the minority leader of the Senate; and

''(2) the Committee on House Administration, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Appropriations, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Speaker, and the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

''(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to subject the process for developing the guidelines described in subparagraphs (B) and (C) of section 221(b)(1) to subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Administrative Procedure Act').''.

(B) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 222 the following new item:

''Sec. 223. Process for adoption of election cybersecurity and election audit guidelines.''.

SEC. __06. REQUIREMENT TO CONDUCT POST-ELECTION AUDITS.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle A of title III of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 21081 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating sections 304 and 305 as sections 305 and 306, respectively; and

(B) by inserting after section 303 the following new section:

''SEC. 304. POST-ELECTION AUDITS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each State shall—

''(1) conduct a post-election audit of each Federal election (as defined in section 2 of the Secure Elections Act) through the inspection of a random sample of marked ballots of sufficient quantity to establish high statistical confidence in the election result;

''(2) provide a description of the planned audit, excluding any information deemed to create a security risk, to be conducted under paragraph (1) on a public website administered by the chief State election official 90 days prior to each such Federal election; and

''(3) provide results of the completed audit under paragraph (1) on a public website administered by the chief State election official within 10 days of the completion of the audit.

''(b) TIME FOR COMPLETING AUDIT.—The audit required by subsection (a) shall be completed in a timely manner to ensure confidence in the outcome of the election and before—

''(1) in the case of a primary election, the date the candidate is placed on the general election ballot; and

''(2) in the case of a general election, the date on which the winning candidate in the election is sworn into office.

''(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State shall be required to comply with the requirements of this section for the regularly scheduled general election for Federal office held in November 2020, and each subsequent election for Federal office.

''(2) WAIVER.—If a State certifies to the Commission not later than November 1, 2020,

that the State will not meet the deadline described in paragraph (1) for good cause and includes in the certification the reasons for the failure to meet such deadline, paragraph (1) shall apply to the State as if the reference in such subparagraph to 'November 2020' were a reference to 'November 2022'.''.

(2) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 401 of such Act (52 U.S.C. 21111) is amended by striking ''and 303'' and inserting ''303, and 304''.

(3) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of such Act is amended—

(A) by redesignating the items relating to sections 304 and 305 as relating to sections 305 and 306, respectively; and

(B) by inserting after the item relating to section 303 the following new item:

''Sec. 304. Post-election audits.''.

(b) REPORTING.—The Election Assistance Commission shall—

(1) collect information regarding audits conducted by States under section 304 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (as added by subsection (a)); and

(2) submit reports to Congress on the information provided by the States under section 304(a)(2) and 304(a)(3) of such Act (as so added) and other information collected by the Commission under paragraph (1).

The reports under paragraph (2) shall be submitted concurrently with the reports required under section 9(a)(3) of the National Voter Registration Act of 1993.

SEC. __07. REQUIREMENT FOR PAPER BALLOTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part 7 of subtitle D of title II of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, as added by section 4, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''SEC. 298. PAPER BALLOTS.

''No State or jurisdiction may use any grant awarded under this Act after the date of the enactment of this section to obtain voting equipment unless such voting equipment records each vote on a marked or printed, individualized, readable paper ballot and allows the voter an opportunity to inspect and confirm the marked or printed ballot (consistent with accessibility requirements under Federal law) before the ballot is cast and counted. Nothing in this section shall prohibit a State from using funds awarded before the date of the enactment of this section to obtain such equipment.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, as amended by section 4, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 297 the following:

''Sec. 298. Paper ballots.''.

SEC. __08. STREAMLINING THE COLLECTION OF ELECTION INFORMATION.

Section 202 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

''Subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, shall not apply to the collection of information for purposes of maintaining any clearinghouse with respect to the administration of Federal elections or the experiences of State and local governments in implementing the guidelines described in paragraph (1) or in operating voting systems in general.''.

SEC. __09. REPORTS TO CONGRESS ON FOREIGN THREATS TO ELECTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and 90 days before the end of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary and the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall submit a joint report to the appropriate congressional committees on foreign threats to elections in the United States, including physical and cybersecurity threats.

(b) VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION BY STATES.—The Secretary shall solicit and consider comments from all State election agencies. Participation by an election agency in the report under this subsection shall be voluntary and at the discretion of the State.

SEC. __10. STATE ELECTION SYSTEM CYBERSECURITY MODERNIZATION AND MAINTENANCE GRANTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20901 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following new title:

''TITLE X—PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CYBERSECURITY MODERNIZATION AND MAINTENANCE

''SEC. 1001. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this title:

''(1) CYBER NAVIGATOR PROGRAM.—The term 'cyber navigator program' means a program under which the State election official employs election technology professionals to provide practical cybersecurity knowledge, support, and services to local election officials, including—

''(A) assessments of local election offices;

''(B) support to local information technology staff or vendors in creating cyber security policies for voting systems (as defined in section 301(b));

''(C) services to mitigate vulnerabilities discovered during an assessment and to improve cybersecurity of a local election office;

''(D) the establishment of best cyber hygiene practices within an office; and

''(E) advice on the purchase of new election systems.

''(2) STATE.—The term 'State' means each of the several States of the United States and the District of Columbia.

''SEC. 1002. PAYMENTS TO STATES.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall award annual grants to States in accordance with this section.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—A State receiving a grant under this section shall use the funds received under the grant only to—

''(1) upgrade election-related computer systems to address cyber vulnerabilities consistent with best practices recommended by the Department of Homeland Security, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the Commission;

''(2) implement a post-election audit system that provides a high statistical confidence in the election result;

''(3) obtain or facilitate cybersecurity training for officials in the office of the State election official and for local election officials; and

''(4) establish or maintain a cyber navigator program.

''(c) AMOUNT OF GRANTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (3), the amount of funds provided to a State under a grant under this section for any calendar year shall be equal to the product obtained by multiplying—

''(A) the total amount appropriated for grants pursuant to the authorization under section 1003(a); by

''(B) the State allocation percentage for the State (as determined under paragraph (2)).

''(2) STATE ALLOCATION PERCENTAGE.—The State allocation percentage for a State is the amount (expressed as a percentage) equal to the quotient obtained by dividing—

''(A) the total voting age population of all States (as reported in the most recent decennial census); by

''(B) the voting age population of the State (as reported in the most recent decennial census).

''(3) MINIMUM AND MAXIMUM AMOUNT OF PAYMENT.—The amount determined under this subsection—

''(A) may not be less than $2,500,000 and

''(B) may not be greater than $10,000,000.

''(4) PRO RATA ADJUSTMENT.—The Commission shall make such pro rata adjustments to the allocations determined under paragraph (1) as are necessary to comply with the requirements of paragraph (3).

''SEC. 1003. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Commission $250,000,000 to carry out this title for each of fiscal years 2019 and 2020.

''(b) AVAILABILITY.—Any amounts appropriated pursuant to paragraph (1) shall remain available without fiscal year limitation until expended.

''(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR COMMISSION.—In addition to the amounts authorized under subsection (a), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Commission such sums as may be necessary to administer the programs under this title.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 202 of the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (52 U.S.C. 20922) is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting ''; and'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) carrying out the grant program under title X.''.

(2) The table of contents of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''TITLE X—PAYMENTS TO STATES FOR CYBERSECURITY MODERNIZATION AND MAINTENANCE

''Sec. 1001. Definitions.
''Sec. 1002. Payments to States.
''Sec. 1003. Authorization of appropriations.''.

SA 3984. Ms. DUCKWORTH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended by the Secretary of Defense in positively referencing, citing, or otherwise relying on a majority ruling in Korematsu v. United States, 323 U.S. 214 (1944), Hirabayashi v. United States, 320 U.S. 81 (1943), or Yasui v. United States, 320 U.S. 115 (1943) to justify the constitutionality or legality of any program, policy, guidance, or activity.

SA 3985. Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division B, insert the following:

''SEC. ____. (a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the condition of the public school facilities of the United States.

''(b) In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall study the following factors related to supporting a 21st century education:

''(1) Structural integrity.

''(2) Plumbing.

''(3) Heating, ventilation, and air conditioning systems.

''(4) Compliance with fire and safety codes.

''(5) Compliance with Federal laws, including the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.).

''(6) Lighting.

''(7) Indoor air quality.

''(8) Environmental conditions, such as exposure to asbestos, lead, and mold.

''(9) Physical security.

''(10) Sufficient space for instruction.

''(c) Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate, and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Education and the Workforce of the House of Representatives, the findings of the study under this section.''.

SA 3986. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, detailing the circumstances in which the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services may be providing Medicare or Medicaid payments to, or otherwise funding, entities that process genome or exome data in the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation. The report shall outline the extent to which payments or other funding have been provided to such entities over the past 5 years, including amounts paid to each entity, the implications of such payments, including vulnerabilities, and specific recommendations on steps to ensure that payments are lawful and appropriate in the future. In developing the report, the Secretary shall also coordinate with other relevant agencies, as determined by the Secretary, to examine the potential effect of allowing beneficiaries' genome or exome data to be processed in the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation on United States national security, United States intellectual property protections, HIPPA privacy protections, future biomedical development capabilities and competitiveness, and global competitiveness for United States laboratories.

SA 3987. Mr. SASSE (for himself and Mr. KING) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. STUDY ON CYBEREXPLOITATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—Not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall complete a study on the cyberexploitation of the personal information and accounts of members of the Armed Forces and their families.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The study required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the vulnerability of members of the Armed Forces and their families to inappropriate access to their personal information and accounts of such members and their families, including identification of particularly vulnerable subpopulations.

(2) Creation of a catalogue of past and current efforts by foreign governments and nonstate actors at the cyberexploitation of the personal information and accounts of members of the Armed Forces and their families, including an assessment of the purposes of such efforts and their degrees of success.

(3) An assessment of the actions taken by the Department of Defense to educate members of the Armed Forces and their families, including particularly vulnerable subpopulations, about and actions that can be take to otherwise reduce these threats.

(4) Assessment of the potential for the cyberexploitation of misappropriated images and videos as well as deep fakes.

(5) Development of recommendations for policy changes to reduce the vulnerability of members of the Armed Forces and their families to cyberexploitation, including recommendations for legislative or administrative action.

(c) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the findings of the Secretary with respect to the study required by subsection (a).

(2) FORM.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term ''congressional defense committees'' has the meaning given such term in section 101 of title 10, United States Code.

(2) The term ''cyberexploitation'' means the use of digital means to obtain access to an individual's personal information without authorization.

(3) The term ''deep fake'' means the digital insertion of a person's likeness into or digital alteration of a person's likeness in visual media, such as photographs and videos, without the person's permission and with malicious intent.

SA 3988. Mr. SCOTT (for himself and Mr. BROWN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VIII of division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amount appropriated by title IV of this division under the heading ''Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' is hereby increased by $8,000,000, with the amount of the increase to be available for research, development, test and evaluation at Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) (in addition to any other amounts available under that heading for such research, development, test and evaluation).

SA 3989. Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WARNER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) In addition, $10,000,000 shall be made available to provide for the deferment of loans made under part D of title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to eligible institutions that are private Historically Black Colleges and Universities that applied for, were denied, and were eligible for a deferment in fiscal year 2018 of such a loan under the terms and conditions of the second paragraph under the heading ''Historically Black College and University Capital Financing Program Account'' under the Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2018.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading ''Student Financial Assistance'' under this title is hereby reduced by $10,000,000.

SA 3990. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3699 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SHELBY) to the amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ___. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be available directly or through a State (including through managed care contracts with a State) to a prohibited entity.

(b) PROHIBITED ENTITY.—The term ''prohibited entity'' means an entity, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and clinics—

(1) that, as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

(B) is an essential community provider described in section 156.235 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), that is primarily engaged in family planning services, reproductive health, and related medical care; and

(C) performs, or provides any funds to any other entity that performs abortions, other than an abortion performed—

(i) in the case of a pregnancy that is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(ii) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life endangering physical condition caused by, or arising from, the pregnancy itself; and

(2) for which the total amount of Federal grants to such entity, including grants to any affiliates, subsidiaries, or clinics of such entity, under title X of the Public Health Service Act in fiscal year 2016 exceeded $23,000,000.

(c) END OF PROHIBITION.—The definition in subsection (b) shall cease to apply to an entity if such entity certifies that it, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and

clinics, will not perform, and will not provide any funds to any other entity that performs, an abortion as described in subsection (b)(1)(C).

SA 3991. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available by this Act may be available directly or through a State (including through managed care contracts with a State) to a prohibited entity.

(b) PROHIBITED ENTITY.—The term ''prohibited entity'' means an entity, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and clinics—

(1) that, as of the date of enactment of this Act—

(A) is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code;

(B) is an essential community provider described in section 156.235 of title 45, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), that is primarily engaged in family planning services, reproductive health, and related medical care; and

(C) performs, or provides any funds to any other entity that performs abortions, other than an abortion performed—

(i) in the case of a pregnancy that is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(ii) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life endangering physical condition caused by, or arising from, the pregnancy itself; and

(2) for which the total amount of Federal grants to such entity, including grants to any affiliates, subsidiaries, or clinics of such entity, under title X of the Public Health Service Act in fiscal year 2016 exceeded $23,000,000.

(c) END OF PROHIBITION.—The definition in subsection (b) shall cease to apply to an entity if such entity certifies that it, including its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, and clinics, will not perform, and will not provide any funds to any other entity that performs, an abortion as described in subsection (b)(1)(C).

SA 3992. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not later than January 1, 2019, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall establish a process to effectuate the purpose of section 404K of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 283m) by transferring to the sanctuary system under such section, by December 31, 2021—

(1) all chimpanzees categorized as Class I, II, III on the American Society of Anesthesiologists Physical Status Scale, as adapted by the Academy of Veterinary Technicians in Anesthesia and Analgesia; and

(2) all chimpanzees categorized as Class IV and V on such scale and deemed eligible to transfer to the sanctuary system by one or more veterinarians none of whom are currently, or have recently been, employed by either the sending or receiving facility.

SA 3993. Mr. LEAHY proposed an amendment to amendment SA 3699 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SHELBY) to the amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted, insert the following:

''$8,503,001''

SA 3994. Mr. MARKEY (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. OPIOID LABELING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 305(c) of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 825(c)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(1)'' before ''The Secretary''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) The label of any container or package containing an opioid or opiate listed in schedule II or III shall, when dispensed (other than administered) to or for a patient, contain a clear, concise warning, in a manner specified by the Secretary by regulation, that the opioids or opiates dispensed can cause dependence, addiction, and overdose.''.

(b) REGULATIONS.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall prescribe regulations under section 503(b) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353(b)) to implement the amendment made by subsection (a) and such regulations shall be effective not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) INTERIM RULES.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services may issue the regulations required under paragraph (1) by interim rule to the extent necessary to comply with the timing requirement in paragraph (1).

SA 3995. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not later than January 1, 2019, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall establish a process to effectuate the purpose of section 404K of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 283m) by transferring to the sanctuary system under such section, by December 31, 2021—

(1) all chimpanzees categorized as Class I, II, III on the American Society of Anesthesiologists Physical Status Scale, as adapted by the Academy of Veterinary Technicians in Anesthesia and Analgesia; and

(2) all chimpanzees categorized as Class IV and V on such scale and deemed eligible to transfer to the sanctuary system by one or more primate veterinarians or behaviorists, none of whom are currently, or have recently been, employed by either the sending or receiving facility.

SA 3996. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Beginning on January 1, 2019, a group health plan and a health insurance issuer offering group or individual health insurance coverage shall provide coverage of a single dispensing of contraceptives for a 12-month period, with no deductible, coinsurance, copayment, or other cost-sharing requirement.

(b) Congress finds as follows:

(1) Contraception is basic health care for women, and women need access to all birth control methods so that they can use the specific birth control that is right for them.

(2) Removing barriers to access to birth control so that women can plan, space, and prevent pregnancies is critically important for women's health and economic security, as well as the health of any children they may decide to have in the future. Access to birth control is linked to women's greater educational and professional opportunities and increased lifetime earnings.

(3) The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) has removed cost barriers to birth control for over 62,400,000 women, but other non-cost barriers remain, and some women still do not have insurance coverage of birth control.

(4) A woman's chances of unintended pregnancy increase considerably when barriers prevent her from using birth control consistently and correctly.

(5) In recent years, States have taken proactive steps to increase women's access to the birth control method of their choice, as follows:

(A) Several States, including Delaware, Iowa, and Colorado have implemented successful initiatives that include training of providers and consumer education to improve access to the full range of contraceptive methods, resulting in significant reductions in unplanned pregnancy.

(B) At least 12 States (including California, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington) have passed laws requiring coverage of all birth control methods approved by the Food and Drug Administration, without out-of-pocket costs.

(C) At least 12 States (including California, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Massachuettes, Maryland, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, and Ohio) have passed laws requiring coverage of 12 months of birth control dispensed at one time.

(D) At least 7 States (including California, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, and Oregon) have passed laws requiring coverage of over-the-counter methods of birth control without requiring a prescription.

(E) In 2018, the Utah State legislature passed a bill requiring the State to apply for

a Medicaid family planning eligibility expansion with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. When approved, Utah will become the 27th State with such an expansion.

SA 3997. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) Of the amounts made available in this Act for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Director of the Division of Reproductive Health of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall use $25,000,000 to establish a grant program to fund State programs to reduce unplanned pregnancy and improve access to contraception, in accordance with subsections (b) and (c).

(b) An entity receiving grant funds described in subsection (a)—

(1) may use such funds for—

(A) provider contraception training, including for contraceptive method use and insertion, and for pregnancy intention screening;

(B) consumer education;

(C) facilitating same-day access to the full range of contraceptive methods;

(D) reducing out-of-pocket cost barriers to the full range of contraceptive methods where such barriers are not already addressed;

(E) facilitating collaboration among public and private health systems to ensure that individuals can access contraceptive care in a timely manner; or

(F) other activities that grant applicants can demonstrate would help to improve contraceptive access in the State or community; and

(2) shall use such funds to—

(A) provide contraceptive care that is noncoercive, culturally competent care, and medically accurate;

(B) provide information and access to the full range of methods of contraception approved by the Food and Drug Administration, or to fill existing gaps in information and access to such contraception, so as to ensure equitable access to the full range of contraceptive options; and

(C) evaluate projects funded by such grant, in order to demonstrate outcomes such as reducing gaps in contraceptive use, increasing points of access for the full range of contraceptive methods approved by the Food and Drug Administration, and patient satisfaction with provider encounter and method choice.

(c) To be eligible for a grant described in subsection (a), an entity shall be—

(1) a State, local, or tribal government;

(2) a public-private partnership; or

(3) a nonprofit entity.

(d) Congress finds as follows:

(1) Contraception is basic health care for women, and women need access to all birth control methods so that they can use the specific birth control that is right for them.

(2) Removing barriers to access to birth control so that women can plan, space, and prevent pregnancies is critically important for women's health and economic security, as well as the health of any children they may decide to have in the future. Access to birth control is linked to women's greater educational and professional opportunities and increased lifetime earnings.

(3) The Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148) has removed cost barriers to birth control for over 62,400,000 women, but other non-cost barriers remain, and some women still do not have insurance coverage of birth control.

(4) A woman's chances of unintended pregnancy increase considerably when barriers prevent her from using birth control consistently and correctly.

(5) In recent years, States have taken proactive steps to increase women's access to the birth control method of their choice, as follows:

(A) Several States, including Delaware, Iowa, and Colorado have implemented successful initiatives that include training of providers and consumer education to improve access to the full range of contraceptive methods, resulting in significant reductions in unplanned pregnancy.

(B) At least 12 States (including California, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, New York, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington) have passed laws requiring coverage of all birth control methods approved by the Food and Drug Administration, without out-of-pocket costs.

(C) At least 12 States (including California, Colorado, the District of Columbia, Delaware, Illinois, Maine, Massachuettes, Maryland, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, and Ohio) have passed laws requiring coverage of 12 months of birth control dispensed at one time.

(D) At least 7 States (including California, Delaware, Illinois, Maryland, Massachusetts, Nevada, and Oregon) have passed laws requiring coverage of over-the-counter methods of birth control without requiring a prescription.

(E) In 2018, the Utah State legislature passed a bill requiring the State to apply for a Medicaid family planning eligibility expansion with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. When approved, Utah will become the 27th State with such an expansion.

SA 3998. Mr. RUBIO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services shall submit a report to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, detailing the circumstances in which the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services may be providing Medicare or Medicaid payments to, or otherwise funding, entities that process genome or exome data in the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation. The report shall outline the extent to which payments or other funding have been provided to such entities over the past 5 years, including amounts paid to each entity, the implications of such payments, including vulnerabilities, and specific recommendations on steps to ensure that payments are lawful and appropriate in the future. In developing the report, the Secretary shall also coordinate with other relevant agencies, as determined by the Secretary, to examine the potential effect of allowing beneficiaries' genome or exome data to be processed in the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation on United States national security, United States intellectual property protections, HIPAA privacy protections, future biomedical development capabilities and competitiveness, and global competitiveness for United States laboratories.

SA 3999. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) The Secretary of Defense shall enter into any necessary agreements, including agreements with the Internal Revenue Service and the Secretary of Education, to carry out the activities described in this section.

(b)(1) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that student loan interest does not accrue for eligible Federal Direct Loans of eligible military borrowers, in accordance with the Federal prohibition on interest accrual for eligible military borrowers under section 455(o) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087e(o)).

(2) In this section, the term eligible Federal Direct Loan means a loan made under part D of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087a et seq.) for which the first disbursement is made on or after October 1, 2008.

(c) The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that an eligible military borrower who qualified for the no accrual of interest benefit under such section 455(o) during any period beginning on or after October 1, 2008, and did not receive the full benefit under such section for which the borrower qualified, is provided compensation in an amount equal to the amount of interest paid by the borrower that would have been subject to that benefit.

(d) The Secretary of Defense shall obtain or provide any information necessary to implement the activities described in this section without requiring a request from a borrower.

SA 4000. Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. UDALL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division B, insert the following: ''*Provided further*, That in carrying out drug prevention programs and activities to support safe and healthy schools as instructed in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), State educational agencies and local educational agencies receiving funds under part A of title IV of such Act, may target funding toward efforts aimed at reducing or eliminating the use of e-cigarette or electronic nicotine delivery systems (ENDS) or tobacco, as defined by the Food and Drug Administration under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), among youths in schools.''.

SA 4001. MR. MCCONNELL (for Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. MARKEY)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1322, to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist

in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Fisheries Advisory Committee Act''.

SEC. 2. AMERICAN FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the end the following:

''(e) AMERICAN FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) COMMITTEE.—The term 'Committee' means the American Fisheries Advisory Committee established under paragraph (2).

''(B) FISHING COMMUNITY.—The term 'fishing community' means harvesters, marketers, growers, processors, recreational fishermen, charter fishermen, and persons providing them with goods and services.

''(C) MARKETING AND PROMOTION.—The term 'marketing and promotion' means an activity aimed at encouraging the consumption of seafood or expanding or maintaining commercial markets for seafood.

''(D) PROCESSOR.—The term 'processor' means any person in the business of preparing or packaging seafood (including seafood of the processor's own harvesting) for sale.

''(E) SEAFOOD.—The term 'seafood' means farm-raised and wild-caught fish, shellfish, or marine algae harvested in the United States or by a United States flagged vessel for human consumption.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the American Fisheries Advisory Committee Act, the Secretary shall establish 6 regions within the American Fisheries Advisory Committee as follows:

''(A) Region 1 shall consist of Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Territories of Guam and American Samoa.

''(B) Region 2 shall consist of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

''(C) Region 3 shall consist of Texas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Arkansas, Puerto Rico, and the Territory of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

''(D) Region 4 shall consist of California, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

''(E) Region 5 shall consist of New Jersey, New York, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

''(F) Region 6 shall consist of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of the following members:

''(A) REGIONAL REPRESENTATION.—Each of the regions listed in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (2) shall be represented on the Committee by 3 members—

''(i) who are appointed by the Secretary;

''(ii) who reside in a State or territory in the region that the member will represent;

''(iii) of which—

''(I) one shall have experience as a seafood harvester or processor;

''(II) one shall have experience as recreational or commercial fisher or have experience growing seafood; and

''(III) one shall be an individual who represents the fisheries science community or the relevant Regional Fishery Management Council; and

''(iv) that are selected so that the members of the Committee have experience or expertise with as many seafood species as practicable.

''(B) AT-LARGE MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall appoint to the Committee at-large members as follows:

''(i) One individual with experience in food distribution, marketing, retail, or food service.

''(ii) One individual with experience in the recreational fishing industry supply chain, such as fishermen, manufacturers, retailers, and distributors.

''(iii) One individual with experience in the commercial fishing industry supply chain, such as fishermen, manufacturers, retailers, and distributors.

''(iv) One individual who is an employee of the National Marine Fisheries Service with expertise in fisheries research.

''(C) BALANCED REPRESENTATION.—In selecting the members described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Secretary shall seek to maximize on the Committee, to the extent practicable, a balanced representation of expertise in United States fisheries, seafood production, and science.

''(4) MEMBER TERMS.—The term for a member of the Committee shall be 3 years, except that the Secretary shall designate staggered terms for the members initially appointed to the Committee.

''(5) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Committee shall be responsible for—

''(A) identifying needs of the fishing community that may be addressed by a project funded with a grant under subsection (c);

''(B) developing the request for proposals for such grants;

''(C) reviewing applications for such grants; and

''(D) selecting applications for approval under subsection (c)(2)(B).

''(6) CHAIR.—The Committee shall elect a chair by a majority of those voting, if a quorum is present.

''(7) QUORUM.—A simple majority of members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

''(8) MEETINGS.—

''(A) FREQUENCY.—The Committee shall meet not more than 2 times each year.

''(B) LOCATION.—The meetings of the Committee shall rotate between the geographic regions described under paragraph (2).

''(C) MINIMIZING COSTS.—The Committee shall seek to minimize the operational costs associated with meetings, hearings, or other business of the Committee, including through the use of video or teleconference.

''(9) DESIGNATION OF STAFF MEMBER.—The Secretary shall designate a staff member to coordinate the activities of the Committee and to assist with administrative and other functions as requested by the Committee.

''(10) PER DIEM AND EXPENSES AND FUNDING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Committee shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for reasonable travel costs and expenses incurred in performing duties as a member of the Committee.

''(B) FUNDING.—The costs of reimbursements under subparagraph (A) and the other costs associated with the Committee shall be paid from funds made available to carry out this section (which may include funds described in subsection (f)(1)(B)), except that no funds allocated for grants under subsection (f)(1)(A) shall be expended for any purpose under this subsection.

''(11) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The conflict of interest and recusal provisions set out in section 302(j) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(j)) shall apply to any decision by the Committee and to all members of the Committee as if each member of the Committee is an affected individual within the meaning of such section 302(j), except that in addition to the disclosure requirements of section 302(j)(2)(C) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(j)(2)(C)), each member of the Committee shall disclose any financial interest or relationship in an organization or with an individual that is applying for a grant under subsection (c) held by the member of the Committee, including an interest as an officer, director, trustee, partner, employee, contractor, agent, or other representative.

''(12) TECHNICAL REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to review of an application for a grant under subsection (c) by the Committee, the Secretary shall obtain an independent written technical evaluation from 3 or more appropriate Federal, private, or public sector experts (such as industry, academia, or governmental experts) who—

''(i) have subject matter expertise to determine the technical merit of the proposal in the application;

''(ii) shall independently evaluate each such proposal; and

''(iii) shall certify that the expert does not have a conflict of interest concerning the application that the expert is reviewing.

''(B) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the American Fisheries Advisory Committee Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance related to carrying out the technical evaluations under subparagraph (A). Such guidance shall include criteria for the elimination by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of applications that fail to meet a minimum level of technical merit as determined by the review described in subparagraph (A).''.

(b) ROLE IN APPROVAL OF GRANTS.—Section 2(c)(3) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

''(3)(A) No application for a grant under this subsection may be approved unless the Secretary—

''(i) is satisfied that the applicant has the requisite technical and financial capability to carry out the project; and

''(ii) based on the recommendations of the American Fisheries Advisory Committee established in subsection (e), evaluates the proposed project as to—

''(I) soundness of design;

''(II) the possibilities of securing productive results;

''(III) minimization of duplication with other fisheries research and development projects;

''(IV) the organization and management of the project;

''(V) methods proposed for monitoring and evaluating the success or failure of the project; and

''(VI) such other criteria as the Secretary may require.

''(B) If the Secretary fails to provide funds to a grant selected by the American Fisheries Advisory Committee, the Secretary shall provide a written document to the Committee justifying the decision.''.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF SPECIFIED PURPOSES OF FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS GRANTS PROGRAM TO INCLUDE FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Section 2(c)(1) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)(1)) is amended by inserting fisheries science, recreational fishing, before harvesting,.

SEC. 4. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS PROPOSALS.

Section 2(c) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) Any person awarded a grant under this subsection shall make publicly available a title and abstract of the project to be carried out by the grant funds that serves as the public justification for funding the project that includes a statement describing how the project serves to enhance United States fisheries, including harvesting, processing, marketing, and associated infrastructures, if applicable.''.

SA 4002. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Ms. MURKOWSKI) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1142, to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''J. Bennett Johnston Waterway Hydropower Extension Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbers 12756, 12757, and 12758, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the applicable project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the procedures of the Commission under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the applicable project for up to 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF LICENSE.—If the time period required for commencement of construction of a project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Commission may reinstate the license for the applicable project effective as of the date of the expiration of the license; and

(2) the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on that expiration.

SA 4003. Mr. SCHUMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 3695 proposed by Mr. SHELBY to the bill H.R. 6157, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title II of division B, insert the following:

SEC. ___. (a) There are appropriated under the heading ''Healthcare Research and Quality'' under the heading ''Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality'', in addition to any other amounts made available under such heading, $2,000,000 to support grants to address misdiagnosis, which shall include the establishment of Research Centers of Diagnostic Excellence to develop systems and new technology solutions.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount appropriated under the heading ''Emerging and Zoonotic Infectious Diseases'' under the heading ''Centers for Disease Control and Prevention'' is hereby reduced by $2,000,000.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. PORTMAN. 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 FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a business meeting and hearing on the following nominations: Michael Faulkender, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, and Elizabeth Darling, of Texas, to be Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Health and Human Services.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael A. Hammer, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, John Cotton Richmond, of Virginia, to be Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, with the rank of Ambassador at Large, Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana, Donald R. Tapia, of Arizona, to be Ambassador to Jamaica, David Hale, of New Jersey, to be an Under Secretary (Political Affairs), Dereck J. Hogan, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Moldova, Philip S. Kosnett, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Kosovo, and Judy Rising Reinke, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to Montenegro, all of the Department of State, and a routine list in the Foreign Service; to be immediately followed by a hearing to examine the nominations of Kevin K. Sullivan, of Ohio, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Nicaragua, Francisco Luis Palmieri, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Honduras, and Karen L. Williams, of Missouri, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Suriname, all of the Department of State.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: William Bryan, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, and Peter Gaynor, of Rhode Island, to be Deputy Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, both of the Department of Homeland Security.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 27, 2018, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Jonathan A. Kobes, of South Dakota, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eighth Circuit, Kenneth D. Bell, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of North Carolina, Carl J. Nichols, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia, and Martha Maria Pacold, Mary M. Rowland, and Steven C. Seeger, each to be a United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS, FORESTS, AND MINING

The Subcommittee on Public Lands, Forests, and Mining of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, August 22, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Aakash Singh, immigration counsel with my Judiciary Committee staff, and Robert Shifflett, a detailee from the Department of Homeland Security, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session.

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

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my fellow, John Price, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the year.

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

ANTI-TERRORISM CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 514, S. 2946, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Anti-Terrorism Clarification Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. CLARIFICATION OF THE TERM "ACT OF WAR".

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2331 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (5), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) the term 'military force' does not include any person that—

''(A) has been designated as a—

''(i) foreign terrorist organization by the Secretary of State under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189); or

''(ii) specially designated global terrorist (as such term is defined in section 594.310 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations) by the Secretary of State or the Secretary of the Treasury; or

''(B) has been determined by the court to not be a 'military force'.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any civil action pending on or commenced after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. SATISFACTION OF JUDGMENTS AGAINST TERRORISTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2333 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end following:

''(e) USE OF BLOCKED ASSETS TO SATISFY JUDGMENTS OF U.S. NATIONALS.—For purposes of section 201 of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (28 U.S.C. 1610 note), in any action in which a national of the United States has obtained a judgment against a terrorist party pursuant to this section, the term 'blocked asset' shall include any asset of that terrorist party (including the blocked assets of any agency or instrumentality of that party) seized or frozen by the United States under section 805(b) of the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1904(b)).''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any judgment entered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 4. CONSENT OF CERTAIN PARTIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2334 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) CONSENT OF CERTAIN PARTIES TO PERSONAL JURISDICTION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for purposes of any civil action under section 2333 of this title, a defendant shall be deemed to have consented to personal jurisdiction in such civil action if, regardless of the date of the occurrence of the act of international terrorism upon which such civil action was filed, the defendant—

''(A) after the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, accepts—

''(i) any form of assistance, however provided, under chapter 4 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2346 et seq.);

''(ii) any form of assistance, however provided, under section 481 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2291) for international narcotics control and law enforcement; or

''(iii) any form of assistance, however provided, under chapter 9 of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2349bb et seq.); or

''(B) in the case of a defendant benefiting from a waiver or suspension of section 1003 of the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 (22 U.S.C. 5202) after the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this subsection—

''(i) continues to maintain any office, headquarters, premises, or other facilities or establishments within the jurisdiction of the United States; or

''(ii) establishes or procures any office, headquarters, premises, or other facilities or establishments within the jurisdiction of the United States.

''(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to any defendant who ceases to engage in the conduct described in paragraphs (1)(A) and (1)(B) for 5 consecutive calendar years.''.

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2946) to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the meaning of the terms ''act of war'' and ''blocked asset,'' and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported substitute amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2946), as amended, was passed.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

ANWAR SADAT CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking be discharged from further consideration of S. 266 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 266) to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 266) was passed, as follows:

S. 266

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Anwar Sadat Centennial Celebration Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Anwar Sadat was born on December 25, 1918, in Mit Abu al-Kum, al-Minufiyah, Egypt, as 1 of 13 children in a poor Egyptian family.

(2) In 1938, Sadat graduated from the Royal Military Academy in Cairo and was appointed to the Signal Corps.

(3) Sadat entered the Army as a second lieutenant and was posted to Sudan where he met Gamal Abdel Nasser and fellow junior officers who became the ''Free Officers'' who led the Egyptian revolution of 1952.

(4) Sadat held various high positions during Nasser's presidency, assuming the role of President of the National Assembly in 1960 and Vice President in 1964.

(5) President Nasser died of a heart attack on September 28, 1970, at which point Sadat became acting President. Sadat was subsequently elected as the third President of Egypt.

(6) On October 6, 1973, President Sadat, along with his Syrian counterparts, launched an offensive against Israel. A permanent cease-fire was reached on October 25, 1973.

(7) In 1974, after talks facilitated by Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Egypt and Israel signed an agreement allowing Egypt to formally retrieve land in the Sinai. President Sadat later wrote in his memoirs that his meetings with Kissinger ''marked the beginning of a relationship of mutual understanding with the United States culminating and crystallizing in what we came to describe as a 'peace process'. Together we started that process and the United States still supports our joint efforts to this day''.

(8) Months of diplomacy between Egypt and Israel followed the signing of this initial agreement and a second disengagement agreement, the Sinai Interim Agreement, was signed in September of 1975.

(9) President Sadat addressed a joint session of Congress on November 5, 1975, during which he underscored the shared values between the United States and Egypt. In this speech, President Sadat addressed the path to peace, saying, ''We are faced, together with other nations, with one of the greatest challenges of our time, namely the task of convincing this generation, and those to follow, that we can finally build a viable international system capable of meeting the demands of tomorrow and solving the problems of the coming age''.

(10) On November 19, 1977, President Sadat became the first Arab leader to visit Israel, meeting with the Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin. President Sadat spoke before the Israeli Knesset in Jerusalem about his views on how to achieve comprehensive peace in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

(11) Before commencing negotiations, President Sadat courageously announced to the Knesset, ''I have come to you so that together we might build a durable peace based on justice, to avoid the shedding of 1 single drop of blood from an Arab or an Israeli. It is for this reason that I have proclaimed my readiness to go to the farthest corner of the world''. President Sadat further poignantly stated that ''any life lost in war is a human life, irrespective of its being that of an Israeli or an Arab. . . . When the bells of peace ring, there will be no hands to beat the drums of war''.

(12) On September 17, 1978, President Jimmy Carter hosted President Sadat and

Prime Minister Begin at Camp David where the 3 leaders engaged in 13 days of negotiations that resulted in the ''Framework for Peace in the Middle East'' (commonly known as the ''Camp David Accords'').

(13) Following negotiations, President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin signed the Egypt-Israel Peace Treaty (in this section referred to as the ''Peace Treaty'') at the White House on March 26, 1979. Addressing President Sadat at the signing of the Peace Treaty, which remains an important anchor for peace in the region today, Prime Minister Begin commended President Sadat by saying, ''In the face of adversity and hostility, you have demonstrated the human value that can change history—civil courage''.

(14) The Peace Treaty featured mutual recognition of each country by the other and ultimately the cessation of the state of war that had existed between Israel and Egypt since the 1948 Arab-Israeli War. Israel completely withdrew its armed forces and civilians from the rest of the Sinai.

(15) In 1978, both President Sadat and Prime Minister Begin were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for signing the Peace Treaty, which made Egypt the first Arab country to officially recognize Israel.

(16) While presenting the Nobel Peace Prize to President Sadat, Aase Lionaes, Chairman of the Norwegian Nobel Committee, said, ''During the 30 preceding years, the peoples of the Middle East have, on 4 separate occasions, been the victims of warfare and there seemed no prospect of peace. President Sadat's great contribution to peace was that he had sufficient courage and foresight to break away from this vicious circle. His decision to accept Prime Minister Menachem Begin's invitation of November 17, 1977, to attend a meeting of the Israeli parliament on November 19 was an act of great courage, both from a personal and from a political point of view. This was a dramatic break with the past and a courageous step forward into a new age''.

(17) During his Nobel lecture, President Sadat remarked, ''I made my trip because I am convinced that we owe it to this generation and the generations to come not to leave a stone unturned in our pursuit of peace''.

(18) In remarks to the People's Assembly in Cairo on March 10, 1979, President Carter praised President Sadat, telling the Assembly, ''Your President has demonstrated the power of human courage and human vision to create hope where there had been only despair.''. President Carter also said that the Peace Treaty would ''strengthen cooperation between Egypt and the United States'' and underscored the support of the United States for the agreement, saying, ''I fully share and will support President Sadat's belief that stability must be maintained in this part of the world . . . He and I recognize that the security of this vital region is being challenged. I applaud his determination to meet that challenge, and my Government will stand with him''.

(19) The signing of the Peace Treaty enraged many individuals who opposed normalized relations with Israel. President Sadat was assassinated on October 6, 1981, by Khalid Islambouli, a member of Egyptian Islamic Jihad. President Sadat was well aware of the controversy to which his actions would lead, but pushed for peace anyway.

(20) Upon the death of President Sadat, President Ronald Reagan proclaimed, ''President Sadat was a courageous man whose vision and wisdom brought nations and people together. In a world filled with hatred, he was a man of hope. In a world trapped in the animosities of the past, he was a man of foresight, a man who sought to improve a world tormented by malice and pettiness''.

(21) President Sadat is recognized in the United States and throughout the world as a respected leader and champion of peace whose vision provided a roadmap for the peaceful resolution of conflict that endures nearly 40 years after its inception.

(22) President Sadat bravely reached out to Israel and dedicated himself to peace, furthering the national security of Egypt and the stability of the Middle East.

(23) On the 30th anniversary of the Peace Treaty, President Barack Obama praised the enduring legacy of the Camp David Accords and the ''courage and foresight of these leaders, who stood together in unity to change the course of our shared history''. President Obama closed by saying, ''Today, as we seek to expand the circle of peace among Arabs and Israelis, we take inspiration from what Israel and Egypt achieved 3 decades ago, knowing that the destination is worthy of the struggle''.

(24) The Camp David Accords and the Peace Treaty continue to serve the interests of the United States by preserving peace and serving as a foundation for partnership and dialogue in a region fraught with conflict and division.

SEC. 3. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the posthumous award, on behalf of Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his achievements and heroic actions to attain comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary.

(c) PRESENTATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The gold medal referred to in subsection (a) shall be presented to—

(A)(i) the widow of Anwar Sadat, Jehan Sadat; or

(ii) if Jehan Sadat is unavailable, the next of kin of Jehan Sadat; and

(B) a representative of the Government of Egypt.

(2) AWARD OF MEDAL.—Following the presentation described in paragraph (1), the gold medal shall be given to—

(A) Jehan Sadat; or

(B) if Jehan Sadat is unavailable, the next of kin of Jehan Sadat.

SEC. 4. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

The Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 3 under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, at a price sufficient to cover the cost thereof, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 5. STATUS OF MEDALS.

(a) NATIONAL MEDALS.—The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

(b) NUMISMATIC ITEMS.—For purposes of sections 5134 and 5136 of title 31, United States Code, all medals struck under this Act shall be considered to be numismatic items.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

AMERICAN FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 283, S. 1322, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Fisheries Advisory Committee Act''.

SEC. 2. AMERICAN FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) AMERICAN FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) COMMITTEE.—The term 'Committee' means the American Fisheries Advisory Committee established under paragraph (2).

''(B) FISHING COMMUNITY.—The term 'fishing community' means harvesters, marketers, growers, processors, recreational fishermen, charter fishermen, and persons providing them with goods and services.

''(C) MARKETING AND PROMOTION.—The term 'marketing and promotion' means an activity aimed at encouraging the consumption of seafood or expanding or maintaining commercial markets for seafood.

''(D) PROCESSOR.—The term 'processor' means any person in the business of preparing or packaging seafood (including seafood of the processor's own harvesting) for sale.

''(E) SEAFOOD.—The term 'seafood' means farm-raised and wild-caught fish, shellfish, or marine algae harvested in the United States or by a United States flagged vessel for human consumption.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the American Fisheries Advisory Committee Act, the Secretary shall establish 6 regions within the American Fisheries Advisory Committee as follows:

''(A) Region 1 shall consist of Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Territories of Guam and American Samoa.

''(B) Region 2 shall consist of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

''(C) Region 3 shall consist of Texas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Arkansas, Puerto Rico, and territory of the Virgin Islands.

''(D) Region 4 shall consist of California, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

''(E) Region 5 shall consist of New Jersey, New York, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

''(F) Region 6 shall consist of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of the following members:

''(A) REGIONAL REPRESENTATION.—Each of the regions listed in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (2) shall be represented on the Committee by 3 members—

''(i) who are appointed by the Secretary;

''(ii) who reside in a State or territory in the region that the member will represent;

''(iii) of which—

''(I) one shall have experience as a seafood harvester;

''(II) one shall have experience as a processor; and

''(III) one shall have experience as a recreational fisher; and

''(iv) that are selected so that the members of the Committee have experience or expertise with as many seafood species as practicable.

''(B) AT-LARGE MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall appoint to the Committee at-large members to ensure that the Committee fairly reflects the expertise and interest of the fishing community located in each region, as follows:

''(i) One individual with experience in mass market food distribution.

''(ii) One individual with experience in mass market food retail or food service.

''(iii) One individual with experience in the marketing of seafood.

''(iv) One individual with experience in growing seafood.

''(v) One individual with experience as a recreational fisher.

''(vi) One individual who is an employee of the National Marine Fisheries Service with expertise in fisheries research.

''(vii) One individual that represents the fisheries science community.

''(4) MEMBER TERMS.—The term for a member of the Committee shall be 3 years, except that the Secretary shall designate staggered terms for the members initially appointed to the Committee.

''(5) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Committee shall be responsible for—

''(A) identifying needs of the fishing community that may be addressed by a project funded with a grant under subsection (c);

''(B) developing the request for proposals for such grants;

''(C) reviewing applications for such grants; and

''(D) selecting applications for approval under subsection (c)(2)(B).

''(6) CHAIR.—The Committee shall elect a chair by a majority of those voting, if a quorum is present.

''(7) QUORUM.—A simple majority of members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

''(8) MEETINGS.—

''(A) FREQUENCY.—The Committee shall meet not more than 2 times each year.

''(B) LOCATION.—The meetings of the Committee shall rotate between the geographic regions described under paragraph (2).

''(9) STAFF.—The Committee may employ staff as necessary.

''(10) PER DIEM AND EXPENSES AND FUNDING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Committee shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for reasonable travel costs and expenses incurred in performing duties as a member of the Committee.

''(B) FUNDING.—The reimbursements made under subparagraph (A) shall be paid with the funds made available for grants under subsection (c).

''(11) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The conflict of interest and recusal provisions set out in section 302(j) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(j)) shall apply to any decision by the Committee and to all members of the Committee as if each member of the Committee is an affected individual within the meaning of such section 302(j), except that in addition to the disclosure requirements of section 302(j)(2)(C) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(j)(2)(C)), each member of the Committee shall disclose any financial interest or relationship in an organization or with an individual that is applying for a grant under subsection (c) held by the member of the Committee, including an interest as an officer, director, trustee, partner, employee, contractor, agent, or other representative.''.

(b) ROLE IN APPROVAL OF GRANTS.—Section 2(c)(3) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

''(3)(A) No application for a grant under this subsection may be approved unless—

''(i) the Secretary is satisfied that the applicant has the requisite technical and financial capability to carry out the project;

''(ii) the Secretary evaluates the proposed project as to—

''(I) the selections of the Committee established in subsection (f);

''(II) soundness of design;

''(III) the possibilities of securing productive results;

''(IV) minimization of duplication with other fisheries research and development projects;

''(V) the organization and management of the project;

''(VI) methods proposed for monitoring and evaluating the success or failure of the project; and

''(VII) such other criteria as the Secretary may require; and

''(iii) the application selected for funding meets the proposal developed by the American Fisheries Advisory Committee under subsection (f).

''(B) JUSTIFICATION.—If the Secretary fails to provide funds to a grant selected by the Committee, the Secretary shall provide a written document to the Committee justifying the decision.''.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF SPECIFIED PURPOSES OF FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS GRANTS PROGRAM TO INCLUDE FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Section 2(c)(1) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)(1)) is amended by inserting ''fisheries science, recreational fishing,'' before ''harvesting,''.

SEC. 4. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS PROPOSALS.

Section 2(c) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) Any person awarded a grant under this subsection shall make publicly available a title and abstract of the project to be carried out by the grant funds that serves as the public justification for funding the project that includes a statement describing how the project serves to enhance United States fisheries, including harvesting, processing, marketing, and associated infrastructures, if applicable.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1322) to establish the American Fisheries Advisory Committee to assist in the awarding of fisheries research and development grants, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn, the Sullivan substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported substitute amendment was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 4001) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to as follows: (The amendment is printed in today's Record under ''Text of Amendments.'')

The bill (S. 1322), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 1322

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Fisheries Advisory Committee Act''.

SEC. 2. AMERICAN FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3), is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the end the following:

''(e) AMERICAN FISHERIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) COMMITTEE.—The term 'Committee' means the American Fisheries Advisory Committee established under paragraph (2).

''(B) FISHING COMMUNITY.—The term 'fishing community' means harvesters, marketers, growers, processors, recreational fishermen, charter fishermen, and persons providing them with goods and services.

''(C) MARKETING AND PROMOTION.—The term 'marketing and promotion' means an activity aimed at encouraging the consumption of seafood or expanding or maintaining commercial markets for seafood.

''(D) PROCESSOR.—The term 'processor' means any person in the business of preparing or packaging seafood (including seafood of the processor's own harvesting) for sale.

''(E) SEAFOOD.—The term 'seafood' means farm-raised and wild-caught fish, shellfish, or marine algae harvested in the United States or by a United States flagged vessel for human consumption.

''(2) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the American Fisheries Advisory Committee Act, the Secretary shall establish 6 regions within the American Fisheries Advisory Committee as follows:

''(A) Region 1 shall consist of Alaska, Hawaii, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Territories of Guam and American Samoa.

''(B) Region 2 shall consist of Maine, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut.

''(C) Region 3 shall consist of Texas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, Arkansas, Puerto Rico, and the Territory of the Virgin Islands of the United States.

''(D) Region 4 shall consist of California, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho.

''(E) Region 5 shall consist of New Jersey, New York, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia.

''(F) Region 6 shall consist of Michigan, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

''(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of the following members:

''(A) REGIONAL REPRESENTATION.—Each of the regions listed in subparagraphs (A) through (F) of paragraph (2) shall be represented on the Committee by 3 members—

''(i) who are appointed by the Secretary;

''(ii) who reside in a State or territory in the region that the member will represent;

''(iii) of which—

''(I) one shall have experience as a seafood harvester or processor;

''(II) one shall have experience as recreational or commercial fisher or have experience growing seafood; and

''(III) one shall be an individual who represents the fisheries science community or the relevant Regional Fishery Management Council; and

''(iv) that are selected so that the members of the Committee have experience or expertise with as many seafood species as practicable.

''(B) AT-LARGE MEMBERS.—The Secretary shall appoint to the Committee at-large members as follows:

''(i) One individual with experience in food distribution, marketing, retail, or food service.

''(ii) One individual with experience in the recreational fishing industry supply chain, such as fishermen, manufacturers, retailers, and distributors.

''(iii) One individual with experience in the commercial fishing industry supply chain, such as fishermen, manufacturers, retailers, and distributors.

''(iv) One individual who is an employee of the National Marine Fisheries Service with expertise in fisheries research.

''(C) BALANCED REPRESENTATION.—In selecting the members described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Secretary shall seek to maximize on the Committee, to the extent practicable, a balanced representation of expertise in United States fisheries, seafood production, and science.

''(4) MEMBER TERMS.—The term for a member of the Committee shall be 3 years, except that the Secretary shall designate staggered terms for the members initially appointed to the Committee.

''(5) RESPONSIBILITIES.—The Committee shall be responsible for—

''(A) identifying needs of the fishing community that may be addressed by a project funded with a grant under subsection (c);

''(B) developing the request for proposals for such grants;

''(C) reviewing applications for such grants; and

''(D) selecting applications for approval under subsection (c)(2)(B).

''(6) CHAIR.—The Committee shall elect a chair by a majority of those voting, if a quorum is present.

''(7) QUORUM.—A simple majority of members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may hold hearings.

''(8) MEETINGS.—

''(A) FREQUENCY.—The Committee shall meet not more than 2 times each year.

''(B) LOCATION.—The meetings of the Committee shall rotate between the geographic regions described under paragraph (2).

''(C) MINIMIZING COSTS.—The Committee shall seek to minimize the operational costs associated with meetings, hearings, or other business of the Committee, including through the use of video or teleconference.

''(9) DESIGNATION OF STAFF MEMBER.—The Secretary shall designate a staff member to coordinate the activities of the Committee and to assist with administrative and other functions as requested by the Committee.

''(10) PER DIEM AND EXPENSES AND FUNDING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A member of the Committee shall serve without compensation, but shall be reimbursed in accordance with section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for reasonable travel costs and expenses incurred in performing duties as a member of the Committee.

''(B) FUNDING.—The costs of reimbursements under subparagraph (A) and the other costs associated with the Committee shall be paid from funds made available to carry out this section (which may include funds described in subsection (f)(1)(B)), except that no funds allocated for grants under subsection (f)(1)(A) shall be expended for any purpose under this subsection.

''(11) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The conflict of interest and recusal provisions set out in section 302(j) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(j)) shall apply to any decision by the Committee and to all members of the Committee as if each member of the Committee is an affected individual within the meaning of such section 302(j), except that in addition to the disclosure requirements of section 302(j)(2)(C) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1852(j)(2)(C)), each member of the Committee shall disclose any financial interest or relationship in an organization or with an individual that is applying for a grant under subsection (c) held by the member of the Committee, including an interest as an officer, director, trustee, partner, employee, contractor, agent, or other representative.

''(12) TECHNICAL REVIEW OF APPLICATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Prior to review of an application for a grant under subsection (c) by the Committee, the Secretary shall obtain an independent written technical evaluation from 3 or more appropriate Federal, private, or public sector experts (such as industry, academia, or governmental experts) who—

''(i) have subject matter expertise to determine the technical merit of the proposal in the application;

''(ii) shall independently evaluate each such proposal; and

''(iii) shall certify that the expert does not have a conflict of interest concerning the application that the expert is reviewing.

''(B) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the American Fisheries Advisory Committee Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance related to carrying out the technical evaluations under subparagraph (A). Such guidance shall include criteria for the elimination by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of applications that fail to meet a minimum level of technical merit as determined by the review described in subparagraph (A).''.

(b) ROLE IN APPROVAL OF GRANTS.—Section 2(c)(3) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)(3)), is amended to read as follows:

''(3)(A) No application for a grant under this subsection may be approved unless the Secretary—

''(i) is satisfied that the applicant has the requisite technical and financial capability to carry out the project; and

''(ii) based on the recommendations of the American Fisheries Advisory Committee established in subsection (e), evaluates the proposed project as to—

''(I) soundness of design;

''(II) the possibilities of securing productive results;

''(III) minimization of duplication with other fisheries research and development projects;

''(IV) the organization and management of the project;

''(V) methods proposed for monitoring and evaluating the success or failure of the project; and

''(VI) such other criteria as the Secretary may require.

''(B) If the Secretary fails to provide funds to a grant selected by the American Fisheries Advisory Committee, the Secretary shall provide a written document to the Committee justifying the decision.''.

SEC. 3. EXPANSION OF SPECIFIED PURPOSES OF FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS GRANTS PROGRAM TO INCLUDE FISHERIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.

Section 2(c)(1) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)(1)) is amended by inserting fisheries science, recreational fishing, before harvesting,.

SEC. 4. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF GRANTS PROPOSALS.

Section 2(c) of the Act of August 11, 1939 (15 U.S.C. 713c–3(c)), is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) Any person awarded a grant under this subsection shall make publicly available a title and abstract of the project to be carried out by the grant funds that serves as the public justification for funding the project that includes a statement describing how the project serves to enhance United States fisheries, including harvesting, processing, marketing, and associated infrastructures, if applicable.''.

J. BENNETT JOHNSTON WATERWAY HYDROPOWER EXTENSION ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 1142.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1142) to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of certain hydroelectric projects.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill as reported be considered, the committee substitute be withdrawn, the Murkowski amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 4002) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''J. Bennett Johnston Waterway Hydropower Extension Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbers 12756, 12757, and 12758, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the applicable project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the

procedures of the Commission under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the applicable project for up to 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF LICENSE.—If the time period required for commencement of construction of a project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Commission may reinstate the license for the applicable project effective as of the date of the expiration of the license; and

(2) the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on that expiration.

The bill (S. 1142), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1142

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''J. Bennett Johnston Waterway Hydropower Extension Act of 2018''.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission project numbers 12756, 12757, and 12758, the Commission may, at the request of the licensee for the applicable project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the procedures of the Commission under that section, extend the time period during which the licensee is required to commence the construction of the applicable project for up to 3 consecutive 2-year periods from the date of the expiration of the extension originally issued by the Commission.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF LICENSE.—If the time period required for commencement of construction of a project described in subsection (a) has expired prior to the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Commission may reinstate the license for the applicable project effective as of the date of the expiration of the license; and

(2) the first extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on that expiration.

VETERANS PROVIDING HEALTHCARE TRANSITION IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House to accompany S. 899.

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

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 899) entitled ''An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to ensure that the requirements that new Federal employees who are veterans with service-connected disabilities are provided leave for purposes of undergoing medical treatment for such disabilities apply to certain employees of the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes.''

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table without intervening action or debate.

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

VETERANS TREATMENT COURT IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 466, H.R. 2147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2147) to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 2147) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ARETHA FRANKLIN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 615, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 615) honoring the life and legacy of Aretha Franklin and the contribution of Aretha Franklin to music, civil rights, and the City of Detroit.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 615) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, August 23; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; and that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Johnson nomination.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:59 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, August 23, 2018 at 9:30 a.m.