



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JULY 13, 2017

No. 118

## Senate

The Senate met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DEB FISCHER, a Senator from the State of Nebraska.

### PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's prayer will be offered by Pastor Bill Ewing of Christian Life Ministries in Rapid City, SD.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Please join me.

As we bow our knees before You, Father, grant us thankful hearts and let our eyes see the many blessings we have been given living in this great land.

Put a protective hedge around these leaders, their marriages, and their families, and let peace dwell in their homes. O Lord, strengthen these that You have placed with this authority so Christ may dwell in their hearts through faith; and that they would be rooted and grounded in loving kindness and truth. May they be able to comprehend the knowledge of Your will and to know the love of Christ so they make decisions that protect and preserve the lives You have entrusted to them.

Lord, teach us to listen. The times are noisy and our ears are weary with the thousands of sounds that continuously assault us. Give us the spirit of young Samuel when he said to You, "Speak, for Your servant is listening." Let us hear You speaking in our hearts so that we get used to the sound of Your voice; that its tones may be familiar to us, and we would lead this great Nation accordingly.

Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, July 13, 2017.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,  
President pro tempore.

Mrs. FISCHER thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

The Senator from South Dakota.

### WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I wish to express my appreciation for the opportunity to welcome to the U.S. Senate Pastor Bill Ewing.

Pastor Bill Ewing started a ministry called Christian Life Ministries in the early 1980s in Rapid City, SD, along with his wife Nancy. It is a ministry that has impacted thousands of people across this country, my wife Kimberly and I being among those, and our family. We have benefited enormously from Pastor Ewing's spiritual mentorship, his always wise and godly council, and his example of faithfulness.

In addition to those in my State of South Dakota and across the country, the ministry has been involved through the years in ministering to people who have been through very difficult circumstances. They were there after 9/11 in New York and after Hurricane Katrina. There have been countless examples of things that happened not only here at home but also around the world—all the things that have gone on in the country of Haiti—Christian Life Ministries has been on the scene and has been very ably ministering to people who have been impacted by these horrific events.

Bill Ewing is a lifelong South Dakotan, although he did venture over to Wyoming to go to college, where he was a two-time All American baseball player and actually was in the California Angels farm system for a number of years before an injury ended his career, but that loss to the California Angels and Major League Baseball was an enormous win for people all over South Dakota and all across this country who have benefited from the work he and his team in Christian Life Ministries have done.

So it is my honor to be able to welcome Pastor Bill Ewing to the U.S. Senate. I thank Chaplain Black for his hospitality and generosity for allowing my friend and pastor, Bill Ewing, to be the visiting Chaplain here in the U.S. Senate.

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

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3965

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the American people deserve better than ObamaCare.

Across the country, Americans are paying more for less under ObamaCare. Already, ObamaCare premiums have increased, on average, by more than 100 percent on the Federal exchange. Next year, ObamaCare premiums could rise by as much as 50 percent or more in States like Georgia and Maryland.

All across the country, Americans are losing choice and access. Already, Americans living in 70 percent of the counties have little or no options for ObamaCare insurance. Next year, nearly 40 percent fewer insurers have filed to participate in the ObamaCare exchanges. Many Americans face the real possibility of having no options to pick from at all.

These trends are not new—costs have been going up and choice has been going down for years—but these trends continue to get worse, and things are not likely to turn around unless we act.

ObamaCare was a direct attack on the middle class from the very start. It is a ticking timebomb today. ObamaCare's years-long hurtle toward collapse is rapidly approaching its seemingly inevitable conclusion, total meltdown, which would hurt even more Americans on top of those it has hurt already.

We can't let that happen, and we are continuing to work hard to ensure it doesn't.

After extensive consultation across the conference, numerous meetings with constituents, and intensive conversations with Members, our conference has updated last month's Better Care discussion draft with additional provisions to make it stronger. We just walked through that revised draft together. It is now available online. I encourage everyone to review it.

As before, it aims to stabilize and reform the collapsing insurance markets that have left too many with no options, and it aims to make insurance more affordable and more flexible so it is something Americans actually want to buy.

For those stuck with ObamaCare insurance they don't want or can't afford, we don't think they should be forced to buy it any longer. For those who buy insurance on an exchange and want to continue doing so, we want them to have lower premiums and more choices.

For those tired of healthcare decisions being outsourced to far-off bureaucrats, we want to transfer millions of those decisions back to them and to their doctors.

We also want to strengthen Medicaid for those who need it most, by giving States more flexibility while ensuring that those who rely on this program don't have the rug pulled out from under them. Many States want the ability to reform and improve their Medicaid Program so they can actually deliver better care at a lower cost, and we would like to dramatically expand their authority to do that. It is an idea that should significantly improve healthcare in States all across our country.

The draft we just discussed, like the one before it, addresses all of these objectives. It would again give Americans more tools for managing their own care and this time goes even further. It would again devote significant resources to the fight against the opioid crisis and this time goes even further. The revised draft improves on the previous version in a number of ways, all while retaining the fundamental goals of providing stability and improving affordability.

Now, regardless, I am sure we can expect many of the same, tired, and predictable attacks from the defenders of ObamaCare's failed status quo. It hardly matters what the draft says; they would launch the same kinds of attacks anyway.

I would remind colleagues, this is the same crowd that said ObamaCare would lower costs, they pledged it would increase choice, and they promoted the infamous broken promise—if you like your plan, you can keep your plan. They were wrong before, and they are wrong again today.

Moreover, serious ObamaCare solutions from Democrats are hard to find these days. What we have heard recently essentially boils down to this:

No. 1, apply a multibillion-dollar bandaid—no reforms, no changes, just billions more for insurers. That is the game plan of the folks on the other side.

No. 2, quadruple down on ObamaCare and pass a massive expansion of a failed idea that puts bureaucrats in control of nearly every single healthcare decision in the country. The total cost of that so-called single-payer idea could add up to \$32 trillion, according to an estimate of a leading proposal.

These are not serious solutions that Americans need to solve the real problems before us, but if Democrats would like to offer these ideas, then let's open debate on the underlying legislation so they can do that. I am sure Members will have more ideas about how we can improve this draft. The only way for anyone—Democrat, Republican, or Independent—to have that opportunity is to vote yes on opening the debate.

We expect an updated projection from the Congressional Budget Office early next week. Once that is released, we will have the opportunity to vote on the motion to proceed. That is the only way by which everyone will be able to come to the floor, share their ideas,

and have their voices heard through both robust debate and a robust amendment process.

I remain disappointed that our Democratic friends made clear early on that they did not want to engage in a serious, bipartisan effort to solve this issue. But they have a renewed opportunity to engage now. I hope they will take it. I hope every Senator will vote to open debate because that is how we change the status quo.

This is our opportunity to really make a difference on healthcare. This is our chance to bring about changes we have been talking about since ObamaCare was forced on the American people. It is our time to finally build the bridge away from ObamaCare's failures and deliver relief to those who need it.

Failure to act means more families get hurt as it continues to collapse. It also means the law's problems will grow more formidable, making them even harder to solve. That is not something any of us should be comfortable with.

So it is time to rise to the occasion. The American people deserve better than the pain of ObamaCare. They deserve better care, and the time to deliver that for them is next week.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, after 2 weeks of delay, we have now seen the revised Republican TrumpCare bill. It appears that little has changed to the core of the bill.

The Republican TrumpCare bill still slashes Medicaid. The cuts are every bit as draconian as they were in the previous version—a devastating blow to rural hospitals, to Americans in nursing homes, to those struggling with opioid addiction, and so many more. The Republican TrumpCare bill still allows insurers to charge older Americans five times or more than they charge younger Americans. Premiums for so many people aged 55 to 64 will go way up. Americans in their sixties could be paying tens of thousands of dollars more than they do today. The Republican TrumpCare bill still blocks funding to Planned Parenthood, limiting access to affordable healthcare for millions of women.

So what is new in the bill? Well, it appears that Republicans have included a new \$60 billion tax break on health savings accounts, which only benefits those wealthy enough to afford putting money into them. For Americans who are struggling to pay for insurance coverage, for the average family who sits down on a Friday evening and says: How are we going to pay our existing bills, and for middle-income families who struggle to make ends meet, a tax break on health savings accounts will not help. It will only help wealthier Americans, who sometimes use these accounts as tax shelters.

It appears the Republican TrumpCare bill includes something like the Cruz amendment, which makes the overall bill even worse than before. The Cruz amendment causes costs to go up by letting insurers sell cut-rate insurance policies with lower premiums but huge, huge deductibles and copays, so that out-of-pocket costs would actually go up, not down, even if premiums are lower.

The Cruz amendment drives Americans with preexisting conditions into markets with unaffordable coverage. They virtually would have no coverage at all. Even Senator CHUCK GRASSLEY said the amendment would likely “annihilate the pre-existing condition requirement.” The Cruz amendment will likely cause death spirals in the insurance markets for Americans who need coverage the most. Even the conservative American Action Forum said the Cruz amendment is “the definition of a death spiral.”

From what we are seeing, the new Republican TrumpCare bill is every bit as mean as the old one, and, in one big way, it is even meaner, with the addition of something like the Cruz amendment.

Moderate Republicans looking at this bill should be able to see that the incredibly modest changes to the tax provisions—the small pot of funding for opioid abuse treatment and these other tweaks around the edges—are like a drop in the bucket compared to what the bill does to Medicaid, to seniors, and to Americans with preexisting conditions. It is clear that the core of this bill will remain until the bitter end.

So a vote on the motion to proceed will be a vote on the core of this bill. It is a vote on the idea that middle-class Americans and seniors should pay more for less healthcare. It is a vote on the idea that it should be harder for the neediest Americans to afford healthcare. It is a vote on the idea that corporations and special interests deserve another tax break.

If you are for that idea, vote yes on the motion to proceed. But my Republican friends should not be tempted by the promise of amendments to fix this bill. It is clear that the Republican leadership wants and needs to keep the core of this bill—a dagger to the heart of Medicaid and tax giveaways for corporations and special interests—to the bitter end.

Republicans keep talking about needing to change the status quo on healthcare, but you don't change the status quo to make it worse. That is what this bill would do. This is far, far worse than the status quo. We, Republicans and Democrats, can work together to actually improve our healthcare system, to stabilize the marketplaces, and to reduce the costs that average Americans pay for their healthcare, particularly for prescription drugs.

We can do it, but my Republican friends need to abandon this wrong-headed, partisan, behind-closed-doors approach, and they ought to do it on the motion to proceed next week.

#### APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, we Democrats sent a letter to our Republican colleagues laying out our principles on appropriations so that Republicans would know exactly where we stand and we could avoid the possibility of their shutting down the government. We have three principles: relief from damaging sequestration cuts, parity between defense and jobs and economic growth funding, and no poison pill riders, like the ineffective border wall. These are the same principles we laid out during the last budget negotiation, which resulted in a strong and bipartisan package.

But on Tuesday—which is why I am on the floor speaking—the House Appropriations Committee released a draft of its Homeland Security bill, which includes funding for an unnecessary, ineffective, and expensive border wall with Mexico, paid for by American taxpayers, breaking the President's promise, repeatedly given, that Mexico would pay for it. The bill also funds an unacceptable deportation force and unnecessary detention beds.

The President's budget calls for funding a new eminent domain strike force—a team of Trump lawyers that the administration wants to send to the border to take private land away from the American people to build this wall. This proposal has met with stiff resistance from homeowners living in border communities. Republicans and Democrats on both sides of the aisle have rightfully come out against this proposal. Not a single border State Republican supports the idea. The Senate should reject it outright.

If House Republicans keep on this path—the path of these poison pill amendments and dramatic cuts in programs that help working Americans—I fear they are steering us toward a train wreck.

Remember, the President said he wanted a shutdown. He tweeted earlier this year: “Our country needs a good ‘shutdown’ in September to fix mess!” He wants one. His budget director, Mick Mulvaney, has always been for a shutdown. By including border wall funding in their proposal and dramatically cutting domestic spending, House

Republicans, unfortunately, are playing right into their game.

I urge my Republican colleagues, please, let cooler heads prevail. To my Republican friends in the Senate, I would say persuade your colleagues in the House to abandon this dangerous, irresponsible path they put us on, which can only lead to a government shutdown. I guess they want it.

We should be working together on a responsible way forward on appropriations, in line with the principles we laid out which produced a successful bipartisan deal on the last budget.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, as public servants, I have always thought it is our duty to serve with dignity, integrity, and fairness to the best of our abilities. No matter where you are from or how we got here, the citizens of our States have sent us to Washington with the hope that we will do what is best for them. We hold the public's trust, and that is something that should guide us in everything we do.

Last week, I was home in Michigan for the Fourth of July. My family and other Michiganders celebrated and honored those who had fought for our independence and those who continue to defend our sacred freedom. Our American democracy is rooted in the promise of freedom and equal opportunity for every American. Our resilient Nation has persevered because of shared commitment to do what is right, even if we don't always agree on how to get there.

While home last week I had the opportunity to speak to many Michiganders and hear what was on their mind. They had a whole range of topics on their mind, but the No. 1 issue I heard was about the proposed Republican healthcare bill. Some were angry, some were confused, but most were simply scared. They are scared for their children, they are scared for their spouses, they are scared for their aging parents, and many are scared about what this bill could mean for their own health and well-being.

I wish to highlight a few of the stories shared with me in recent days. Susan from Clawson, MI, shared her unfortunate story about when she fell on hard times, unexpectedly lost her small business and with it her income.

Susan, despite all of her hard work in the past, no longer had the resources to obtain private health insurance. During this time—and it was an extremely stressful time—she also discovered she had an unidentified lump on her breast. Through some research and the help of friends, Susan was able to enroll in Medicaid and get the treatment for what she discovered was a very aggressive but treatable form of cancer.

Without Medicaid, Susan may not have gotten the treatment she needed and may have lost her life. Nobody

takes pleasure in sharing such deeply personal stories, but Susan wants to be sure anyone that who finds themselves in such a difficult position has the support she had.

I appreciate her bravery in beating cancer and her willingness to share this very personal experience.

Alayna from Southfield, MI, shared that she was diagnosed with a rare tumor almost a year ago. Alayna serves as a minister of music in her church in downtown Detroit and enjoys working with children through various local programs. Alayna works part time and her husband works full time, often 70 hours per week. Neither has healthcare benefits through their employers.

Alayna and her husband were able to obtain coverage through the ACA marketplace, a plan she would not have been able to purchase without the Affordable Care Act. Alayna is rightfully terrified by the Republican plan and said she would probably be dead without the affordable coverage she received under the Affordable Care Act, leaving her husband and her 5-year-old daughter behind.

Matt, from Waterford, was unable to get health insurance before the ACA due to two preexisting conditions. After obtaining healthcare through the Affordable Care Act, he discovered one of his preexisting conditions had led to cancer in his digestive tract. Matt is convinced the ACA literally saved his life and that he would not have been able to afford the care he needs otherwise.

Hearing the stories of Matt, Susan, Alayna, and countless other Michiganders like them, I feel the need to remind this body that these individuals are our neighbors. They are husbands and wives and fathers and mothers. Illnesses or emergencies can happen to anyone. Ministers get sick. Students get sick. Small business owners get sick.

Matt didn't choose to be born with a preexisting condition, Susan didn't ask for breast cancer, and Alayna's tumor could have been on any one of us.

Last week, we honored our country's fight for independence, our Nation's brave Founders, and all who have sacrificed to build our Nation by working toward a more perfect union to ensure America is the land of opportunity for all.

The healthcare bill Republicans have written goes against the very values we honor and cherish. It does not bring us closer to opportunity for all. When the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office concludes that the Republican bill will leave millions of people uninsured, that should send a strong signal to all of us that we need to go back to the drawing board.

About an hour ago, my Republican colleagues released additional last-minute changes to their healthcare bill, intended to win over a few more votes within their party—changes that were drafted behind closed doors and

without input from the American public, the very people we represent. In their rush to get this bill done quickly, my colleagues have not fully considered how this proposal will impact their constituents.

Healthcare stakeholders and our Nation's insurers have told Republicans this latest change will still cause premiums for older Americans and those with preexisting conditions to skyrocket. It will still increase the number of Americans without health insurance by millions.

We should be working on bipartisan legislation that will truly improve our healthcare system by increasing insurance coverage while bringing down cost, not forcing a vote next week on legislation that is seriously flawed.

I ask my Republican colleagues to listen to their fellow Americans, Americans who are scared of what this bill will mean for them and for their families. I ask my Republican colleagues to listen to the people calling their office every single day and even traveling here to Washington, DC, to speak out against this bill. I ask my colleagues to listen to the independent experts and healthcare stakeholders who have said, in no uncertain terms, that this bill will cost millions of people their health insurance and could cost thousands of Americans their very lives.

I ask my colleagues to remember why they came to Washington in the first place. I ask my colleagues to step back and ask themselves some tough questions. Will this bill help people or will it hurt people? What will this bill mean for rural hospitals in their State, for lifesaving addiction treatments, for preventive care that saves lives and taxpayer dollars? Does this bill hold true to the important American values of fairness, freedom, and equal opportunity for all?

If the answer to any of these questions is no, we should scrap this bill, start over, and work together, in a bipartisan way, to bring down healthcare costs and improve the quality of care available to every American, no matter who they are or where they live.

I yield the floor.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Morning business is closed.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Francis Hagerty IV, of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Japan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, let me begin by reviewing the threats the United States is facing around the world today. The campaign against ISIS is far from over. We must build on the success of retaking Mosul and ensure an enduring defeat of terrorist threats in Iraq and Syria and throughout the region.

Every day we learn more about Russia's asymmetric capabilities—from cyber attacks to disinformation campaigns—even as they modernize their military, occupy Crimea, destabilize Ukraine, and threaten our NATO allies. China continues to militarize the South China Sea and modernize its own military at an alarming rate. North Korea gets ever closer to developing the capability to strike the U.S. homeland with a nuclear-armed missile.

I could spend a lot of time going through all of the threats we face. We are at war. We are at war. There are brave young men and women serving in Afghanistan, as I speak. Some of them have been wounded and killed. We must always ask ourselves: Are we really doing all we can to support them?

Our military is facing a crisis. Years of budget cuts from this Congress have failed our men and women in uniform. In order to rebuild the military, the Pentagon needs to ramp up readiness programs and embark on an ambitious plan for modernization to make sure our servicemembers are given the training, resources, and capabilities they need. To do that, the Department of Defense must have senior leadership.

The position of Deputy Secretary of State is one of the most critical positions in our government. It is essentially the chief operating officer of the largest, most complex organization in the world—the Department that is entrusted with ensuring our national security.

Patrick Shanahan is a well-qualified nominee who passed out of the Armed Services Committee on a voice vote. This body voted overwhelmingly, 98 to 1, to confirm General Mattis as Secretary of Defense. He had our overwhelming support to lead the Department during challenging times. Yet we have not given Secretary Mattis the senior leadership he needs to help him do his job.

Tomorrow, I say to my colleagues, the current Deputy Secretary of Defense, Bob Work, will leave his office. There simply is no more time to delay moving the nomination of Patrick Shanahan. You can choose to vote no, you can choose to vote yes, but let's just vote. The obstruction has gone on long enough, and it has to stop.

I wish to say, I understand the frustration my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel with the process we have been through, particularly on the issue of healthcare. The issue of healthcare should have gone through

the relevant committees. It should have had amendments, it should have had debate, it should have had discussion, and maybe we could have passed something going through the regular order, and we didn't. I understand the frustration my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are feeling. I felt the same thing in 2009 when we did ObamaCare, basically on the same basis. Yet amnesia seems to have set in here or new Members are not remembering or care.

What is going on in this body, unfortunately, these days is plagued by partisanship and politics. This is a time to put aside all of that for the sake of our national security and come together as Republicans and Democrats to move this nomination. Our men and women in uniform deserve no less.

Let me say again to my friend from New York, whom I have enjoyed doing battle with for many years, he is a man of honesty and integrity and a man of his word. I understand his frustration, and I understand the frustration on the other side of the aisle because we felt the same thing.

I would again ask the indulgence of the leader of the Democrat Party on the other side to at least consider this unanimous consent request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 157, the nomination of Patrick Shanahan to be Deputy Secretary of Defense; that the nomination be confirmed; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, first, there is no one I have more respect for on either side of the aisle than the Senator from Arizona. He said some nice words about me, and I extend them back to him five times over. He is a fine man. He has great integrity, great courage, great service to our country, and no one has helped defend America more—both when he was in the Armed Forces and here on the Senate floor—than the gentleman. I respect that.

I respect that you always try to put yourself in the other person's moccasins. That was one of the great Indian proverbs.

I know he is doing that, as he mentioned in his remarks.

I would like to make a couple of quick points.

First, our Republican leader has chosen this week to proceed with three nominees under regular order. He could have advanced this nominee and a few others from the DOD but instead chose a district court judge in Idaho, a nominee to OMB, Ambassador to Japan. So I say to my good friend from Arizona, given the frustration he remarked on that our side has on healthcare, which is so important to so many—as is keeping a strong and fully staffed Defense

Department—I would say to the gentleman that we would be happy to consider the nominee in the regular order. And maybe once things change a little bit on healthcare, with the consent of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, we can move a lot of things quickly. But at this point, despite my great respect for my dear friend, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCAIN. Before the Democratic leader leaves, may I ask one more?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Monday, July 17, the Senate proceed to executive session for consideration of Executive Calendar No. 157. I further ask that there be 30 minutes of debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination with no intervening action or debate, and that, if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

Before I ask for a ruling on that, may I just say that the Senator from New York has a legitimate comment. Why in the world we would be wasting time on the Ambassador to Japan when we have the Department of Defense nominees in line is something I can neither account for, nor can I condone. So I understand the frustration of the Senator from New York.

Maybe sometime after our 2 weeks in August, perhaps some of us ought to sit down and talk and work out an agenda. We have a train wreck coming, as the Senator from New York knows. We have the debt limit. We have appropriations bills to pass. We have all these things piling up, we have about 30 days to do it in, and so far, I have seen no plan to address these challenges.

The only way we are going to address some of these challenges, I say to my colleagues, with their partisanship and anger and dislike of anybody who lives over there, the fact is that we need to work together to work these things out, and we can do it without betraying principle, but we can also do it by understanding the priorities and the dedication and patriotism of those on the other side of the aisle.

So I understand the Senator from New York. I don't agree with the Senator from New York, but I understand his frustration. So I renew my consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHUMER. Reluctantly, again, I must object. But I would say to my colleague from Arizona, I would like very much to sit down and work out these other problems. I think that if he and I sat in a room together, we could figure these things out ourselves pretty well, and it would be our job to persuade our colleagues to try to do the same. I understand. I used the same words—"train wreck"—earlier this

morning. If we don't come to a good agreement, for instance, on appropriations and the budget, the defense forces that he so dearly holds and so many of the issues on our side would be hurt dramatically—the country would. So I promise him, I will endeavor to work with him in the most good-faith way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. MCCAIN. May I ask one more question of the Democratic leader? When would Mr. Shanahan's nomination be in order?

Mr. SCHUMER. I think if it is filed—it will be up to the Republican leader. If it is filed tonight, the cloture motion would be voted on Monday night, and then maybe we could talk about—with the permission of my colleagues from the other side—speeding it up after that.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I am speaking today because proponents of TrumpCare have their heads stuck in the sand. Many of the Republicans in this Chamber are clearly in denial that we live in a country where 91 Americans die each and every day from an opioid overdose; where 1.3 million Americans went to the hospital for an opioid-related issue in 2014; where 2,000 Massachusetts residents died from an opioid overdose just last year, and 69 percent of those cases had the illicit opioid fentanyl in their bodies. If people across the country were dying from overdoses at the same rate as in Massachusetts, that would be 100,000 people per year—two Vietnam wars' worth of deaths every single year. Over 10 years, that would be 1 million people who die if they were dying at the same rate as they are in Massachusetts—1 million people over 10 years dying from opioid overdoses in our country.

If these Republicans took their heads out of the sand, they would hear the near-unanimous calls from the experts and the pleas of mothers and fathers to stop this machete to Medicaid which they have brought with their new healthcare reform bill. They would hear the alarm bells Americans across the country are ringing against this cruel and heartless and immoral legislation.

These desperate voices should be enough to get Republicans to abandon their efforts to rip away insurance coverage for treatment and recovery services for Americans struggling with substance use disorders, but instead of accepting the truth and listening to their constituents, they have decided to take a cynical path and replace these life-saving services with a paltry opioid fund of \$45 billion over 10 years.

There has been a lot of talk from the Republicans about so-called fixes that they can work on with Democrats, but this opioid fund isn't a fix, it is a falsehood. It is a false promise to the people suffering from opioid addiction. It is a

false future that won't include critical Medicaid funding for treatment and recovery services. It is a false bargain that Republicans will make at the expense of families desperate for opioid addiction treatment.

This opioid fund is a politically craven effort to buy votes from Republicans whose States are being ravaged by the prescription drug, heroin, and fentanyl crisis, but the American people will not be fooled. This opioid funding is nothing more than a public health pittance, a wholly inadequate response to our Nation's preeminent healthcare crisis. In fact, the amount included in this latest version of TrumpCare is not even half of the amount that the Affordable Care Act would have spent on covering opioid use disorder treatment if we just left that law alone to work as intended.

Here are the numbers. The Center for American Progress has estimated that the Affordable Care Act would spend \$91 billion for opioid coverage alone over the next decade, compared to the \$45 billion the Republicans are putting into their bill which they announced today.

We already know that access to treatment is a challenge. Only 1 in 10 Americans with substance addiction receives treatment. There are estimated to be 2 million people with an opioid use disorder who are not receiving any treatment for this disorder.

It should not be a surprise to anyone that the epidemic of opioid abuse will only get worse as long as we have a system that makes it easier to abuse drugs than to get help for addiction disorders. And the paltry GOP fund that provides less than half of the funding of the Affordable Care Act is only going to accelerate the death sentence for the millions of people with substance use disorders.

Sadly, we know that my Republican colleagues who are attempting to jam this immoral and callous TrumpCare bill through this body actually are aware of the crisis facing their States. They speak to the same constituents. They read the same newspapers. They see the same obituaries of Americans who lost their lives to the opioid overdose epidemic. And that is why we have been able to make some bipartisan progress. Last year, we passed the CARA bill. We passed legislation to fund \$1 billion for treatment. But support for the TrumpCare bill and this opioid fund is a betrayal of all of that hard-fought progress we were making.

Republicans are turning their backs on their vow to combat the opioid epidemic, and President Trump is breaking his promise from the campaign trail to "expand treatment for those who have become so badly addicted." Instead, they are moving forward with a proposal that would rip insurance away from 22 million people and threaten insurance coverage for 2.8 million Americans with a substance use disorder.

This bill would eviscerate Medicaid—the leading payer of behavioral health

services, including substance use treatment—by nearly \$800 billion, and all of this to give billions in tax breaks to billionaires and big corporations.

One analysis has found that under the Senate's previous version of TrumpCare, Republicans provided a nearly \$33 billion tax break to the top 400 earners, the top 400 billionaires in America, which is the equivalent of ending Medicaid expansion for too many people in our country.

Let's look at what they are planning. They are planning to cut from \$91 billion down to \$45 billion the amount of money we spend on opioid treatment in the United States. At the same time, they have \$33 billion that they are going to give in a tax break to the wealthiest 400 billionaires in America. Where is that money going to be better spent in our country over the next 10 years—\$33 billion for the 400 wealthiest people or adding that money back in so that we can have treatment for people who have opioid addiction problems in their families? What is going to be better for America?

Well, the Republicans say: We need all that money that would go for treatment to give it to the wealthiest people in our country.

They can afford their treatment. Their families will have all the healthcare coverage they need if they have problems in their families. But the Republicans don't care. If you kicked this bill in the heart, you would break your toe. That is how bad it is.

So, for me, this is without question, at the heart, a simple explanation of what is fundamentally wrong with this Republican bill. There are many other things wrong with it—preexisting conditions, go all the way down the line—but how can you, when we have this plague hitting our country, take all that money away and give it away to billionaires? It is just wrong. There are too many families, too many letters, too many conversations that we have all had with these families. There are too many tears that we have seen. So, for me, there can be nothing that is worse than doing that to families—taking away their hope.

This is going to be a battle of monumental proportions. All I can tell you is that for the 2,000 families who had someone who died in Massachusetts last year, we are going to make sure this is a battle that everyone knows because if the American people understood that they are doing this to all of those families who have an opioid problem right now, there would be a revolt that would rise up across this country. Over this next week, the American people are going to learn about what is in the soul of this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I am here with Senator CORKER today to address the Senate and encourage this body to vote in support of Bill Hagerty as our Ambassador to Japan.

In 2013, when Bill Hagerty was the commissioner of economic and community development for Tennessee, he gave a speech entirely in Japanese at the American Embassy in Tokyo.

I have looked it up. There have been 16 U.S. Ambassadors to Tokyo, a very distinguished group since World War II: a five-star general, two former Senate majority leaders, a former Vice President of the United States, a former Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the daughter of a former President of the United States. So far as I know, none of them were able to do what Bill Hagerty did in 2013 when he made a speech entirely in Japanese at the American Embassy in Tokyo.

That is just one reason I think Bill Hagerty is one of President Trump's best appointees.

He was born in Tennessee, graduated from Vanderbilt University, was associate editor of the law review, worked as a consultant for the Boston Consulting Group. During his final 3 years, he lived in Tokyo, and he served as senior managing executive for their clients around Asia.

He was selected by President George H.W. Bush to be on his staff, and there he worked on trade, commerce, defense and telecommunications issues. He was a White House fellow. He was founder and chairman of a company in private life that became the third largest medical research company in the United States. He founded his own private equity and investment firm.

From 2011 to 2015, he was the commissioner of economic and community development for Tennessee. In that role, working with Governor Haslam, he was enormously successful. They secured \$15 billion in investments and 90,000 jobs for our State. For 2 of those years, Tennessee was the No. 1 State for economic development and the No. 1 State in job creation through foreign direct investment.

Bill Hagerty is a distinguished Eagle Scout. He was head of a capital campaign for the Scouts. He served on the board for the Far East Council of the Scouts, encouraging the growth of Boy Scouts throughout Asia. One way he intends to continue that mission is that his two sons will join their respective troops in Japan following his confirmation. His wife, Chrissy, would want me to quickly add that there are two aspiring Girl Scouts in their family who will have time to do the same.

This is not only one of the best appointments but one of the most important of this President. There is a reason we have had such a distinguished list of Ambassadors since World War II, including our former majority leader, Senator Howard Baker from Tennessee.

Mike Mansfield, another former majority leader of this body, was also Ambassador. He used to say in every speech he made that the Japanese-American alliance is the most important two-country relationship in the world, bar none. Ambassador Mansfield said that so often that Americans in

Tokyo used to call our Embassy there the “Bar None Ranch.”

If you will permit a little parochialism, Mr. Hagerty comes from a state, Tennessee, which has the most important relationship with Japan of any State, bar none.

That began about 40 years ago. I remember President Carter saying to me as a new Governor and to other Governors: “Go to Japan. Persuade them to make in the United States what they sell in the United States.”

Off we all went. During my first 24 months as Governor, I spent 3 weeks in Japan and 8 weeks on Japanese-American relations. I explained to Tennesseans that I thought I could do more good for our State in Japan than I could in Washington, DC. It turned out to be true. Nissan, Bridgestone, Komatsu, and other companies came, and so did the jobs.

By the mid-eighties, Tennessee had 10 percent of all the Japanese capital investment in the United States, and this has continued. Nissan and Bridgestone have North America’s largest auto plants and tire plants in Tennessee. With Mr. Hagerty’s help, Bridgestone, as well as Nissan, have decided to locate their North American headquarters in our State.

Bill Hagerty, if approved by the Senate, would go to Japan not only able to speak the language but, having lived and worked there, understanding how close ties between Japan and the United States can create bigger paychecks for Americans, as well as for the Japanese.

I join my colleague, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER, in enthusiastically saying it is my hope that the Senate will approve today his nomination and that he will soon be on the job, and his children will be in their respective Scout troops in Japan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the senior Senator from Tennessee, Mr. ALEXANDER, for his eloquent comments about this great nomination. I also thank him again, as I have many times, for the outstanding relationship he developed with Japan that has borne so much fruit for the citizens in our State and so many States across the Southeast. I thank him very much for that.

I rise today also to offer my strong support for the nomination of Bill Hagerty to serve as the U.S. Ambassador to Japan. Bill is one of the most outstanding appointments that President Trump has made, and his confirmation is long overdue.

The relationship between the United States and Japan speaks for itself, and hosting Prime Minister Abe as one of the first visitors speaks to how the Trump administration and our country feel about Japan.

As a fellow Tennessean, I have had the privilege of knowing Bill Hagerty

and his family on a personal level. I have seen him in business and the outstanding things he has done there. I have seen him represent our State as commissioner of economic development, and he caused it to be one of the most heralded States in the country relative to job creation. Much of that had to do with his ability to deal with other governments around the world and cause them to be attracted to our State.

I also know that he and his wife Chrissy actually met in Japan, so this is an exciting time and sort of a homecoming for their family.

There is no one more well-suited to fill this important role, and I know our Nation will benefit from Bill’s leadership and experience as he carries on the tremendous legacy of U.S. Ambassadors to Japan, including the late Howard Baker, another fellow Tennessean.

I am really, really proud of this nomination and know that Bill will represent the very best of our country during his service in Japan.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this confirmation. This is long overdue, and I know he will be going to Japan at a time when we truly need an ambassador with his capacity.

I yield the floor.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

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

Mr. ALEXANDER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) would have voted “yea.”

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 86, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 160 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Alexander	Bennet	Boozman
Baldwin	Blumenthal	Burr
Barrasso	Blunt	Cantwell

Capito	Grassley	Perdue
Cardin	Hassan	Portman
Carper	Hatch	Reed
Casey	Heitkamp	Risch
Cassidy	Heller	Roberts
Cochran	Hoeven	Rounds
Collins	Inhofe	Rubio
Coons	Isakson	Sasse
Corker	Johnson	Schatz
Cornyn	Kaine	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Scott
Cotton	King	Shaheen
Crapo	Klobuchar	Shelby
Cruz	Lankford	Strange
Daines	Leahy	Sullivan
Donnelly	Lee	Tester
Duckworth	Manchin	Thune
Durbin	Markey	Tillis
Enzi	McCain	Toomey
Ernst	McConnell	Van Hollen
Feinstein	Menendez	Warner
Fischer	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Flake	Murphy	Wicker
Franken	Murray	Wyden
Gardner	Nelson	Young
Graham	Paul	

NAYS—12

Booker	Heinrich	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Stabenow
Gillibrand	Merkley	Udall
Harris	Peters	Warren

NOT VOTING—2

McCaskill Moran

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the Hagerty nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

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. 157.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Patrick M. Shanahan, of Washington, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.



Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, Tom Cotton, Thom Tillis, Lindsey Graham, Mike Crapo, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker, Dan Sullivan, John Cornyn, John Thune, Steve Daines, John Barrasso, David Perdue, Mike Rounds, Orrin G. Hatch, John McCain.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call be waived.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Mr. FLAKE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1552 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. FLAKE. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today I wish to make some remarks paying tribute to a former staff member of mine for whom I have the highest opinion. However, before I begin those remarks, I should take a moment to address the elephant in the room.

Mr. President, today the majority leader revealed a revised discussion draft for legislation to repeal and replace ObamaCare. Let me say at the outset that this bill isn't perfect. There are some things in the bill that, given my preferences, I would do very differently. But one thing I have learned in my 40 years in this Senate is that people who demand purity and perfection when it comes to legislation usually end up disappointed and rarely accomplish anything productive. That is particularly true when we are talking about complex policy matters.

The next vote on this legislation will presumably be whether to let the Senate proceed to the bill. Regardless of any of the positions of my colleagues on this particular draft, if they support the larger effort to repeal and replace ObamaCare, they should at the very least want to have a debate on this bill. Under the rules, we will have an open amendment process. Members will get a chance to make their preferences known and to have the Senate vote on them. Taking that opportunity is the very least we can do.

Keep in mind, virtually every Republican in this body has supported the effort to repeal and replace ObamaCare more or less since the day it was signed into law. We have all made promises to our constituents along those lines. This legislation, while far from perfect, would fulfill the vast majority of those promises.

If we pass up this opportunity, we are looking at further collapse of our health insurance markets, which means dramatically higher premiums and even fewer healthcare options for our constituents. Make no mistake, while some are talking about a bipartisan solution to prop up markets in

the event this bill fails, there is no magic elixir or silver bullet that will make that an easy proposition.

I have to think that at the end of the day, if we fail to take action to fulfill the promises we have all made, we will have to answer to the American people for the missed opportunity and the chaos that will almost certainly follow. I hope all of my colleagues will keep that in mind.

#### TRIBUTE TO EVERETT EISSENSTAT

Mr. President, I wish to take this time to pay tribute to a very dear and noble colleague of mine, Everett Eissenstat. For the past 6 years, Everett has served as my chief international trade counsel on the Senate Finance Committee—a very important position. He has had a long and distinguished career in public service, obtaining and utilizing what is really an unparalleled level of knowledge and expertise about our Nation's trade policy. In fact, I think it is safe to say that very few, if any, individuals have had as great an impact on the current state of U.S. trade law as Everett Eissenstat. His public service will continue, as he has recently gone on to serve as the Deputy Director of the National Economic Council.

Everett received his juris doctorate at the University of Oklahoma, where he graduated cum laude and served as research editor of the Oklahoma Law Review. He also holds a master's degree in Latin American studies from the University of Texas at Austin and a bachelor's degree in political science and Spanish from Oklahoma State University. With diverse alma maters like that, some might wonder how Everett decides what colors to wear on college football Saturdays. But those of my colleagues who know Everett will correctly guess that he has, since his undergraduate days, remained a devoted fan of his beloved Cowboys.

After obtaining his law degree, Everett went to work for Dixon and Dixon in Dallas, TX. Later, he worked as Congressman Jim Kolbe's legislative director and, shortly thereafter, he became the international trade counsel for the Senate Finance Committee for Senator GRASSLEY, who was then the lead Republican on the committee.

Everett was a key staffer in the effort to draft and pass the Trade Act of 2002, which renewed trade promotion authority for the first time in 8 years. This was a major update to our Nation's trade laws and made possible the completion and passage of trade agreements with Chile, Singapore, Australia, Morocco, Bahrain, Oman, Peru, Colombia, South Korea, Panama, as well as the countries of the CAFTA-DR agreement; namely, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic.

Everett then helped implement a number of these agreements when he served as Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for the Western Hemisphere, a position he held from 2006 through 2010.

After recognizing his fine work, I asked Everett to return to the Finance Committee in January of 2011 to once again serve as chief international trade counsel, and he continued to distinguish himself as one of the most knowledgeable and dedicated trade lawyers in the country.

Very early in his second tenure at the Finance Committee, he helped shepherd our free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea through the Senate. In 2015, he was the key staffer in the effort to draft, introduce, and pass the bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act, which, among other things, once again renewed trade promotion authority after another 8-year gap, and updated our Nation's trade negotiating objectives for the 21st century.

At about the same time, Congress also passed legislation to update our customs enforcement and facilitation laws, as well as a bill to reauthorize some important trade preferences.

All of these successes were the culmination of years of hard work and represent the most ambitious legislative agenda on trade in recent history, and Everett was an indispensable part of it all.

With his work on passage of those laws in 2015, his work on the prior TPA statute in 2002, and his efforts at USTR, Everett has been a key player in the development and facilitation of a generation of U.S. trade law. That is no small feat. More than anyone I have known, Everett is committed both to improving opportunities for Americans abroad and to ensuring an increasingly free-trade economy around the world. He is a true believer in free trade and the benefits free trade brings to our economy.

I am not the only Senator who will miss Everett's knowledge and expertise. Indeed, during his time here, he was an asset to the entire Senate. But, more than that, I will miss him personally: his tireless work ethic, his calm and thoughtful demeanor, and his cheerful disposition, even when he is breaking bad news or telling Senators things they may not want to hear.

While I am sad to see him go, it is comforting to know that Everett is continuing to serve our country and will keep advancing pro-growth economic policies at the National Economic Council. His expertise and wisdom are more important now than ever before, with numerous trade possibilities on the immediate horizon.

As I have said before, and I imagine I will say many times again, Everett is very, very good at what he does. The administration and the country are lucky to have such an important asset. I look forward to seeing his successes in this new chapter of his career, though it goes without saying that he leaves behind some very big shoes to fill. I count myself lucky to have been the beneficiary of Everett's knowledge and advice for several years.



I want to wish Everett, his wonderful wife Janet, and their sons Jacob and Alex the very best in this and any other future endeavors. Everett has a dedicated family, and I understand that they are here today; that Everett's wife and his one son were outside here just a short time ago. I am quite certain they are just as proud of Everett as I am.

I have worked with a lot of people in the U.S. Senate. I have had a lot of staff people, and all of them have been, almost to a person, very, very good. I have appreciated all of them, and I know that we wouldn't be nearly as good without our staffs whispering in our ears, preparing the documents that we put into the RECORD, working with us to help us improve our abilities to put forth our agendas.

I want my colleagues to know that Everett Eissenstat has been one of the all-time great staff people on Capitol Hill. I hesitate to even call him a staff person because he has the kind of reputation that goes far beyond being a staffer on Capitol Hill. He is one of the great leaders in this country, and I just want him to know how much I personally appreciate him. I want his wife to know how much I appreciate her and him; and his children—I want them to know what a great father they have.

Everett is a great, great man, and I am really happy to have said a few nice words about him on the floor. No matter what I say, it is not enough to explain what a truly great individual Everett Eissenstat really is.

I hope we can get other good staff people like Everett to help us on both sides. We are willing to work with both sides, willing to bring us together to do the things we know are important for this country and its future. Everett is one of those. I am going to miss him terribly. On the other hand, I know that where he is now is very important, and he will do the job as well as anybody alive.

I just want to pay tribute to him and his wife and his son who is here today, and tell him how much we all love and appreciate him.

With that, 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.

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

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

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be here with my colleagues—Senator KLOBUCHAR, from Minnesota, and Senator HEITKAMP, from North Dakota—to talk about the most prominent issue facing us right now; that is, what happens to healthcare for millions of Americans.

At a town hall in Kentucky last week, Majority Leader McCONNELL said that if he can't secure the votes to re-

peal the Affordable Care Act, he will have no choice but to work in a bipartisan way with Democrats on legislation to repair and strengthen the law. Well, I was encouraged to hear the majority leader say that because I don't think bipartisanship should be a last resort. I think it should be the starting point. It should be the beginning of the work we do in this Chamber because that is what the American people want and that is the best way to make lasting public policy.

This is especially true with healthcare legislation, which impacts families all across America. As we have been hearing—and I have had a chance to hear it directly from my constituents in New Hampshire—the American people have wanted all along for to take a bipartisan approach. It is unfortunate that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have spent months trying to pass a partisan, deeply unpopular bill.

Now, I think we would all agree that there are changes we need to make in the Affordable Care Act, something for which I have advocated since we passed the law. I have had the opportunity to work with our colleague TIM SCOTT from South Carolina. In 2015, we worked together to make modest changes to the law to protect small businesses from excessive premium increases. I think that bipartisan approach is something with which, if we started today, we could make changes in the Affordable Care Act to improve it and to make sure that Americans could get better access to healthcare.

We all understand that there are problems currently in the market in terms of premium increases, and we know why these premium increases are happening. In their 2018 rate request filings, insurers justified the increases because of the uncertainty surrounding the repeal of the ACA and because this administration refuses to commit to making what are called cost-sharing reduction payments.

These payments were included as part of the Affordable Care Act to address premiums, deductibles, and copayments and to make them more affordable for working families, basically, to be able to help people afford insurance. The payments have been built into the rates that insurers are charging for 2017. But as we look ahead to 2018, there is a big problem because, if there is uncertainty around those payments, it means premiums will skyrocket, insurers will leave marketplaces, and people will lose their health coverage. Now, we could fix this today if we were willing to work together, because we know what we need to do.

I think New Hampshire offers a vivid example of what we are seeing across the country. Last year, insurance markets were stable, health insurance premiums increased an average of just 2 percent in New Hampshire—the lowest annual increase in the country and in our State's history. Unfortunately, today, because of the uncertainty in the market, it is a very different story.

Insurers in New Hampshire are raising premiums for 2018. The same thing is happening across the country. In some cases, insurers are filing two different sets of rates—one premised on the administration's continuing to make those cost-sharing payments that I talked about earlier, and the second set with higher premiums to account for continuing uncertainty and the possibility that the Trump administration, which is legally charged with implementing the Affordable Care Act, is going to renege on making the payments that have been promised to insurers and, ultimately, to families so that they can get healthcare.

This uncertainty is completely unnecessary. The instability in the ACA marketplaces is a manufactured crisis, and we could put a stop to it today. That is why I have introduced the Marketplace Certainty Act, a bill to permanently appropriate funds that would expand the cost-sharing reduction payments and ensure that we can count on those payments being made.

I am pleased to be joined by 25 other Senators who have already cosponsored this bill, and we can pass this right now if we had agreement with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

The Marketplace Certainty Act is also supported by a broad spectrum of provider and patient advocate groups—including the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Diabetes Association, and the National Association of Community Health Centers, just to name a few.

We can end the artificial crisis. We could immediately restore certainty and stability to the health insurance markets. In turn, this would give us the space we need to come together on a bipartisan basis to improve the Affordable Care Act, to strengthen what is working, and to fix what is not working. That is what we were sent to Washington to do.

Bipartisanship should be our first choice, not a last resort. The American people want us to stop bickering over healthcare, to work together, and to make the commonsense improvements to the law that we should be making.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota—North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. That is OK. I am from the better Dakota. I just have to tell you.

Mr. President, I am always perplexed when the opposition party, the Republican Party, says: We are the party of business. We are the party that believes that government should function more like a business. We are the party that believes that we have to make the tough decisions, we have to do the work that needs to get done, and we have to do it in a timely fashion.

OK, I get that. There is not a corporate board in America confronted with the challenge that we have in healthcare that would not shore up the

cost-saving payments. When you look at those of us who have served on corporate boards, those of us who have spent some time in the private sector, and, certainly, those of us who have been county officials or State officials, where we have actually had to make decisions, we look at how you make those decisions. The first thing you do is to try to make sure that while you are deliberating and while you are making decisions, you don't create market disruption. You don't do the things that create more uncertainty. You stabilize what you can, triage what you can, and then take a look at what the advantages are and what the experience you can bring to bear is to resolve bigger, broader, and more systemic issues.

If we look today at where we are right now with our constituents or our customers, if we can put it in a business sense, our customers are Americans and American families. Guess what. As for those of us who have been in our States and who have spent time looking at healthcare, talking to people about healthcare, talking to providers about healthcare, I will tell you that there are two emotions they have. They are mad, and they are scared. They are probably more scared than mad because under the bills that are being deliberated here, the Republican healthcare bills, they don't know if they can continue to keep their disabled children at home with them. They don't know if they can continue to provide for their parents in a nursing home. They don't know if their rural hospital is going to be able to survive the kinds of reductions in payments that are anticipated under this bill.

Today in North Dakota, \$250 million is the value of Medicaid expansion. I have institutions in North Dakota, providers in North Dakota that are operating on razor-thin margins. They can't make ends meet without making sure that they keep that amount of uncompensated care greatly reduced. They need the cash flow.

If we raise uncompensated care, two things will happen. The first thing that will happen under this bill is that they will have a hit to their bottom line. The second and obvious consequence of that is that, when they negotiate with the private insurance market on what those next payments are going to be, they are going to ask for more money to put back on the private insurance market the cost of uncompensated care.

Let's also take a look at the growing issue in this country of opioids. I have a facility in southwestern North Dakota. Their new hospital anticipates that Medicaid is going to be about 14 to 17 percent of the billings they have. As they are trying to respond—as responsible healthcare providers would—to the opioid crisis, they are looking at converting the old hospital into a long-term facility, a facility where people can go and get healthcare when they are addicted.

They anticipate that the facility will have to rely on about 60 to 70 percent Medicaid reimbursement. When people tell you that these issues aren't intertwined, that the population that is going to need assistance in recovery from addiction is not our Medicaid population, they are wrong. Every person who has looked at this has come to the same conclusion.

The other thing I am going to tell you about the people whom I talked to is that most of them have never been involved in politics. They are not partisans. They don't really even care about politics, but they wonder why they are caught up in this tidal wave of political rhetoric when people are scaring them about whether they are going to have health insurance. They are wondering: What kind of responsible leaders would ever do that? What kind of responsible leaders would not do what they could today to provide some assurances in the near term that the health insurance is going to be available, that their Medicaid is going to be available, and that they are going to be able to take care of their kids?

I am telling you that, instead of continuing to release bad bill after bad bill, I hope the Republicans will come and honestly take us at our word. We stand ready to work with Republicans on a truly bipartisan bill that is going to deliver quality healthcare to North Dakotans and quality healthcare to the people of this country.

People think bipartisanship can't happen. That is not true. Yesterday I held a press conference on a completely separate issue that involves clean coal. Standing side by side when we announced that bill, we had Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, one of the most vocal advocates for aggressive action on climate, and Senators BARRASSO, CAPITO, and me, the most vocal advocates in support of coal. We all stood together introducing this bill because we wanted to offer a real solution on 45Q. We wanted to find out where that lane is where we can all coexist and solve the problems of the American people.

It is not impossible to do this. It is not impossible if we park the partisanship, if we park the ideology, and if we start examining what the true problems and the true issues with our healthcare system are.

The answer is usually in the middle. Has Medicaid worked to get more people with chronic conditions, to manage care, and to lower costs? The answer is yes. Are there too many people on Medicaid? The answer is yes.

We need to grow our economy. We need to help people move them into a workplace where they have workplace insurance. Instead of talking about how we are going to grow the economy, instead of talking about how we are going to raise wages, instead of talking about how we are going to help people get set, we are talking about shifting the responsibility of the sickest among us, shifting that responsibility to the States and back to the patients.

Just 2 weeks ago, I joined 15 of my colleagues trying to bring some commonsense bills forward. I thought we made a great case. We have been challenged: You really don't want to work with us.

That is all facade. That is not true. We are back here again, saying: Please, please, work with us. Let's just for a moment do what Senator MCCONNELL suggested we do. Let's take care of what is happening with the 2018 plan year. Let's remove the uncertainty as we are looking at premiums going up and skyrocketing because of that uncertainty. Let's remove that uncertainty and solve this problem.

That is why I am supporting my colleague Senator SHAHEEN's legislation that makes cost-sharing payments permanent and increases the eligibility and generosity for that benefit.

I also cosponsored Senator CARPER and Senator KAINE's bill to make the reinsurance program for the individual marketplace permanent and to devote resources to outreach and enrollment efforts. As a result, it would encourage insurance companies to offer more plans in a greater number of markets, improving competition, and driving down costs.

Isn't that what we all want? Everyone can agree that is the consequence of this legislation.

Also, earlier this week I introduced another commonsense bill—the Addressing Affordability for More Americans Act. That helps make healthcare more affordable for middle-class families. What does that mean? We know that right now on the exchanges—when we look at subsidization of families on the exchange—we have what we call a cliff event. You are either in or you are out, and there is no stepdown. Many of our middle-class families could experience a joyous event called a pay raise, only to find out that the pay raise evaporates because they lose some of the tax advantages that they received because they bought health insurance on a private exchange.

Why don't we glide that out? The same is true, actually, for Medicaid. Is there an opportunity to take that slide out, or that glide out, and moving more people into the workplace who are on Medicaid?

I share concerns that people have that the subsidization on both Medicaid and on the individual marketplace may result in people not taking economic opportunities that are available to them because, in the long run, it doesn't pencil out, given where they will be with healthcare. Let's take that incentive out. Let's work together. Let's solve that problem.

I think our bill is the starting point. If people have a better idea on how to address that concern, I stand willing and ready to make that work. I want to say that we are here saying: Let's work together. We are here saying: We do not believe that, on this side of the aisle, we have all the answers.

Guess what. I don't believe that, on that side of the aisle, they have all the

answers. I believe we could learn an incredible amount from a hearing with a bipartisan group of Governors who are going to be responsible. They are going to get this heaped into their lap if this passes. That is why you see a bipartisan group of Governors saying: You know what, keep it, because that is not a path forward.

If you want to hear some good ideas, I think we could hear some great ideas from the corporate America that has become self-insured—as they look at wellness programs, as they look at using big data metrics to help keep their population healthier and drive down costs, and as they negotiate for better deals with providers.

There are hundreds of ideas out there. There are hundreds of opportunities to learn more before we take this step, but what is the process we are in? The process we are in is this: Don't confuse me with the facts. Don't confuse me with a new idea. Don't confuse me because, politically, we have to do this.

Do you know what? No one, politically, has to do this. What we have been sent here to do is not to fulfill political promises. We have been sent here to legislate in the best interest of the American people and the people of our States. That is our job—not to represent a partisan political idea. Let's do it.

Let's bring in a whole lot of ideas, and let's park the ideology at the door. Everybody, park the ideology at the door. As so many people on the other side of the aisle would say, let's start acting in a business, yeoman-like manner and start working through these problems.

We have to do what Senator SHAHEEN has suggested, and that is to buy some time by making sure that we don't disrupt the marketplace today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I am honored to be here today with Senator HEITKAMP, from North Dakota—my friend from across the border, the prairies—and also Senator SHAHEEN, from the Granite State. I don't think it is a coincidence that the three of us are here today. We have worked on a number of bipartisan issues over the years.

As I was sitting here, I was remembering when Senator COLLINS stood during the government shutdown and asked for people who would be interested in working with her on a bipartisan plan to get ourselves out of that mess. And all three of us were involved in that effort, which was, I note, half women in the group. I think it is time to do that again when it comes to healthcare.

I appreciated it when last week Senator MCCONNELL said it may be time to work to strengthen the exchanges and to work across the aisle. Like Senator SHAHEEN, I didn't see it as a last option, I saw it as a first option.

I certainly appreciate the work my colleagues have done to propose some

smart ideas that could help us improve the Affordable Care Act, including the Marketplace Certainty Act. When I talked with our small businesses and our citizens in Minnesota, they want that kind of certainty to help with cost sharing.

The idea of doing something more with reinsurance, which we just passed on a State basis in Minnesota with a Republican legislature and a Democratic Governor—we are awaiting a waiver from Health and Human Services here in Washington. We think we should do it in a bigger way on a national level, so I also support the Kaine-Carper bill.

The work that I have been doing on prescription drugs—much of it across the aisle with Senator GRASSLEY—to stop this unprecedented practice of big pharmaceutical companies paying off generics to keep their products off the market—it would save billions of dollars for our taxpayers if they stopped that practice.

Unleash the power of 41 million seniors who are currently barred from negotiating for less expensive drug prices. Bring in less expensive drugs from Canada—a bill that I have with Senator MCCAIN. There is nothing in this new proposal we have seen today that would help in any way with prescription drug prices, and that is just wrong.

That is why we are here to welcome our colleagues to work with us on some improvements in a bipartisan way to this bill, because the bill we saw this morning would again not do anything—minor tweaks but nothing about these major Medicaid cuts that have brought so many people together against this bill.

Minnesota seniors organizations have said that these proposals we are seeing that are not bipartisan—it feels like we are pulling the rug out from underneath families and seniors. That is why we have seen AARP so strongly opposed to a number of the proposals that have been circulating around with no Democratic input.

Many, many people have come up to us across our States. I was in northern Minnesota over the Fourth of July and was there among the Lawn Chair Brigade in one of my favorite units in the Ely parade and the clowns and the Shriners and everything else in the five parades that I did. I was so surprised, as I know my colleagues were, at the number of people who came up—especially parents of kids with disabilities—in front of a whole crowd on the side of the road and said: This is my child. He needs Medicaid. He needs help. We need you to stand with us.

So it is about people like that mom with that child with Down syndrome who needs Medicaid. It is about the senior who knows they are going to need nursing home help. Thirty-two percent of our seniors use Medicaid funding for their nursing home help. A woman told me about her mom, who died 2 years ago at 95 after suffering

from dementia for more than 20 years. She had worked her whole life, but she couldn't afford that nursing home and needed that help. It is about our seniors, who don't want to see the age tax. It is about our rural hospitals that know how important it is to have healthcare not an hour away but 15 minutes away. That is what we are talking about.

So we would welcome any efforts to work on these commonsense bills we have out there, many of which have had Republican support in the past.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues who are here this afternoon for their eloquence, their remarks, their passion for making sure the people in this country can get healthcare when they need it, and for their hard work and legislation to try and make that happen.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1462

Mr. President, in the interest of trying to immediately help to stabilize the insurance markets, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1462; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I reserve the right to object.

I wonder if the Senator from New Hampshire would allow me to pose a question about her request?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Absolutely.

Mr. CORNYN. Is it true that under the so-called Marketplace Certainty Act, this would appropriate billions of additional dollars to insurance companies?

Mrs. SHAHEEN. What is true about the Marketplace Certainty Act is that it would guarantee the payments that were promised under the Affordable Care Act—not to insurance companies but to families who need help affording health insurance. That is one of the goals as we think about what our challenge is to address the healthcare needs of the people of this country, and that, in fact, is what the Marketplace Certainty Act would do.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I appreciate the response from the Senator from New Hampshire. I think I want to explore that a little more. I don't think the cost-sharing subsidies go directly to beneficiaries but, rather, to insurance companies.

Nevertheless, this is exactly the kind of proposal that the Senate can vote on next week when we proceed to the healthcare bill. As we know, unlike traditional legislation, there is an open and unlimited amendment process, and

Members on both sides will have a chance to offer amendments and have the Senate vote on them. So I would encourage all of our colleagues who have ideas about how to shape the healthcare policy to vote to get on the bill and then to offer amendments.

It has been 7 years since ObamaCare was passed. It is in meltdown mode. We are glad to have our colleagues across the aisle offer suggestions on how to improve the current terrible situation for so many millions of people, but I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. I want to be clear that what we need to do is to provide certainty in the marketplace right now. What is happening because of the effort by our Republican colleagues to repeal the Affordable Care Act—which is providing coverage for literally tens of millions of people—what is happening because of this administration's refusal to guarantee those payments that would help people with the cost of their health insurance is that we are seeing instability in the marketplace. But the answer is not the proposal that was released this morning, the second or maybe it is the third draft of healthcare legislation that was done behind closed doors by our colleagues.

Earlier today, I had the opportunity to meet with two children from New Hampshire: Parker, who is 8, and Sadie, who is 10. These kids were here advocating for the children's hospitals that have meant that they can continue to live. They are kids who were born with serious health challenges. They continue to have those serious health challenges, but thanks to Children's Hospital at Dartmouth and Boston Children's Hospital, Parker and Sadie are alive today. They are smart, they are beautiful, and they are the delight of their families. They have been able to get the healthcare they need through CHaD and through Boston Children's because they are able to get covered for their healthcare under Medicaid. What our colleagues' healthcare legislation would do is dramatically cut the Medicaid funding that Parker and Sadie and so many children and old people and disabled in this country depend on in order to stay alive.

That is a mean-spirited bill. That is not the answer to the serious healthcare challenges we have in this country, and that is not what we should be doing to fix what needs to be fixed in the Affordable Care Act. What we need to do is work together.

I am disappointed that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to work behind closed doors instead of having an open process. If this legislation that was introduced this morning is such a great piece of legislation, then let's go through regular order. Let's have a hearing. Let's let the people of this country weigh in and then see whether this is a healthcare bill we should pass.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I would like to associate myself with the comments from the former Governor and now Senator from the great State of New Hampshire.

It is not enough to say the system is failing. It is not enough to come here and say: We can fix it if you just agree to vote the way we are voting. If you just agree, you can present any amendments you want. You can do whatever you want.

We don't even have a CBO score on this legislation. We don't know what is in this legislation. There have been no hearings so that people on both sides of the aisle can ask questions and say: What does this mean for a family on traditional Medicaid who has to rely on this to keep custody of their kids? And by the way, what does it mean if, as a result of losing their Medicaid coverage, those children are no longer able to stay at home and they become foster children because it is the only way they can get healthcare? What does it mean for those families about whom we all think we ought to have a real discussion, young people, young families who have excellent health, how they might have been disadvantaged on the exchange? What do we need to do for them? Maybe they were doing better economically than a lot of folks until they hit the cliff.

That is why I want to see my bill debated, because it can, in fact, offer opportunity. Every time we talk about this, what we hear about is how much it would cost. Well, the bottom line is that if all you do is shift the burden of these costs without any discussions with Governors, with private payers, with corporate America that is self-insured—if all we are doing is shifting costs and saying "It is now your problem," we are not doing our job.

If you look at the Rand Corporation study, 12 percent of the population of this country has five or more chronic diseases. As a result of those unmanaged—typically unmanaged chronic diseases, what you will see is they incur 40 percent of the cost. Is that a problem? The answer is yes, that is a problem. We need to figure out how we can better manage chronic disease.

A great friend of mine, a guy named Richie Carmona, who once was the Surgeon General of this country, used to say—and I think it is true—70 percent of all healthcare costs are related to chronic disease, most of which is preventable. Where in any of these bills are we talking about prevention? Where are we talking about wellness? Where are we talking about bending the healthcare curve? We are only dumping and running with these bills. We are not doing our job, and as a result, we are frightening people in this country. We are frightening the elderly. We are frightening people who say: Right now, I can afford my health in-

urance; I am on an exchange. But when we change the ratio from 1-to-3 to 1-to-5 and reduce the amount of subsidies, then 30, 40, 50 percent of their disposable income will be used to pay for health insurance. That is the thing you are not hearing here.

So we have to come together. We have to come together with the fundamental questions of what is wrong with not just the Affordable Care Act but what is wrong with healthcare and how we fix it and how we change outcomes. We can't do that if we don't work together. This is a body that is divided 48 to 52. How do you come together if you don't come to the middle, if you don't come to the middle to compromise? You don't.

At the end of the day, we have not met our deepest obligation, which is to speak for those who are the least fortunate among us. We have not met our obligation to govern this country in a way that would make our Founding Fathers proud, to make our citizens proud, and that can advance this idea that the U.S. Congress can get something done in the United States of America—instead of partisan rancor.

We hold out the hope that we will at one point be able to debate these ideas that we presented. We hold out the hope that we will, in fact, meet somewhere to arrive at a better plan for the delivery of healthcare in this country.

I just want to close with one thought. There is not one organized healthcare group or advocacy group in my State that supports the Republican healthcare plan, so as we are looking at judgment on that plan, don't take my word for it. Take the medical associations' word for it, take the hospital associations' word for it, take AARP's word for it, take the consortium of large hospitals in my State, which urged a "no" vote on this legislation, take the disabled children's advocacy groups' word for it. This is not a path forward, but we are big enough people and good enough leaders that we can forge a path forward if we just find the will to do it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### SEX TRAFFICKING

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an issue that Members on both sides of this aisle have a deep concern about, and that is human sex trafficking and, specifically, the work we have done to try to stop one website called backpage.com from selling people online.

This morning, I—along with my colleagues TOM CARPER and CLAIRE MCCASKILL—announced that we have asked the Department of Justice to investigate backpage.com for criminal

violations of the law. This is a criminal referral, and it is a new development in this case. We believe there is sufficient evidence to warrant this criminal review by the Justice Department, based on the work that we have done in the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

With estimated revenues of more than \$150 million a year, backpage.com is a market leader in commercial sex trafficking and has been linked to hundreds of reported cases of sex trafficking, including trafficking vulnerable women and children. Backpage has claimed that it “leads the industry” in its screening of advertisements for illegal activity, including sex ads for children. That is simply not true. In fact, we now know that this website has long facilitated sex trafficking on its site so that it can increase its profits—profits that come at the expense of those being trafficked, including children.

When victims or State authorities try to bring actions against this company, backpage has evaded responsibility by saying that it doesn’t write the ads for sex; it just publishes. Frankly, as a rule, courts have sided with the company, citing the immunity granted by a Federal law that is called the Communications Decency Act. The law, in essence, says that if a company like backpage publishes an ad someone else gives them, they are not liable, even though, again in this case, we know that this website has long facilitated sex trafficking and they know what they are doing.

We also now know that backpage has actively edited words and images, which makes them cocreators of these ads. We also know from a new report in the Washington Post just this week that, despite claims, backpage has aggressively solicited and created sex-related ads designed to lure customers. It further demonstrates that backpage is not merely a passive publisher of third-party content. They are involved. The article found that backpage workers were active cocreators of many of these sex advertisements, including those that seek to traffic women and young, underage girls.

I believe the legal consequences should be that they should lose their immunity under the Communications Decency Act, and that is why we have asked the Justice Department today to review this matter.

Let me be clear about the Communications Decency Act. It has an important purpose. It is a well-intentioned law. It was enacted back in 1996 to protect online publishers, and I support the broader legislation, the Communications Decency Act. But the law was not intended to protect those who knowingly violate the law and facilitate illegal conduct, and it was never intended to protect those who knowingly facilitate the sex trafficking of vulnerable women and girls.

We are actively exploring legislation to fix this issue once and for all. I have

been working with a bipartisan group of Senators on potential legislation, and I am hopeful that will soon be introduced in the U.S. Senate. We must protect women and underage girls and hold accountable websites that knowingly facilitate these types of criminal exploitations.

A couple of weeks ago, I was at a place in Ohio called the Ranch of Opportunity in Washington Court House. The Ranch of Opportunity opened its doors in the latter part of 2013. It is on a 22-acre site, a tranquil setting, a peaceful, spacious, and healthy environment for girls between 13 and 18 to help find healing and recovery during a residential program.

The ranch is a place of hope. As it says in its name, it is a ranch of opportunity, and a lot of the girls who spend time at the ranch have been victims of human trafficking and child abuse. In fact, I am told that the majority—roughly 60 to 80 percent—of the young girls who come through this program have been trafficked.

As I have talked to some of the girls and the staff there, of course, backpage.com comes up again and again, as it always does when I talk to survivors and victims of human trafficking. These types of crimes—sexual abuse and trafficking—are horrific, but they are happening. They are happening all over the country, and they are happening more and more. So in your community, wherever you live, sadly I will tell you that this is a problem. Part of it is because of these online traffickers. In other words, as many of the survivors of human trafficking have told me: ROB, this has moved from the street corner to the smartphone, and the smartphone is where backpage.com dominates.

In touring the State, I have heard over and over again about this specific link between drugs and human trafficking. I have talked to trafficking survivors who have told me that their trafficker first got them hooked on heroin and other drugs. I saw this firsthand in May, when I toured the Salvation Army of Greater Cleveland Harbor Light Complex. They have been operating in Cleveland for 65 years, providing incredibly important services to some of the most vulnerable members of society, including women who have been trafficked. It is important to know that link is there.

Both of those issues are so important to address—trafficking and what is happening in terms of the increasing heroin and prescription drug and fentanyl crisis in this country, which is now at epidemic levels. That is why the STOP Act is so important—the Synthetic Trafficking and Overdose Prevention Act, which we are trying to get passed here, as well as the Prescription Drug Monitoring Act, which is so important. There is a connection.

Human trafficking requires urgent action, and so does the opioid epidemic. On human trafficking, including sex trafficking, we are now told it is a

\$150 billion a year industry. Think about that. It is the second biggest criminal enterprise in the world behind the drug trade. Unfortunately, again, it is happening in all of our States.

Just last month, a 26-year-old man was indicted on human trafficking charges. He used backpage.com to advertise the availability of two girls, ages 15 and 17. He advertised them for sex and trafficked them out to several hotels in the area. Thankfully, in this case, members of the Central Ohio Human Trafficking Task Force rescued both of the victims, one in Columbus and one in Toledo.

Cases like this are alarming, but they are happening all over the place. At the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children, experts on this issue report an 846-percent increase in reports of suspected child sex trafficking from 2010 to 2015. That is an increase of more than 800 percent in 5 years. The organization found this spike to be “directly correlated to the increased use of the internet to sell children for sex.” Again, it is the dark side of the internet, and trafficking has now moved from the street corner to the cell phone.

To confront this problem, as chairman of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, along with my colleague and ranking member, Senator CLAIRE McCASKILL, now Senator TOM CARPER, I opened a bipartisan investigation into sex traffickers and their use of the internet. The investigation began over 2 years ago. The National Center for Missing & Exploited Children now says that nearly three-fourths—73 percent—of all suspected child sex trafficking reports it receives from the general public are linked to one website, backpage.com.

According to leading anti-trafficking organizations, including Shared Hope International, service providers working with child sex trafficking victims have reported that between 80 percent and 100 percent of their clients have been bought and sold on backpage.com. Backpage now operates in 97 countries—934 cities worldwide—and is valued at well over one-half billion dollars. According to an industry analysis, in 2013, \$8 of every \$10 spent on online commercial sex trafficking advertising in the United States goes to this one website, backpage.com.

As I said earlier, they say that they lead the industry in screening; in fact, their top lawyer described their screening process as a key tool for disrupting and eventually ending human trafficking. That is not true. Despite these boasts, the website and its owners have consistently refused to cooperate with our investigations on the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. With regard to our inquiries, despite subpoenas for company documents on how they screen advertisements, they have also refused to provide us documents after a subpoena. As a result, this body, the U.S. Senate, last year, for the first time in more than 20 years, voted to

pass a civil contempt citation—in other words, holding backpage.com in contempt and requiring them to supply these documents and come forward with this information or else face a lawsuit and potential criminal violations. Finally, last August, after going through the district court, the Circuit Court, all the way to the Supreme Court, we were able to get their request to appeal it rejected, and we were able to get the documents.

Over 1 million documents were eventually turned over, including emails and internal documents. We went through them all, and what we found was very troubling, to say the least. After reviewing the documents, the subcommittee published a staff report in January that conclusively showed that backpage is more deeply complicit in online, underage sex trafficking than anyone ever imagined. The report shows that backpage has knowingly covered up evidence by systematically deleting words and images suggestive of the illegal conduct, including child sex trafficking. The editing process sanitized the content of millions of advertisements in order to hide important evidence from law enforcement. I encourage people to take a look at this report. They can look at it on our website and other websites here from myself or Senator MCCASKILL.

Backpage CEO Carl Ferrer personally directed his employees to create an electronic filter to delete hundreds of words indicative of sex trafficking or prostitution from ads before they were published. In other words, they knew these ads were about selling girls, selling women online; yet they published them.

Again, this filter they used did not reject ads because of the obvious illegal activity. They edited the ads only to try to cover up the illegal activity. It didn't change what was advertised; it changed the way it was advertised. Backpage did nothing to stop this criminal activity. They facilitated it, knowingly.

What did they do? Well, afraid to erode their profits—they were afraid because, as Mr. Ferrer said, in his words, it would “piss off a lot” of customers. They began deleting words. Beginning in 2010, backpage automatically deleted words including “lolita,” referencing a 12-year-old girl in a book sold for sex, “teenage,” “rape,” “young,” “little girl,” “teen,” “fresh,” “innocent,” “school girl,” even “amber alert”—and then they published the edited versions of those ads on their website. They also systematically deleted dozens of words related to prostitution. This filter made these deletions before anyone at backpage even looked at the ad.

When law enforcement officials asked for more information about the suspicious ads, backpage had destroyed the original ad posted by the trafficker, so the evidence was gone. This notion that they were trying to help law enforcement flies in the face of the

fact that they actually destroyed the evidence that would have helped law enforcement.

We will never know for sure how many girls and women were victimized as a result of this activity. By backpage's own estimate, the company was editing 70 to 80 percent of the ads in their adult section by late 2010. Based on our best estimate, this means that backpage was editing more than one-half million ads a year—more than one-half million ads a year.

At a hearing on the report, the backpage CEO and other company officials pled the Fifth Amendment, invoking their right against self-incrimination rather than responding to questions we had about the report and its findings.

We also heard powerful testimony from parents whose children had been trafficked on backpage. One mother talked about seeing her missing daughter's photograph on backpage. She frantically called the company to tell them that it was her daughter—they finally found her—and to please take down the ad. Their response: Did you post the ad?

Her response: Of course I didn't post the ad. That's my daughter. Please take down the ad.

Their response: We can take it down only if you pay for the ad.

Talk about heartless.

Based on our report, it is clear that backpage actively facilitated sex trafficking taking place on its website in order to increase profits at the expense of vulnerable women and children. Then, after the fact, they covered up the evidence of these crimes.

What is happening to these kids is terrible. It is not just tragic. To me, it is evil.

No one is interested in shutting down legitimate commercial activity and speech. As I said earlier, the Communication Decency Act plays an important role, but we want to stop this criminal activity.

I see some of my colleagues are here to speak. I appreciate their allowing me to finish, but I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in reforming these laws to be able to protect these innocent victims, these children.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, before the chair of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations leaves, I also would like to put into the RECORD that, recently, in a raid that was performed in the Philippines, some very interesting documentation was seized about backpage, according to news reports, and the FBI was immediately called.

I think there is an opportunity to use that information to advance the investigation and to continue to expose the participation of backpage, not just as a billboard or as a want ad but as a knowing participant in the trafficking

of children—not just in our country but globally.

I thank the chairman.

FUTURE ACT

Mr. President, today I am joined by my colleagues from West Virginia and Rhode Island. We are kind of a motley group. We are talking about something that has brought us together with a level of excitement and bipartisanship. I would like to say that it is not just bipartisanship but really coming across the ideological barriers we frequently experience here to try and talk about an issue that is near and dear to our hearts, which is maintaining an opportunity for our coal miners and our coal industry to continue to do what they have done for generations—and that is to produce electricity that fuels this economy in the United States of America—but also recognizing that regulatory certainty is one of the key values we need to establish. In order to provide that certainty, we need to address concerns of other Members of our caucus who have in no small measure a lot of concern about what is happening with CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and what those emissions are doing environmentally.

I want to just kind of introduce this concept. Back in 2008, we passed something called 45Q, which was a provision that would allow for tax credits similar to what we have for wind and solar. Wind credits are production tax credits, and solar credits are investment tax credits. To provide for tax credits, \$10 and \$20—\$10 if you are injecting into a formation or you are enhancing oil recovery, \$20 if you are injecting into a geographic formation to store the carbons as CO<sub>2</sub>—those credits have proved to be, albeit used, but somewhat anemic to jump-start the technology, to jump-start the opportunity to see wholesale carbon sequestration.

We also know that since 2008, we have seen new technologies coming. I know my colleague from Rhode Island will talk about carbon utilization. We are expanding beyond just carbon sequestration—carbon capture and sequestration—to carbon utilization. It is a hugely important part of this puzzle. We believe that if we provide these tax incentives to our industries, if we provide these tax incentives to our innovators, it will drive technology that will have the benefit of guaranteeing that we will see a diverse fuel source in America that includes coal and includes natural gas. We always want to point that out, wherever we represent coal States. I know West Virginia is in proximity to huge natural gas fields. We know that we may be faced with a carbon challenge in natural gas, and the ability to capture CO<sub>2</sub> behind natural gas-fired power may be an essential ingredient for regulatory certainty into the future.

We are excited about this bill. We have 25 cosponsors who will advance and continue to talk about it and continue to grow colleague support. We hope this show of bipartisanship, this ability to work across the aisle, this



ability to come together—maybe not with the same motivations but certainly with the same goal—will prove that on one of the most contentious issues here, which is climate and coal, we can come together and actually get something done that we can all agree on.

With that, I yield the floor, and I defer to my colleague from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from North Dakota. She has been a champion of building this bipartisan coalition. When we announced this yesterday, we had a very large board that showed quite a broad array of groups from around the country that are very much in support of this concept. So, I thank Senator HEITKAMP for her great leadership.

It is terrific to be on the floor with Senator WHITEHOUSE. We both serve on the EPW Committee together, and many times we are totally opposite. Sometimes we feel as if we are on opposite planets, I think, but definitely on different sides of this issue. It is great to be on the same side of an issue such as this, which really helps fortify not just our country but our regions and our beliefs as well.

As Senator HEITKAMP said, we have 25 cosponsors. Some of them are utilities, environmental groups, oil and gas companies, Governors, labor unions, so it is a great array of the country interested in carbon capture utilization and storage. We have done a lot of research in this area, but we haven't been able to scale it up to a point where it is economically viable, and that is where I think the tax credits will be not just welcomed and used, but it will be very important to see that scalability—which we have seen coming in small bits and pieces—maybe come in much greater amounts.

We obviously have a very robust coal industry in the State of West Virginia. We have lost thousands of jobs. Senator WHITEHOUSE and I have talked about his stay in West Virginia. He has great empathy for the coal miner and for those families that have lost jobs, but he is very concerned, as I think we all are, about what it is doing to our environment and how can we improve this.

That is what this legislation, I think, will help do. It will spur domestic investment in the technologies. It will also help us, I think, bring energy security because it goes to the baseload fuels, whether it is coal or natural gas, that we have to have.

I mean, in Washington, DC, today, it is hot out there, and I can guarantee you there are a lot of air-conditioners that are running at maximum speed. If we do not have this baseload power, which is coal and natural gas in areas—and I see my fellow Senator from West Virginia. We know, in coal country, how important that is and also what smiles on people's faces these air-con-

ditioners can bring, as these hot days go, because we are running at full capacity.

We want to make sure that by capturing the carbon stream, we prevent any waste emissions and we provide a possible valuable resource for industry. I remarked yesterday for industry to extract oil, which is very important, obviously, to the Senator from North Dakota and also in our Marcellus shale region.

I believe that with this research and with the spurring of this technology, CO<sub>2</sub> is going to have another use out there. There are all kinds of utilization possibilities, but if we just turn our backs on it or try to shut it down and make it unviable financially to invest in these technologies, we are never going to find that next best use of CO<sub>2</sub>.

So we tweaked the bill a little bit. The Senators have had this bill out for at least a couple of years. There is a companion bill in the House with a lot of cosponsors as well. I think it has, with 25 cosponsors on the Senate floor, bipartisan but very different philosophical beliefs, maybe. Maybe that is not the best way to put it. There are very different regional approaches to this, I guess would be a better way to state that.

We have our universities, such as West Virginia University and Marshall University, that are working on this. We have the National Energy Technology Lab in Morgantown, where Secretary Perry joined both Senator MANCHIN and me to talk about the technologies that are in front of us and the challenge for researchers.

I feel like financing and the economic model is where we are trying to go, in order to spur investment, to provide the regulatory certainty but also the investment certainty in that this is a keeper; that this is something that is here to stay, that it is doable, that it is economically feasible, that it is scalable, and it provides us with a lot of energy security at the same time. I think its greatest benefit of all is to keep our air clean and get it cleaner and meet the challenges of the next several decades.

With that, I turn it over to the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, it is a great pleasure for me to be here with Senator HEITKAMP. We knew each other as attorneys general so I have admired the Senator from North Dakota for a long time. From my time in West Virginia, I remember Senator CAPITO's father who is a very formidable and renowned political personality in West Virginia. To be here with the two of them is a personal pleasure. Senator MANCHIN is also joining us, so I am very happy to be here.

I thank Senator HEITKAMP, Senator CAPITO, Chairman BARRASSO, and my friend Senator GRAHAM for leading this bipartisan effort, and I thank Senator MANCHIN for joining us on the floor.

We have more than 20 other cosponsors so this is a bill that has broad bipartisan support and has a great coalition behind it. It has everything from my great friends at the Natural Resources Defense Council, many of our friends in the AFL-CIO, to nonprofits like the Clean Air Task Force, to moderating groups like Third Way and the Center for Climate and Energy Solutions, which are trying to pick their way through the divide, industry groups like Wyoming's Cloud Peak Energy coal company and West Virginia's Peabody, a coal company, and the ethanol industry. So we have really good, broad support. It is an unusual coalition, and I am excited by it.

There are ways to remove carbon dioxide from the air and from emissions, and we are seeing a lot of it. I went with LINDSEY GRAHAM up to Saskatchewan to see the Boundary Dam facility, where they basically put the output of the coal-burning powerplant through a cloud of amino droplets that strip out the carbon dioxide and pump it to a nearby oilfield where they can use the carbon dioxide to pressurize the oilfield and facilitate the extraction of oil. That is made possible because they have an oilfield nearby that will pay for that carbon dioxide to use in order to extract the oil. If I remember correctly, they were getting close to \$30 per ton. That is a pretty real revenue stream, but a lot of our American coal facilities do not have the luxury of being next to an oilfield that will pay for the carbon so you have to look elsewhere for revenues to make it worth your while. What we have in America is a market failure in which there is nobody who will pay you for removing carbon pollution. The way our market is structured it just does not work.

The simplest approach, of course, would be to put a proper price on carbon and let the whole economy go to work in solving the problem of carbon pollution. Short of that, this bill takes an important step by putting a value on reducing carbon emissions by paying facilities with a tax credit for every ton of carbon emissions they can keep out of the atmosphere. If we can get this passed and if we can get this into the Tax Code so it is lasting, then investors can look at it and say: Hey, we can finally put some money behind these technologies, and we can get them going, not just in the power sector.

This reaches into industrial carbon capture, into technologies like carbon utilization, and into really exciting new technologies like direct air capture. Now, most of these are happening elsewhere. To look for the models, you have to go to Saskatchewan, like I did and like Senator HEITKAMP has done, or you have to go to Iceland, where they are pumping carbon dioxide down into geological structures where it reacts and becomes stone, or you have to go to Switzerland, where they are taking direct air carbon capture technologies, because, there, their market



is not broken so there actually is a return on this.

We are seeing good work at our National Labs, I will say, which is funded by Congress and people like Dr. Julio Friedmann, whom Senator HEITKAMP and I know and work with. We are doing exciting stuff. Yet to take it to a marketable level, there has to be a business strategy. You have to be able to make a business case to investors if you are going to put money behind building what could be a multi-hundred-million-dollar carbon capture plant. This will begin to do that, and it makes me very excited.

In particular, I thank my cosponsors for making sure we are not talking about CCS any longer and that we are talking about CCUS. It is not carbon capture and storage. It is carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration.

I have also been to Shenandoah, IA. Shenandoah, IA, has a big ethanol plant, and there is a company, called bioprocessH<sub>2</sub>O, that is in the exhaust stream of that ethanol plant. They pipe out their waste heat, their waste energy, their waste CO<sub>2</sub>, their wastewater all into a plant that grows algae, and the algae eats up the CO<sub>2</sub>. They take about 15 percent of it out of the stream, and it turns it into a product. They use it for feed, for cattle, for fish. They use it for makeup and other products. They use it for a whole variety of purposes. It is a new form of agriculture that is going to be very valuable, and the fact that you can make it efficient to strip carbon dioxide out of a plant's exhaust is a great thing.

This is a good way we can work together. It may be the first time I can think of that Senator McCONNELL and I have ever been on a bill together. He is not on it now in this particular iteration because neither he nor the Speaker want to get onto a bill that is a tax bill while they are looking at tax reform. Yet, clearly, we know where their hearts are from the fact that they were on it the last time. So there is a lot of welcomed political news around this, and I think it has the chance of really revving up American industry so it is not the Canadians and the Icelanders and the Swiss who are cleaning our clocks because we have not bothered to get our economic structure in order to make this a profitable undertaking. It is a great first step, and I am proud to be a part of it.

I yield to my friend, the Senator from West Virginia, JOE MANCHIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Rhode Island. I have been to his State, and we have gone to the algae farms. It has a lot of potential. I agree with the Senator 100 percent.

I applaud Senator HEITKAMP and Senator CAPITO for leading the effort to update and improve this tax credit for carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration. We have the support of 25 Democrats and Republicans—totally

bipartisan—and when you have Senator WHITEHOUSE and Senator BARRASSO on a bill, you know you have a real bill. It can happen. So that is very encouraging.

Senator CAPITO and I come from West Virginia, and Senator HEITKAMP comes from the energy-producing State of North Dakota. Coal was one of the most abundant energy sources in the world. It is lying on most continents, and most countries have it, and they are going to use it. It is a very efficient way of producing energy because it is plentiful.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Does the Senator know that, in Cumberland, RI, there used to be coal mining? In fact, there are still coal mines underground in New Cumberland, WV. Every once in a while, one collapses, so we have been there.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am so encouraged that you remember the history of your great State in not forgetting those coal mines.

We have to face the facts and the realization that there are 8 billion tons of coal being burned in the world on an annual basis. We burn less than 1 billion in the United States of America, and we are the country that has done more to clean up the environment than any other country. They all talk about doing different things, but we have taken the SO<sub>x</sub> and the NO<sub>x</sub> and the mercury out and the particulates. We have done more in the last two decades than has ever been done, and there is more that can be done.

I have to be very honest with you. The last 8 years was very challenging and difficult for us. No one wanted to make the effort. They talked a good game, but no one would put the investment into the technology that was needed. Now we have this bill—it is bipartisan that everybody is working hard on—that has a chance to really put us in the forefront of how we utilize this carbon capture and sequestration.

West Virginia has one of the first powerplants, the Mountaineer Power Plant, that shows it can be done commercially. We did a commercial test there. We know it can be done. We know it is expensive. At the time, President Obama said to go ahead and build a coal plant, and we will break you. He knew it was not financially feasible, and that is where that statement came from.

First of all, coal was a baseload fuel. There are only two baseload fuels in the world today. Baseload is 24/7 uninterrupted power. That is coal and nuclear. Gas has now replaced coal in the United States of America in its being more plentiful for the production of energy, which we depend on, but it still can be interruptible because the gas pipelines could be sabotaged. They could break, and weather conditions could change that.

So you have to make sure everything is working for the people of the United States of America who have always been used to and been dependent upon turning the switch on or their heat and their power or opening their fridge, and everything is working. It comes because you have baseload that is dependable, reliable, and affordable. You are going to have that.

I think, maybe in my grandchildren's lifetimes, they are going to see, maybe, commercial hydrogen, which will be water vapor. I think that is coming. It is just not here yet. So we are going to use what we have and what we need and make sure we do it in the cleanest fashion. The United States should be and will be the leader of this. This is what helps us do it, and it gives us incentive to move forward on it.

When we were doing scrubbers back in the eighties, the Clean Air Act, I will never forget, at the time, to do scrubbers that take sulfur out, you have to inject, basically, limestone. This crushed limestone, basically, clings to the sulfur, and the sulfur drops out in the form of the ash. What are you going to do with all of this by-product of this ash? Can it be detrimental? Is it hazardous? Guess what. A lot of the drywall you are using today is made out of the ash that came out of the new scrubbers from which we did not know we were going to have a by-product.

So there is value. I still believe in my heart, with this piece of legislation, that we are going to find a valuable use of this waste. Can it be solidified? We know we can take clear stream CO<sub>2</sub> off. Can we solidify this CO<sub>2</sub>? It would not just be sequestering it. We are doing it in liquid form now and pressuring it into the ground. If you have oil or some other energy that is valuable to return back, then you can offset the cost, but in a lot of parts of the country, we do not have that oil so we are not able to have a value returned. It is pure cost, and the cost is about one-third of the production. A perfect example: If you have a 900-megawatt powerplant and you have carbon capture sequestration, but you have no value in return, you lose 300 megawatts by pushing it into the ground. It makes it nonfeasible financially, and that is when the statement came, "You build it, and we will break it." That is how they break it. You cannot do it. So if we don't have to sequester it and pressure it in the ground when we solidify this clear stream carbon from liquids to solids, can we use the spent fuel of a solid carbon, CO<sub>2</sub>?

This is what we should be working on. These are the things we should be doing. We missed 8 years. We had a hiatus for 8 years. Let's catch up. This piece of legislation puts us on the path to make something happen, to truly make us unique in the world of what we do and how we do it. The rest of the world counts on us. All the other countries are talking about all the things they are doing in climate; trust me,

they are not. They are talking about it; they are not doing it. Even our NATO allies aren't using what we have already developed and perfected. They are not using scrubbers, and they are not using baghouses for mercury.

It is not CO<sub>2</sub> killing people in Beijing; it is basically particulates. It is particulates that we have taken out of the air. We can do this, but we need to work together. We can't be fighting each other. There is not a West Virginian I know who wants to breathe dirty air or drink dirty water—or an American—and they are not going to. We have improved and will continue to improve. But we can't be pitting one environmental group against another manufacturing or production group, and that is what we have done. We are just tearing each other apart because we are picking sides: Are you for the environment or are you for the economy? I am for both. I am for the environment, and I am for the economy, and I think there is a balance between the two.

If we do the technology and the manufacturers or the producers of electricity refuse to use the technology that is proven, then they should be shut down. They get a certain period of time to retrofit. If they will not do it, then shut them down.

We haven't gotten there yet on this, and that is why this piece of legislation is so important. All of the working groups and environmental groups—everybody should be behind this. We have an array of Senators who have come together, unlike most bills. We don't often have this happen. I am proud of what the Presiding Officer has done. I am proud of my good friend from North Dakota. I am proud of my friend from Rhode Island. I am proud of my friend from Wyoming. I am proud of everyone coming together and saying: If we are going to use it, let's do it better.

With that I say thank you—thank you to all of us for working together on this and for continuing to move the United States of America forward. West Virginia will do its part, I can assure my colleagues of that.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Madam President, one thing I want to talk about, as we are talking about carbon utilization—and Joe did a great job of talking about new technologies. Frequently when I talk about this topic people say: There is no such thing as clean coal. Coal cannot be a clean energy source. And I say: That is not true. I tell them about my personal experience with the largest carbon sequestration storage program in the country, up until some of the new developments, and that was Dakota Gas. I served on the board of directors of Dakota Gas, and, ironically, the carbon capture and transmission into an oil field was not done to respond to concerns globally about carbon; it was done to produce a sal-

able and lucrative byproduct—CO<sub>2</sub>—which can be used in the oil fields.

The one point I want to make is that a lot of the new development in exploration and in production of oil is done in tight formations, shale formations. This is not a technology, CO<sub>2</sub> flooding isn't a technology that has been widely used in tight formations because we haven't figured out how to do it.

I want to acknowledge one of those great American corporations, Occidental Petroleum, for doing something they call huff and puff, where they inject the CO<sub>2</sub>. They basically let that sit in the well and then eventually recharge the well. They are seeing excellent results in using this as an enhanced oil recovery method.

We are very excited about the bipartisan group. We are very excited that we can take one of the most contentious issues—one of the most contentious issues here on the floor—an issue for which, time after time, no one could find a path forward, and we have met with great success in getting good people to come together.

Finally, I want to say that it has been a joy to work with the junior Senator from West Virginia. I spend a lot of time with the senior Senator from West Virginia. The junior Senator from West Virginia, from my experience, is always looking for solutions to problems—not adding to the rancor, but looking for solutions to real problems. We have had a great partnership, and I look forward to our continued partnership in promoting and moving this issue forward.

With that, I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I wanted to say a few words about the new Republican healthcare plan that was just announced a few hours ago. While there are some modest changes in it, the truth of the matter is that this plan remains a disaster. It remains an embarrassment. I think the indication that it is an embarrassment is that with legislation that would impact about one-sixth of the American economy of over \$3 trillion a year—legislation that, because it is healthcare, impacts virtually everybody—there has not been one public hearing on this legislation. It has all been done behind closed doors. Honestly, no matter what one's view may be on where we as a Nation should go with healthcare, whether you like this bill or you don't like this bill, I just don't know how someone can seriously say that we don't have to hear from physicians about the impact of this legislation on their ability to treat their patients. I just don't know how you do that—or that we don't have to hear from hospitals.

I come from a rural State. What will the impact of this legislation and the massive \$800 billion cuts on Medicaid do to rural hospitals all over the United States? There is some belief that many rural hospitals in areas

where they are desperately needed will be forced to shut down. Is that the truth? That is what I hear, but I can't tell you definitively because there hasn't been a hearing on that issue. So I don't know how we go forward with legislation without having administrators from rural hospitals coming before the committee—I am on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee—or the Finance Committee to answer that question.

The Presiding Officer comes from a State and I come from a State where we have a major opioid crisis. It is devastating the entire country. What will this bill do to our ability to prevent and treat the opioid crisis, which is decimating this country from one end of America to the other? What happens if you cut \$800 billion in Medicaid? How will people get the treatment they need today—which is inadequate? In my State, it is inadequate. I don't think there is a State in the country that today is providing the necessary treatment or prevention capabilities to deal with this opioid and heroin crisis, which is ravaging America. What impact will an \$800 billion cut have on that? I understand there is some additional money going into opioid treatment, but how do you do that without the framework of allowing people the access to get healthcare? If you get thrown off of healthcare, what will the additional opioid money mean? I think not a whole lot.

In this bill, there are still hundreds of billions of dollars—several hundred billion dollars—in tax breaks to large health insurance companies, to drug companies, to medical device companies, and to tanning salons. As a nation, are we really interested in giving significant tax breaks to large insurance companies and then throwing children who have disabilities off of the Medicaid they currently receive? Is that what the American people want? I don't think they do.

I have to tell my colleagues that this Republican legislation, as the Presiding Officer knows, has been opposed by almost every major national healthcare organization in the country, including the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, the AARP, which is the largest senior group in America, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Pediatrics Association. Virtually all of the major healthcare groups are saying that this legislation would be a disaster for the people they serve.

Just last night we had a teleconference townhall in Vermont and we had some 15,000, 16,000 people on the phone. The calls that were coming in were very painful calls. I almost didn't want to be honest in answering the calls. A woman calls up and she says: My son has a very serious medical illness, and we spend a fortune on prescription drugs. What is going to happen if this bill passes? What was I going to tell her, that perhaps her son would die? It is just not something I feel comfortable even talking about.

The truth is—and this is not BERNIE SANDERS talking, this is study after study after study that says that if you do as they did in the House, which is throw 23 million people off of health insurance, including people who are struggling with cancer, people who are struggling with heart disease, people who are struggling with diabetes, what does common sense tell us? If you are struggling with cancer and you lose your health insurance, what do you think is going to happen to you?

What study after study has shown is that thousands of people will die. It is not that any Republican here wants to see anyone die, but that is the consequence of what happens when you throw, as the House bill did, 23 million people off of health insurance. We should not be giving tax breaks to insurance companies and then throwing disabled children, or people with terrible illnesses who are fighting for their lives, off of health insurance.

The AARP is very strongly opposed to this legislation. The reason is pretty clear. What every person in America should understand, and I am not sure that many do, is that Medicaid now pays for over two-thirds of all nursing home care—two-thirds. What happens to the seniors and persons with disabilities who have their nursing home coverage paid for by Medicaid today? What is going to happen to those people?

What happens if your mom is in a nursing home? You don't have a lot of money, and your mom is in a nursing home paid for by Medicaid. What happens if Medicaid is slashed? What is going to happen to your mom? Is she going to be thrown out on the street or end up in the basement of your house? Are you going to have to make the choice about whether you take care of her or put away a few bucks to send your kid to college? If suddenly a daughter or a son is going to have to care for a mom or a dad thrown out of a nursing home, how do they go to work to earn the money their families need?

These are legitimate questions, and it would have been nice to have a hearing or two in order to answer those questions.

The bottom line is that we have legislation before us that is widely rejected by the American people. The last poll that I saw, which was done by USA Today, suggested that 12 percent of the American people supported this legislation—12 percent. Virtually every major healthcare organization in America opposes this legislation. There is nothing I have seen today—none of the tweaks that have been put into this make this legislation in any way, shape, or form acceptable.

It is no great secret that the Affordable Care Act is far from perfect. I don't think you hear anybody here say: Hey, the ACA is great; it doesn't need any changes. It does need changes. Deductibles are far too high in Vermont. Premiums are too high. Copayments are too high. And the cost of

prescription drugs in Vermont and all over this country is off the charts.

I was in West Virginia, and I talked to a woman for a moment after I spoke, and she said that she is taking care of her older brother. Her brother has seizures. The medicine her brother was using went up by 900 percent over the last few years. Why? Because that is what the drug companies can get away with. Tomorrow it may be 1,000 percent. Does anybody in America think that makes sense? Is anybody happy in America? Are people in Missouri happy, are people in West Virginia and people in Vermont happy that we are paying by far the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs? I don't think so. There are ideas out there about how we can significantly lower the costs of prescription drugs in this country, how we can lower deductibles, how we can lower copayments.

Now, as I have said many, many times, I happen to believe that while it is important that we improve the Affordable Care Act, at the end of the day, this country must do what every other major country on Earth does, and that is to understand that healthcare is a right, not a privilege.

Right now, we have 28 million people who have zero health insurance. If this bill in the House were to go through, there would be another 23 million on top of the 28—over 50 million people—without any health insurance. Does that make any sense to anybody?

Our job is to join the rest of the industrialized world and make sure that every man, woman, and child has healthcare as a right, no matter what your income is. When you get sick, you go to the doctor. When you have to go to the hospital, you don't go bankrupt. That is what a civilized democracy is about. That is what they do in Canada. That is what they do in the UK, France, Germany, Scandinavia, and Holland. Every major country on Earth guarantees healthcare to all people. That is where I want to see our country go, and I will be introducing legislation to make sure that happens.

More and more people all over this country want to move us in that direction. But right now, our job is to make sure that millions of people do not lose their health insurance in order to give tax breaks to insurance companies. Our job is to make sure that disabled children continue to get the care they need and older folks aren't thrown out of nursing homes. That is what we have to do.

So I urge in the strongest possible way the defeat of this legislation. Then, let's go forward to improve the Affordable Care Act, not destroy it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

#### NOMINATIONS

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, it has been nearly 7 months since President Trump took office. He was sworn in on the steps of the Capitol on January 20.

Our colleagues across the aisle have had, frankly, more than enough time

to come to terms with the election results. Unfortunately, they seem to be channeling their disappointment through the confirmation process by engaging in an unprecedented level of obstruction.

We spent all this week when the Senate could do no other business on the executive calendar than to confirm three nominees—three nominees of about 500 that need to be appointed by the President. They are there only because the President would want them there. They come and go as Presidents come and go. Many of them have gone. The problem is that their replacements haven't been there.

If there is any doubt as to just how unprecedented this drawn-out confirmation process has been, let's look at how it stacks up against the previous administration. We are only a couple of weeks away from August, and Senate Democrats have only allowed us to confirm 52 of President Trump's 216 nominees. That is 24 percent. By the August recess of President Obama's first term, the Senate had confirmed 313 of his 454 nominations, or 69 percent.

So we start out with an incredibly slow start, where previous administrations—both the Bush administration and the Obama administration—by the end of the first week, or often by the end of the first day, had most of their Cabinet confirmed.

Getting a Cabinet confirmed is a process that took every minute of time that the Senate rules could possibly be stretched to allow.

Then, we look at nominations. The President, as I said, has nominated 216 people. Less than one out of four of them have been confirmed. In President Obama's term, even though he had more nominees by this time, he had a lot more confirmations. The Senate confirmed 69 percent of the Obama nominees.

There are currently more than 150 nominations waiting for confirmation, many of them are already out of committee. They are ready to come to the floor, but Senate Democrats have caused this backlog by using every procedural tactic to needlessly delay nominees. But, when they delay the nominees, they also delay our ability to get to the other work.

So there are two questions here. Are you going to let the President take over the government, which the Constitution and the Senate have been an active part of? Are you going to get the other work done? If you don't let the President take over the government, how do you effectively get the other work done? It is really a plan that works really well if what you want to do is slow down any changes of where the government was on January 20.

A Wall Street Journal editorial earlier this week said:

Democratic obstruction against nominees is nearly total, most notably including a demand for cloture filings for every nominee—no matter how minor the position. This

means a two-day waiting period, and then another 30 hours of debate. The 30-hour rule means Mr. Trump might not be able to fill all of those 400 positions in four years.

In fact, at the rate we are going, it will take more than 11 years to fill all the jobs that the President is supposed to be able to fill. I guess that would put us in the third term of the Trump Presidency before he ever got every job filled the first time, which the President is expected to fill under the laws that have been there, most of them for a long time.

The Wall Street Journal editorial talks about these difficult terms, like cloture. What does that mean? That means that you have to get a vote to move forward with the nomination—normally, not done where nominations are concerned.

There is a rule that allows you to have vigorous debate on any nominee who really is a problem, but that rule has clearly been abused. Now the cloture vote only takes 51 votes. This is no odd Senate majority or anything like that. A majority of the Senators can vote to move forward with the nominee. But then, if you will not consent to waive any of the other rules, you have to wait 2 days before you can get to that. You can't do anything else during those 2 days. Then you have to have 30 hours of debate.

That has happened over and over. As a matter of fact, this happened 30 times. That sounded like about 5 days to me, certainly 3½ days. That whole process has happened 30 times, only to have many of these nominees get 90 or more votes, to have no debate on the floor about the nominee for whom you are supposed to be insisting on 30 hours of debate and to come to the floor and talk about whatever else you want to talk about. But if you go back and view the tape on whatever has happened during these confirmations, you will find very little discussion of the 30 times that 30 hours of debate was supposedly required before we could get to a final vote. Then, often, in the final vote, in a bipartisan effort to find nominees who are willing to serve, they get more than 90 votes. That just has never happened before.

By the first August recess in his administration, President Obama only had eight cloture votes. So what has happened here 30 times under President Trump happened 8 times under President Obama. Three percent of the nominees confirmed under President Obama had a cloture vote between swearing in and August, but 60 percent of the nominees from President Trump have had a cloture vote, but about the same amount of real debate. If we look back at what happened in 2009, the hours of actual debate on nominees were about the same, but the use of the maximum abuse of the rules is different.

Let me say this. The rules of the Senate were designed to protect the minority, and that is a good thing. This is a unique body in a democratic country,

where the minority has been traditionally protected, and that protection lasts until the minority begins to abuse it. There will be a point here pretty quickly where I think Senators are going to have to wonder if this rule is any longer a rule that should be sustained.

We cannot continue to do what we are doing. We don't have 11 years and 4 months to confirm the Trump nominees. Nobody would want the President to have—well, maybe not anybody—an 11-year and 4-month term. But our friends on the other side are acting like that is how long he has to get just this rudimentary part of this job done that largely should have been done in the first 6 months.

Only 10 percent of the President's nominees' confirmations have been done by a voice vote. That is another alternative—just bring the nominee, nobody objects to waiving the rules, and you have a voice vote.

Ten percent of President Trump's confirmations have been done by voice vote while more than 90 percent of President Obama's confirmations were done by a voice vote. So we have the same percentages there, just totally turned around—10 percent for Trump and 90 percent for President Obama. The contrast is striking. It is not just simply math. It is, again, about the key positions of government that aren't filled.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I hear all the time that our country faces more threats from more directions than at any time in our history. But we have only been allowed by this strung-out process, insisted on by Senate Democrats, to confirm 6 of the President's 22 nominees for the Department of Defense. The Department of Defense has 22 nominees already made, and only 6 of them are over there doing the jobs, of which the President says: Here are the 22 people I would like to have, and there will be more names to follow.

The positions that haven't been confirmed are the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the next job in the Defense Department and the principal deputy under the Secretary of Defense; and the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

I don't know about everybody else. I was a little confused by how long these titles are. But if you look at what each of these people do, these are critical to the mission of defending the country and they haven't been filled. These are positions that need to be filled.

The President continues to work to improve the safety of our communities and enforce our Nation's laws. We have seen obstruction when it comes to the Justice Department and the 19 people who have been willing to serve—all of whom I think are out of committee or about to be out of committee.

If one of them is out of committee, that would be enough. But the President has nominated 19 people to fill these vacancies, and only 3 nominees have been confirmed. Two of the nomi-

nees who have been reported out of the committee received votes of 20 to 0 and 19 to 1. We would think that is somebody who could come to the floor with a likely voice vote.

My bet is that when they do get voted on, 98 Senators will vote for them. But if we continue to do what we are doing now, only 2 days after a cloture vote, 2 days after the vote, and then almost a day and a half of debate after that, it is a disservice to the people that elected us to do these jobs and even a greater disservice to the people who elected the President to do his job.

Once again, these are key positions in Justice—the Solicitor General of the United States, the principal person who argues in court for the United States of America—and it is the middle of July.

My colleagues from across the aisle have clearly decided that it is in their best political interests to stand in the way of the President's nominees, but, maybe, more importantly, to stand in the way of the Senate's ability to get its job done.

When I talked to Missourians, they want to know what we are doing and why we can't get the work done that they sent us here to do. They also want to know why we can't let the President do the job he was sent here to do.

We need to be working on the failures of the current healthcare system, how we make college more affordable, and what we can do to improve our infrastructure. Those are things we need to get to, and we need to allow the President to put his government in place for that to happen.

He was sworn in 7 months ago. He has every right to put the government in place. It is time for our friends across the aisle to stop grandstanding, to stop standing in the way. It is time to stop debating the Presidential election, and it is time to start debating the issues of how to run the government and to let the President put his people in those jobs so that process can begin.

Mr. President, I see my friend from Wisconsin is here. I will conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

(The remarks of Mr. JOHNSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1553 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

REMEMBERING GENE ZERKEL

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, as you know, for months now, I have been

coming to the floor to recognize a special Alaskan, somebody who makes my great State a better place for all of us to live, someone we call the Alaskan of the Week, usually an unsung hero who has done great things but doesn't want anyone to tell you about it because they are humble people. Some of these people have been very well known throughout the State, and others, as I mentioned, are doing their jobs in different communities throughout the State, but they are all considered our Alaskans of the Week. Unsung, well known—they all share a love for Alaska for good reason: There is so much to love about our great State.

I know most of the people in this room and watching on TV and in the Gallery think of Alaska as a majestic place, majestic landscape. It is true. It is majestic, but it is truly the people of Alaska who make it such a special place, kind and generous people, patriots and pioneers who pave the way for the rest of us and leave a very indelible and important mark on my State and, in many cases, our country.

Today, I would like to recognize one of these very special Alaskans, a trailblazer, someone whose work has touched nearly every corner of the State, someone whom we recently lost, unfortunately, just this week, but his memory will last forever. I am talking about Gene Zerkel, who was a member of the "greatest generation" and an aviation legend in the great State of Alaska.

I don't have to remind you, but many others throughout our country don't know just how important aviation is to Alaska. In my State, our skies are the highways and the roads. We have about 8,000 general aviation pilots in Alaska, which is more than any other State per capita by far, and with good reason: There are no roads and ferry services to over 100 communities in Alaska, including regional centers like Bethel, Nome, Barrow, and Kotzebue. That means everything from mail services to baby diapers has to be flown in by plane, and if someone gets sick and needs to go to a hospital, the only way they get to see a doctor is by a plane.

Our pilots and our airline industry are essential to serving the people of Alaska, and Gene Zerkel has been a part of that service, a legendary part of Alaska aviation, for decades.

Let me tell you a little bit about Gene. He lived life on his own terms and defined it through love of God, family, country, and aviation. The latter—his passion for aviation—took hold when he was just 3 years old, then living in Indiana when he took his first airplane ride with a barnstormer. He was so taken with it, when he grew up, he continued to do some of those kinds of flights, traveling in airshows.

Like so many in the "greatest generation" in our Nation, he enlisted in the Army Air Corps during World War II and later joined the U.S. Air Force. He continued his passion for aviation after he left the military. Some of his

favorite adventures were flying during the construction of the DEWLine throughout Alaska and Canada in the 1950s.

In 1973, he fulfilled a lifelong dream so many people in America have, which was to come to Alaska and start a family. He started to fly in the great skies above Alaska. We are a better State and a safer State for it.

In Alaska, he owned and operated Great Northern Airlines and became senior VP of operations and maintenance for the legendary MarkAir. He also started Alaska Aircraft Sales and Maintenance, which still operates to this day on Lake Hood in Anchorage, AK.

He was an innovator. He transformed the de Havilland DHC-2 Beaver into what was known as the Alaska Magnum Beaver, and he was known for always putting safety first.

In 2007, Gene was awarded the Wright Brothers Master Pilot Award from the U.S. Department of Transportation and the FAA in recognition of his more than 50 years—half a century—of promoting aviation safety within the aviation industry, particularly in Alaska.

Gene lived for 90 years. He saw so much and did so much for many of us. His name is written above the skies of Alaska. But most importantly, he was a devoted husband of 48 years to his wife Joyce and the faithful father of nine children.

I had the good fortune of calling Gene a friend and was able to visit with him a few weeks ago. At 90 years old, he was still full of life and spark and energy and passion and optimism. I have also been in touch recently with one of his sons, a young Alaskan hero, Keenan, who has his father's passion for serving our country, with many deployments to Afghanistan as part of the 210th Rescue Squadron of the Alaska Air National Guard. He is literally a true hero in my State. Keenan carries on his father's passion for aviation, Alaska, and serving in the military.

Gene's love of country, family, and aviation will always be with us. My wife Julie and I pray for his family and his friends during this time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### HEALTHCARE LEGISLATION

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I rise to speak to the repeal and replace effort that is before us, and the challenge has been how to do so. Senator MCCONNELL has recently introduced a bill, and as we pore over it, there is much to like, but quite likely, there will be some Senators who will still express reservations as to whether this amendment adequately fulfills President

Trump's campaign pledges—those pledges specifically to continue coverage, care for those with preexisting conditions, eliminate mandates, and lower premiums.

If more is required, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I have actually come up with an amendment that we will add to the bill being offered. It doesn't replace it but, rather, it adds to it. In it, we return to conservative solutions that devolve power back to States and rely upon the States to, in turn, devolve power to the patient.

So what does this bill do? What we do basically is take the dollars that the Federal Government would give to a State under ObamaCare and we give those same dollars in the form of a block grant. We allow the State to then administer the money in its best way to, one, give patients the power, and two, fulfill President Trump's pledges.

We think this works. It is a 10th Amendment solution in which that which is not specifically given to the Federal Government is, in turn, given to the State. Let the States decide what they want to do. Some object. They say: Oh my gosh. A conservative State may do something that we don't think—whoever is speaking—it should be allowed to do. Another might say: Well, I don't think a liberal State should be allowed to do that. Under our bill, we devolve to the State, so a blue State can do a blue thing and a red State can do a red thing. Let's let our States be the laboratories of democracy that teach each other the best way in which to insure others. But we say it will be the State that has the power and not the Federal Government.

If you oppose this approach, it means you would trust a Washington bureaucrat more to address the needs of your State than you would trust the people of your own State.

We would still have those protections which would allow folks to get the adequate coverage they need. There would still be—for example, preexisting conditions will be covered, fulfilling President Trump's pledge to that end. We would fulfill what I call the Jimmy Kimmel test—that everybody who is ill or has a loved one who is ill would have adequate resources to have that person's illness addressed.

We have a precedent as to how this is done. Congress, I am told, when it addressed the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program, gave the dollars necessary, with flexibility to the States. Although at the time the solution was criticized as giving too much money to the States, since the Federal Government has not had to put in more money. Because of the flexibility, the States have been able to use the dollars allocated in such a way as to meet the needs of the population.

So what could a State do with these dollars?

It could help those patients who are at higher risk or higher cost purchase

the coverage they need, perhaps in a reinsurance or in an invisible high-risk pool that would allow premiums to be lowered for those individuals and for all.

It could maintain status quo. Those folks getting tax credits instead could have these dollars fund their purchase of insurance. It could be used together with Senator CRUZ's amendment, which would allow a health savings account to be used to purchase health insurance. The individual could set up such an account, the State could fund it, and then these dollars could then be used to purchase insurance. I like that, personally. That particular provision was in the Cassidy-Collins bill, the Patient Freedom Act, and it dovetails very nicely with block-granting these dollars back to the States to care for someone.

It could directly contract with providers to provide assistance to a specific population. So imagine you have an Indian reservation—or if not an Indian reservation, which might be covered under another source of funding, another fairly isolated population that does not have access to healthcare, the State could say: OK, we are going to come in and provide providers specifically for that population.

Alaska may adopt this because they have 700,000 people stretched over a land mass almost as big as the lower 48, and that might be a solution Alaska comes up with, but the point being, the solution would be specific for that State. Unlike ObamaCare, in which, out of Washington, DC, Washington bureaucrats dictate that the same approach be taken across the Nation no matter how different the States are, in this, the money is given to the State, and the State is asked to provide for their citizens in a way specific for the needs of that State.

We think the Graham-Cassidy amendment returning power to States and to patients is a conservative solution which ultimately gives the patient more power. I will repeat. This does not replace that bill which is being offered by Senator MCCONNELL. It would be an amendment to that. And if it turns out that some Senators feel as if that particular bill is not adequate to fulfill President Trump's campaign promises, we think this amendment could take the bill the rest of the way.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. CANTWELL. Thank you, Mr. President.

I know my Republican colleagues are working on versions of the healthcare bill they have been talking about today, and I know my colleagues are

going to try to say they are protecting the sickest of Americans, and they are saying they do want to ensure that people with preexisting conditions don't have to pay through the nose when they need care. I think the President called the House version of this attempt a mean bill, and I think the original Senate bill was just as mean, if not meaner, with the number of people who would be cut off of Medicaid over a period of time and left without access to care.

Today's bill also includes an amendment or a package of ideas by my colleagues from Texas and Utah—a provision that allows insurers to sell junk insurance on the individual health insurance market. As long as they offer at least one plan that is real insurance, insurers could offer a bunch of plans that, as CBO has said, are not really insurance; that is, they just cover one or two things. Yes, they would be cheaper, but if CBO doesn't consider these types of plans insurance, how are they insurance?

I think the whole notion of junk insurance being invested into this bill is very problematic. Under junk insurance plans, they can limit or deny coverage of essential benefits, including hospitalization, maternity care, preventive care, prescription drugs, laboratory care, and substance abuse treatment. That is what they can limit. We wouldn't want those limited. This is why CBO says that if you can't go to the hospital and get care, then it is not really insurance. I have to agree with them on that.

These plans could charge people more or simply deny them based on pre-existing conditions, and these plans could pay out less than 60 percent of the healthcare expenses, leaving the beneficiary with unbelievable, insurmountable deductibles that would be hard to pay. These plans could also impose an annual or lifetime cap on insurance.

I had a young woman come to my office today who was treated at Seattle Children's Hospital in our State. This family actually lives in a neighboring State, but Seattle Children's Hospital is such a regional entity in the State of Washington, in Seattle, and we are so proud of that. They told me about the debilitating disease this young child was born with and how many surgeries she has had. Literally, with the brain treatments she has had to receive, she and her mother told me that if there had ever been any lifetime caps, they would have exhausted them in the first few years. I am so proud that she came to see us today and is continuing to talk about why capping healthcare plans would be so devastating to somebody like her.

We don't want to create two markets of insurance. We don't want the one that is the real plan, real insurance, and the one where everybody goes and buys insurance that even CBO says is not real insurance.

I know that probably in the last few days of discussion, people have said:

Ok, we will put a bunch of money in to help the real, or regulated market. I talked to my insurance commissioner in the State of Washington, and he said: Listen, when you don't spread out risk, you are not going to have a market and you are going to create problems.

So the notion that you think that catastrophic out-of-pocket costs won't be borne by these individual patients, I think, is wrong or that these higher premiums and deductibles could be paid by these individuals. It turns out that these junk plans, as I said, do not even count as insurance, and everybody who is in the real insurance market would then end up having to pay more.

The bill explicitly states that non-compliant plans will not count as creditable coverage for the purpose of individuals demonstrating that they have insurance.

I am checking with my staff.

Is that right? Is that what is in the proposal?

Yes. The bill explicitly states that noncompliance plans will not count as credible coverage for the purpose of individuals demonstrating that they have insurance.

Under this bill, if someone gets one of those junk plans—if somehow you see that marketed and you buy into it because you think it is cheap and you think it is the greatest thing ever—and then you try to enroll in a comprehensive plan, there is a good chance that you will get a lockout period of 6 months before you can get coverage.

Why am I here talking about this? Because the State of Washington tried this. We tried this approach in the 1990s. After our State had passed a major healthcare reform bill in the 1990s, a group of State legislators allowed these junk plans to be sold along with compliant plans. Guess what happened? Nearly all of the insurers in our State pulled out of the individual insurance market, and a death spiral ensued. Why? Because the cost then of that individual market was so high and so great that they could not service it.

They said: Oh my gosh, if I have to offer a compliant plan along with this junk insurance, I cannot make the compliant plan work because it costs so much. We are not staying.

This very important experience taught us that that is not the way for us to spread risk.

I am concerned—and I have heard from a number of patient advocacy groups, not just the young woman from Seattle Children's Hospital who came to see me today but consumer groups and health insurers themselves, like America's Health Insurance Plans, Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, AARP, American Cancer Society's Cancer Action Network, American Diabetes Association, American Heart and Lung Association, Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, March of Dimes, National MS Society, National Health Council, and the National Coalition for Women



with Heart Disease. All of these organizations do not like this idea of junk insurance, of saying you can have a compliant plan that is real insurance and a marketplace in which there are things that are not really insurance, because then people are going to go buy a bunch of things that are not really insurance and then not have the ability to get cost and care and run up uncompensated care. Then you are going to make the real market unsustainable and unresponsive, and the rates are going to go so high that people are just going to pull out.

A group of 10 of those leading patient advocacy groups wrote:

Under the amendment, insurance companies would be allowed to charge higher premiums to people based on their health status—in addition to opting out of other patient protections in current law, such as the guarantee of essential health benefits—

Those are the things I was going over a few minutes ago—

and the prohibition on annual and lifetime coverage caps.

They go on to write:

Separating healthy enrollees from those with preexisting conditions will also lead to severe instability of the insurance market. This is unacceptable for our patients.

Yesterday, America's Health Insurance Plans wrote:

Allowing health insurance products governed by different rules and standards would further destabilize the individual market and increase costs for those with preexisting conditions.

That is the largest health insurance group in the country, and they are writing this.

If they are telling us in advance that this is going to really destabilize the market and cause problems, we should listen because right now what we have had is an expansion of Medicaid and covering more people, raising the GDP and helping areas of our States and country and creating more stability.

We have had some challenges in the individual market. We should fix that. We should definitely drive down the cost of the delivery system by continuing to improve it. But the notion that this is the fix for the individual market when the providers are telling us it is going to destabilize the market and drive us out—we should understand what the result of that is going to be.

Yesterday, the Blue Cross Blue Shield Association wrote:

The result (of Cruz/Lee) would be higher premiums, increased Federal tax credit costs for coverage available on the exchanges, and insurers exiting the market or pricing coverage out of reach of consumers.

I believe our goals should be trying to drive down the cost of insurance. We have lots of ideas about that, and I want to work with our colleagues on that, but I am very concerned that this approach to try to get people supporting a Senate proposal is the wrong approach and will drive people out of the market.

I think the bill is still a war on Medicaid. The bill still permanently cuts

and caps the Medicaid Program. I have said numerous times that we saved \$2 billion in the State of Washington by rebalancing people off of nursing home care and on to community-based care. It is a great concept. Look, we have a lot of people who are going to live longer. We have baby boomers who are reaching retirement. The number of people who are going to demand services, whether from Medicaid or Medicare, is going to be increased just because of the population bubble. We should be doing things to drive down the costs of care.

There are great ideas, and I was able to get some of those in the bill. We ended up passing those things, and some States are actually working on that. More than 15 States are actually working on that concept of rebalancing to community-based care and making long-term care more affordable under this provision. I guarantee you that we have to do that, but if you permanently cap or cut Medicaid, you are going to have veterans who use access to Medicaid for care who are not going to get care. You are going to get people who need opioid treatment.

I find it interesting that we would have this program over here. I see that my colleague from Michigan is on the floor. We call it the Saginaw Health Clinic.

One would say: OK, Saginaw Health Clinic, there is a bunch of money in this bill. Apply for opioid help.

They would say: OK. We are going to get \$10 million.

When you walk in the door of the opioid Saginaw Health Clinic, the first thing they will ask is if you are on Medicaid. If you are not on Medicaid, you are not going to get any opioid help.

So the notion that we would cut people off of Medicaid but put more money in the opioid problem is not what we need to do to solve our challenge. What we need to do is make sure we are delivering the most cost-effective care as possible and make sure people are getting access to care.

That is why I have been all over the State of Washington. I have met so many people. I have met people at healthcare facilities who have told me that some of their highest costs were from a patient who continually came to see them in the emergency room, maybe 30 times a year, because he did not have coverage, so he drove up the cost for everybody. They said they finally got this person on the Medicaid expansion. Guess what. They do not have those costs anymore in their hospitals and facilities. It has driven down the costs.

I do not want to see people kicked off of Medicaid. I do not want to see it cut in a declining budget. I want us to improve Medicaid and make it more cost-effective and more utilized and supported.

Estimates by the CBO of the original Senate bill are that the Medicaid cut would be \$772 billion over the next dec-

ade and that the Federal investment would be cut by 35 percent within the next two decades, relative to current law projections. That is a lot of consequence for the Medicaid population. I think that is why we have so many groups and organizations here that are anxious about this proposal and where we go. We definitely want to talk to our colleagues.

One former CBO Director said, the junk insurance idea is "a recipe for a meltdown." This is someone who served in past Republican administrations, and I take his word seriously.

I think what we need to do is work together to make sure we get a program that addresses our most fundamental issues—the challenges in the individual market, keep addressing how we keep and stabilize a population on the most affordable rates there are, and keep the things we know have worked very well, like the Medicaid expansion. It has worked. It has supported people, and it has helped us stabilize the market.

I will remind my colleagues, too, that the State of New York took one provision of the Affordable Care Act and has 650,000 people in New York on a very, very affordable insurance plan. We think that if you are an individual in the individual market, you should be able to get the same clout as somebody who works for a large employer. You should be able to go in and buy in bulk as a class, as a group of people, and when you buy in bulk, you should get a discount. That is what we think will help us in the individual market to drive down these costs for what is about 7 percent of the marketplace.

I urge my colleagues to reject this latest proposal. Let's get serious about fixing the things that we know we can fix and improve upon, but for the over 22 million Americans who are very nervous about this proposal because they know they are going to get cut off of care, let's not do that to them. Let's improve where we need to go in affordability in the healthcare arena and not think that a junk insurance program or cutting people off is the solution for the future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I want to thank my friend from Washington State, who has been such a leader on healthcare.

In looking at her chart, at the junk insurance amendment and all of the groups opposing it, it reminds me of the calls I used to get prior to the Affordable Care Act from someone who was healthy and young and had a policy for years that was only \$50 a month. He thought it was great. Then, all of a sudden, he got sick or his child got sick.

He called me up and said: I paid into insurance all of these years, and they only covered 1 day in the hospital.



I remember having that conversation with somebody—or no days in the hospital. That is what you call a junk insurance plan.

This latest version of the healthcare bill would allow that to come back so that somebody will have the false confidence in paying \$30, \$40, \$50 a month and thinking he has insurance. Then, if something happens, he will find out it is just a bunch of junk and that it does not cover anything. That is going to be legal again. Right now, it is not legal to do that. With health reform, we stopped that. But that would be legal again under this proposal, and I am deeply concerned about that.

I am obviously rising to talk about the Republican healthcare bill. I do not believe it is a healthcare bill, but that is what we are debating, is healthcare or whether healthcare will be taken away. What I would rather be doing is working with my friend who is in the chair on lowering the cost of prescription drugs. We have worked on many things together—mental health and addiction services. I would rather be doing that than debating what we are debating. I would rather be focused on how we lower the cost of prescription drugs, which is the cost I hear about the most from my constituents, or about other out-of-pocket costs for people who are in the private insurance system, the individual insurance market.

We do have situations in which copays and deductibles are too high in the private insurance market. Gutting Medicaid will do nothing about that—nothing. It will just take away healthcare from tens of millions of people. It will not change the private insurance market at all, which is where I believe we need to focus, and I am anxious to do that and work across the aisle in order to do that.

I want to make sure we are talking about building on healthcare coverage, lowering costs, and tackling prescription drug costs. Instead, this bill would take away healthcare from millions of Americans. We know that from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office. We don't know yet how many millions under the current version, but we know that at some point, we will get a score on that from the Budget Office. We know it will be a lot of people who are going to lose their insurance, and they don't need to lose their insurance in order to tackle bringing down the cost of insurance.

So what do we know about this proposal? The versions keep changing, but it is the same old song over and over again—a little bit of change, a little bit of different refrain, but it is the same old song in the end. What we know is that doctors don't like it and nurses don't like it, hospitals don't like it, insurance companies don't like it.

People in Michigan don't like it. They have called and written and told me in person, people approaching me in Fourth of July parades. People are scared. They are concerned. A woman's

mom is in a nursing home who has Alzheimer's disease, and she is panicked. Three out of five seniors in nursing homes in Michigan are there with the help of Medicaid health insurance. Others are deeply concerned about their family members, their children, themselves.

This is called the Better Care Act, but there is nothing better about it. Democrats have ideas to actually make our healthcare system better, by stabilizing our insurance markets and making premiums more affordable. My friend Senator SHAHEEN of New Hampshire introduced the Marketplace Certainty Act. It would ensure cost-sharing payments that were part of healthcare reform, that they would actually remain in a stabilizing way so they could be counted on. This would offer peace of mind to families and stability to the market.

Senators CARPER, KAINE, NELSON, and SHAHEEN introduced the Individual Health Insurance Marketplace Improvement Act, which would create a permanent reinsurance program, which we had before—before it was changed 2 years ago—to stabilize the market and bring down premiums.

There have been things that would happen to destabilize the markets. Two years ago, there was an action, and now with a new administration we need to stop that and reverse it and stabilize the markets.

Senator HEITKAMP has a proposal that helps more families afford health insurance by smoothing out the individual market tax credit cliff that is there—the tax credits that help low-income, moderate-income people be able to afford insurance—to fix that in a way that is more beneficial to families.

Senator MCCASKILL's Health Care Options for All Act would allow people who live in a county without an insurer on the exchange—they don't have anybody in the private individual marketplace exchange, no insurance company—to sign up for the same exchange plans we have. There are people being covered. We hear a lot about Iowa, for instance. Even though there may be no private insurance companies doing a private marketplace option, Senators, Representatives, our staffs who are required to be in, as they say, ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act, have an exchange. So to help people immediately, we could allow the people of Iowa to get the same option that their Members of Congress in Iowa have and that their staffs have. That would be possible, as a way to address this issue in the short run and to help people. I don't know why somebody who is in Iowa or Michigan or anyplace else shouldn't be able to get the exact same coverage a Member of Congress can get.

Here is what we do know in terms of the ideas in the bill. Our Republican colleagues know how unpopular the bill is. A new poll found that only 12 percent—12 percent—of Americans support this bill. It is so unpopular they have

been trying to rewrite it and get enough votes to pass it. We keep hearing about changes, but unfortunately none of these amendments make it better. In some cases, like the junk insurance policies that will be allowed, they actually make it worse.

Now, the proposal that would provide \$45 million to tackle the opioid epidemic, even Republican Ohio Gov. John Kasich said it would be like spitting in the ocean. It is not enough, he said. I appreciate the focus on that. It is a horrible epidemic. It is an epidemic in Michigan and across the country, but it is certainly not enough to make up for the huge cuts to Medicaid insurance—healthcare insurance, as the Senator from Washington State indicated.

The other proposal that we understand is in the new bill, as I mentioned before, would give insurers the freedom to once again refuse to cover basic health services like maternity care or addiction treatment, as long as one plan they offer, among many, would include essential health benefits. So everything else could be junk, and there would be one high-cost plan that would actually cover things families need.

Insurance companies themselves know this is a terrible idea. In a letter to Senator CRUZ and Senator LEE, Scott Serota, president and CEO of Blue Cross Blue Shield Association, wrote that their plan “is unworkable as it would undermine pre-existing condition protections, increase premiums and destabilize the market.” That is what is viewed as this great new provision in the bill.

He added: “The result would be higher premiums, increased federal tax credit costs for coverage available on exchanges, and insurers exiting the market or pricing coverage out of reach of consumers.”

In other words, premiums would skyrocket for older people, people who take prescription drug medications, people with chronic conditions. Everyone else would be left with the junk insurance policy that doesn't cover really anything, and they feel OK unless they get sick. We would all be stuck with a fragmented, destabilized insurance market.

Remember preexisting conditions? This would bring them right back.

This bill is wrong for many, many people, but let me mention Felicia. In 2011, she was an AmeriCorps member serving in Lansing who didn't have health insurance. When she started feeling tired all the time and losing weight, she went to the Center for Family Health in Jackson.

Felicia was diagnosed with stage IV Hodgkin's lymphoma. The Center for Family Health helped her get coverage through Medicaid and care at the University of Michigan, including chemotherapy and later a stem cell transplant.

Felicia writes:

Now I am feeling awesome. I am cancer-free, and I am working part time while I am

finishing up college. I feel that I owe my life to the Center for Family Health.

Felicia knows the importance of comprehensive health coverage. It saved her life.

Nick and Chelsey know it too. They and their three young children are covered by Healthy Michigan, our State's Medicaid expansion. Nick and Chelsey are both employed full time. Chelsey also attends college full time.

During a routine visit, doctors discovered that her oldest son was born with an obstructed kidney, which had lost one-third of its function by the time he was 5 years old. Thanks to the Medicaid expansion, he was able to have surgery before his kidney lost all function. Without the Medicaid expansion, which ends under the Republican bill, these working parents and their three children couldn't afford healthcare coverage, let alone surgery.

Margo knows this because she sees it every day. She manages a clinic in Kent County on the west side of the State. She said the lives of patients are much different today than they were a few years ago. Margo wrote:

Seeing working people who have struggled all of their adult lives to manage their chronic health conditions finally have access to regular doctor visits, health education, and prescription medications has been a tremendous relief. You cannot imagine the sense of dignity our patients feel.

She added:

Please see it in your heart to care about the people of Michigan who work but do not get insurance through their employer.

So, finally, let me just say, doctors know this is a bad bill. Nurses know this is a bad bill. Hospitals know this is a bad bill. Insurance companies know this is a bad bill. I know that even many of my Republican friends know this is a bad bill. Their amendments haven't changed that. Costs go up and care goes down. Preexisting conditions come back. Millions lose their coverage.

What we should be doing is working together to stabilize the marketplace, reduce out-of-pocket costs, and lower the outrageous costs of prescription drugs—by the way, not giving a tax cut to prescription drug companies, as is in this bill, and other companies as well.

Felicia, Nick, Chelsey, and millions more like them in Michigan and across this country deserve that much.

I sincerely hope that when it comes time to vote on whether to proceed to this bill, that the majority of the Members in the Senate will say no.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

### VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for today's vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 104, William Francis Hagerty IV to be Ambassador to Japan. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.●

### HELP FOR WILDLIFE ACT

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I joined Senators BARRASSO, CAPITO, KLOBUCHAR, BOOZMAN, and BALDWIN in introducing S. 1514, the Hunting Heritage and Environmental Legacy Preservation—HELP—for Wildlife Act.

This bill represents a more than \$100 million annual Federal investment in the protecting the bay. The bill has several provisions, one of which reauthorizes the programs at the heart of restoring and maintaining the health of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. S. 1514 reauthorizes the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's, EPA, Chesapeake Bay Program through 2022 at \$90 million per year, which is more than the program has ever been funded in its history. This unique regional partnership, managed by EPA through the Chesapeake Bay Program office in Annapolis, helps program partners collaborate to achieve the goals of the voluntary, bipartisan Chesapeake Bay agreement. Because this program expired in 2005, reauthorizing the program is critical to secure necessary appropriations and reject the Trump administration's proposal to eliminate the program.

S. 1514 also reauthorizes the Chesapeake Bay gateways and water trails network and the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Grants Assistance Program, which provides \$6 million per year throughout the watershed in technical and financial assistance to State, community, and nongovernmental partners to increase access to the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries. The bill also reauthorizes the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation, NFWF, until 2023. As the Nation's largest conservation grant-maker, NFWF has been instrumental in completing conservation projects in Maryland and around the Chesapeake Bay. In 2016, the State received nearly \$5 million in funding for projects protecting and restoring habitat for fish and wildlife.

S. 1514 also reauthorizes the North American Wetlands Conservation Act, NAWCA, which provides grants to increase and protect wetlands which not only provide habitat for wildlife, but also reduce the severity of flooding and coastal erosion, and improve water quality. In the 2014 to 2015 grant period alone, Maryland received \$1 million from the NAWCA program, which was

leveraged with nearly \$3 million in additional contributions by outside partners to protect 1,600 acres of wetlands in the State.

The bill reauthorizes the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act for another 5 years and authorizes \$6.5 million to be spent each year on conservation projects that protect more than 350 different species of birds which summer in the United States and winter in the tropical regions. Twenty-one different State birds are neotropical migrants, including Maryland's famous and beloved Baltimore Oriole.

S. 1514 codifies the National Fish Habitat Partnership, a collaboration between public agencies, private citizens, and nonprofits for promoting fish conservation. America is home to more than 3,000 species of fish, and 22 percent of the stream miles in this country are at high or very high risk of current habitat degradation. Over the past few years, \$175,000 in funds from this program were used in Maryland to rehabilitate three different streams, funding which was 27 matched by \$843,000 from private investors. The partnership estimates that the improved habitat in the three streams for brook trout provided a total socio/economic impact of \$9.2 million.

I am proud that S. 1514 contains so many provisions to help the Chesapeake Bay and the State of Maryland.

I would like to speak for a minute about the importance of reauthorizing these programs and the "power of the purse." As my colleagues in the Senate well know, the "power of the purse" is the two-step process of authorizing and appropriating. Authorizing legislation can establish, continue, or change programs and activities, and it signals to the appropriators that they should fund these programs. The budget process is not complete until the appropriations process provides the actual funding for the activities and programs established through the authorization process.

Office of Management and Budget Director Mick Mulvaney has said that President Donald Trump is sending a deliberate message to Congress about spending money on unauthorized programs. With the President putting an emphasis on boosting defense spending without adding to the deficit, administration officials are looking closely at expired authorizations. By reauthorizing these programs, we are sending our own clear message back: these programs matter to our constituents and to us.

Mr. Mulvaney said lawmakers too often ignore the "regular order" process of approving a budget, authorizing specific programs, and then appropriating the money for those programs. "We actually spend a lot of money in the federal government on programs that aren't authorized at all," he said. "Either they used to be authorized and they lapsed, or they were never authorized in the first place. They simply were appropriated without any authorization. It's the wrong way to do it."

Because of President Trump and Director Mulvaney's position, it is more important than ever that the essential programs contained in S. 1514 be reauthorized.

None of these reauthorizations are more important to Maryland than EPA's Chesapeake Bay Program. In 1987, Congress ratified the Chesapeake Bay Program, a voluntary partnership among the watershed States and the EPA, under the Clean Water Act. The 1987 legislation supported cleanup efforts with a program of grants and scientific research. In 2000, Congress directed the EPA to "ensure that management plans are developed and implementation is begun" to meet the goals of the Chesapeake Bay Agreement. In June 2014, the Governors of the six States in the watershed signed a new voluntary Chesapeake Bay watershed agreement to work in partnership with the Federal Government through the Chesapeake Bay Program. The watershed agreement has ten goals to improve water quality in local rivers and streams and the Chesapeake Bay by 2025.

The program office is housed within the EPA, which provides staff and funding. Primary funding for the program comes from State governments. Federal funding was first authorized at \$40 million annually from fiscal year 2001 to fiscal year 2005 to fund environmental studies and grants that support restoration activities in the Chesapeake Bay. Congress has appropriated funds for the Program since the authorization for appropriations expired in fiscal year 2005. In fiscal year 2017, for instance, Congress appropriated \$73 million for the program. The President's fiscal year 2018 budget eliminates funding for the program and cuts other programs that also benefit the bay across several Federal agency partners' budgets.

A healthy bay means a healthy economy, and this recovery cannot be accomplished without a strong Federal commitment. At a time when we have seen nutrient levels dropping and water quality improving, I am deeply disappointed President Trump is intent on turning the clock back to a time when a swath of the Chesapeake Bay in mid-summer was a hypoxic low-oxygen zone or "dead zone".

The most recent State of the Bay report, issued biannually by the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, evaluates the progressing and overall health of the Bay for 2014 to 2016. The Chesapeake Bay's health was given a grade of C-minus, a slight improvement from the previous State of the Bay report in 2014. This progress is due largely to the continued implementation of the Chesapeake Clean Water Blueprint. This improvement, though modest, was hard-won. It is the result of countless hours of grueling work by State and Federal public servants and nonprofit workers, as well as citizens' actions across the watershed. A grade of C-minus is hardly an acceptable end-

point. To reach an A, which would represent a saved and comprehensively healthy Bay, we will need redouble and accelerate our efforts. I am determined to pass on a vibrant and healthy Chesapeake Bay to the next generation, for the sake of public health and the local economies that depend on a clean and bountiful bay. This is all the more reason that we need to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Program and make sure that it is fully funded in this year's appropriations bill.

Many Marylanders and national wildlife organizations are happy about the HELP for Wildlife Act. The Choose Clean Water Coalition and Blue Water Baltimore have issued statements of support. The Chesapeake Bay Foundation will testify in support of this bill next week in a legislative hearing the Environment and Public Works Committee is holding. The National Wildlife Federation's Collin O'Mara said the bill "represents a great bipartisan effort to conserve America's outdoor heritage for hunters, anglers, campers, hikers, and wildlife enthusiasts, while helping to restore America's wildlife populations." The Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership said the bill is "the strongest legislative package of sportsmen's priorities in years."

As S. 1514 moves out of the Environment and Public Works Committee and to the Senate floor in the coming weeks, I urge my colleagues to support this bill that is critical not only to the Chesapeake Bay and the State of Maryland, but to conservation efforts in every State across the Nation.

#### INTERNATIONAL RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, today I wish to speak about the issue of international religious freedom.

Sadly, in recent months, the nightly news has reported far too many stories of innocent people around the world who have been intentionally targeted in acts of horrible violence simply because of their desire to worship in a way their consciences dictate.

Recently, the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association held the first "World Summit in Defense of Persecuted Christians" in Washington, where participants from 130 countries gathered together, many of whom have faced brutal persecution in their home country because of their faith.

As I am sure my colleagues and most Americans know, Rev. Billy Graham has touched the lives of millions of people in the United States and around the world. He has counseled Presidents and Prime Ministers and has been called America's pastor. As a fellow North Carolinian, I am proud call both Billy Graham and his son Franklin my friends.

As the son of a Presbyterian minister, these recent events reminded me of a letter written by my late father, David Burr, to my grandparents. On Thanksgiving Day 1964, writing from

South Korea as a soldier in the Army, my dad wrote a letter about a special worship service held for troops in a tiny chapel on the side of a hill, just within sight of the 38th Parallel dividing North and South Korea. With rifles in tow, my father and his fellow soldiers made their way through the snow and into the chapel. To their surprise, the man standing up front to conduct the worship was not their usual Protestant or Catholic chaplain, but a young Jewish rabbi and a veteran of the previous war.

In his letter, my father wrote about the beautiful lesson he had heard that day where the scripture reading was from Hosea chapter 6, which says, "The voice of God cried unto His people, What shall I do with you? For your goodness is as the morning cloud, and as the dew that goes early away. For I desire goodness, not promises; I desire acknowledgement and not your bargains." My father, deeply moved by the message, then went on to write about the rabbi's powerful benediction prayer that closed the worship: "He that enjoys anything without thanksgiving is as though he robbed God."

Every July Fourth, our country gives thanks for the freedoms we are privileged to have as Americans and celebrates the birth of our Nation. Indeed, the freedoms we enjoy are immortalized in our Declaration of Independence: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness."

The Founding Fathers understood that these unalienable rights, including the freedom to worship, was a fundamental human right endowed by our Creator.

As I read from my father's letter, I can see he realized this, too. "All the way back to the barracks," he wrote, "I knew that I was one who was stealing from God, for every day I am enjoying the times that were so full and wonderful there at home. Every day, though we are cold and discouraged, my heart is warm with your prayers and thoughts of you, and I have not been thanking God. I have not been fair, for God has walked with me all these years and I have never thought to say thank you to Him."

I share this story today because I believe that, if we as Americans are thankful for these unalienable rights endowed by our Creator, we should also stand up for the millions across the world who are robbed of these same fundamental human rights—and sometimes lose their lives because of it. As Members of the U.S. Senate, we especially should not forget this.

As chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I think about North Korea, I think about Iran, and I think about all the different regions around the world where terrorist activity poses a real threat to our national security. Today I also think about

places like North Korea, Iran, and so many other countries not just in a national security capacity alone, but about the people who are suffering under political systems that deny their fundamental right to freely worship as they choose.

The rabbi's lesson of Hosea chapter 6 that day was about a passage where strength, courage, and hope by the great Hand above were poured into those who were lonesome, afraid, and discouraged. At the end of my dad's letter, he asked my grandfather, "Please, dad, put the benediction of the rabbi over your desk for that is the quickest way you can bring me home." If so, by keeping international religious freedom as a foreign policy priority, I believe that is the quickest way we can bring persecuted people hope.

As my father did in his letter, I close by repeating the rabbi's benediction: "He that enjoys anything without thanksgiving is as though he robbed God." I urge my colleagues: Let's remember to be thankful for the God-given freedoms we enjoy in the United States and to shine a light on the dark corners of the world. Let's not forget in this Congress how we can help the millions who are robbed of these fundamental rights.

Thank you.

#### TRIBUTE TO AFGHANISTAN ROBOTICS TEAM

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am very pleased that Afghanistan's robotics team will be coming to Washington to compete with students from nearly 150 countries in the FIRST Global Challenge, which begins on Sunday, July 16. I extend a warm welcome to these brilliant young minds, Lida Azizi, Somayeh Faruqi, Faramarz Najafi, Rodaba Noori, Fatemah Qaderyan, Kawsar Roshan, and Alireza Mahraban. Of course, we extend a warm welcome to the team's creation, a robot that can sort balls, recognize blue and orange, and move objects to their proper places. People across Afghanistan are extremely proud of the robotics team's achievements. In recent days, Americans have become acquainted with the many challenges they have overcome in order to excel in their studies and come to the U.S., and we too, are very proud of them.

I have been impressed to learn about their passion for education and determination to pursue STEM studies. This team's indomitable spirit is a testament to what can be achieved through hard work, creativity, and perseverance. Each member of the Afghan robotics team has become a powerful symbol for young women across the globe, especially for those in developing regions who face barriers to education and opportunity.

The FIRST Robotics Competition should also be recognized for its ability to bring young people together in the name of science, mathematics, and

technology. It is the creation of Granite Stater Dean Kamen, and had its beginnings in a New Hampshire high school gym a quarter century ago. Today, FIRST programs reach more than 400,000 young people across the world every year. Beginning this weekend in Washington, the FIRST Global Challenge will bring some of the best and brightest young people from around the world to compete, to demonstrate teamwork, and to forge new friendships.

It gives me great joy to know that Lida, Somayeh, Faramarz, Rodaba, Fatemah, Kawsar, and Alireze will be among them. The FIRST Global Challenge is a competition, and only one team will leave Washington with top honors, but the seven young women representing Afghanistan are already winners. They have had the courage to overcome barriers and the audacity to compete with some of the most talented young people from across the globe. I wish these young women great success. I thank them for inspiring us with their fierce determination to achieve.

#### 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JUVENILE AND FAMILY COURT JUDGES

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, today I am honored to congratulate the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges on 80 years of promoting justice for children and families.

On May 22, 1937, the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, NCJFCJ, was established by judges who came together with a vision of strengthening the juvenile court system and providing support, sharing knowledge, and facilitating an exchange of ideas with their colleagues across the Nation. The NCJFCJ is the oldest judicial membership organization in the country and a leading provider of judicial education. The NCJFCJ believes judges are the leaders of the juvenile and family court system, and by engaging all stakeholders, better decisions are made with improved outcomes for children, families, and victims of domestic violence. I am so proud that they have made Reno, NV, their home.

The NCJFCJ brings together a broad constituency of judicial officers, attorneys, advocates, court administrators, clerks of court, probation officers, child welfare professionals, and others with a common goal of ensuring the most effective juvenile and family court system. It addresses a wide range of complex issues impacting the well-being of children and families that encompass juvenile delinquency, domestic child sex trafficking, child abuse and neglect, child custody and visitation, substance abuse, domestic violence, trauma, mental health, and military issues. The NCJFCJ also leads development and implementation of policies and practices to ensure fair, equal,

effective, and timely justice for children, families, and victims of domestic violence.

For eight decades, the NCJFCJ has been known for the exemplary quality of its services, including advanced education, training, publications, technical assistance, research, data and statistics, and policy development to promote justice for children and families. Inspired by the leadership, experience, expertise, dedication, and passion of its members, the NCJFCJ is committed to another 80 years of efforts to meet the ever-evolving needs of our most vulnerable population: the children and families who seek justice.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring the 80 years of achievements and tireless efforts of the National Council of Juvenile and Family Court Judges, its members and staff, past and present, to ensure a timely, fair, and coordinated justice system for children and families and safer communities across the country.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO JOE KALIKO

● Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I wish to thank and commend Joe Kaliko for his extraordinarily valuable commitment and service in aiding and advocating for our most vulnerable throughout the community. His many deeds of generosity and caring have made him a go-to person when people need help. His life is a real inspiration for all of us.

Joe Kaliko is founder of the Needs Clearinghouse, a private nonprofit organization. He has actively partnered with governmental agencies, in helping provide necessary—sometimes life-saving—resources to people through programs such as Hug a Hound and the Refugee Assistance Project. He has helped raise funds and contributions to a myriad of charitable causes, touching many, many lives. I have seen those people and the powerfully positive effects on their lives, disabled people who now have ramps for access to their homes, veterans who now have housing, ill people who now have better healthcare, and numerous others.

Joe Kaliko is all about making a difference. He is a true hero.●

##### RECOGNIZING THE HAVRE YOUTH BASEBALL ALL-STAR TEAM

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this week I have the distinct honor of recognizing the Havre youth baseball, 10U, All-Star team. This past weekend, the team from Havre won the Montana Cal Ripken Baseball State title for the 10 years old and under division.

Despite a loss to Belgrade in their opening game of the tournament, the Havre All-Stars battled their way to the championship game, and defeated Bozeman to claim the title. In addition to an outstanding performance on the

baseball diamond, the community of Havre also served as host for the tournament. A successful 4-day youth sports State tournament is the result of hard work from the many volunteers who pitched in to make the event a great success.

With summer events in full swing, I would like to commend the community of Havre for their hospitality and congratulate the youngsters on the All-Star team for their accomplishment.●

#### 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF NEW BALTIMORE, MICHIGAN

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the 150th anniversary of the city of New Baltimore, MI. This celebration is a historic benchmark for New Baltimore, as well as the State of Michigan.

Located in Macomb County, along the northern coastline of Lake St. Clair, New Baltimore residents pride themselves on their traditional downtown, rich heritage, recreational activities, and a family-orientated spirit. Throughout 150 years of change and growth, the city remains anchored in that local spirit.

The area was first inhabited by French fur trappers and hunters. Among those was an explorer named Pierre Yax, the son of the first German resident of Michigan. Yax secured a land grant from President John Quincy Adams in 1826, in what was then the Michigan Territory. As other French settlers followed, long farms were established, stretching from the rivers outward. In 1845, the area was first recognized as a settlement when Alfred Ashley platted 60 acres of land. Mr. Ashley was a local businessman and would name the area the Village of Ashley. This name would remain until 1867 when the village was officially incorporated as New Baltimore. New Baltimore would stay a village until it became a city in 1931.

In its early days, New Baltimore was linked to the regional economy through its position along waterways. It operated as a small port, bringing agriculture and manufactured goods to the surrounding communities. The area became known for the manufacturing of barrels, brooms, bricks, coffins, corsets, and creamery products.

As shipping methods changed and automobile transportation increased, so too did the role of New Baltimore. The city began transitioning to a resort and commercial area. New attractions were built, including an opera house, hotels, saloons, a brewery, and other leisure and resort attractions. With the construction of a locomotive line between port Huron and Detroit in the 1800s, New Baltimore became a hub of activity well into the 20th century.

Today New Baltimore is a vibrant community covering nearly 7 square miles. Residents take pride in their excellent schools, including a high school, two middle schools, seven elementary schools, two early childhood

centers, and an alternative education program. The resort industry continues to flourish with events such as the annual Bay-Rama Fish Fly Festival, which attracts thousands of people each year. The city's public park and beaches also provide opportunity for numerous recreational activities.

The city of New Baltimore has a proud history, vibrant present, and bright future. As New Baltimore celebrates this milestone, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating its residents, elected officials, and businesses as they celebrate their history. I wish the city continued growth and prosperity in the years ahead.●

#### REMEMBERING KENNETH ENGBRETSON

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Kenneth Engbretson, a lifelong Montanan—born and raised—and a veteran who served in World War II.

To Kenneth's family, on behalf of myself, my fellow Montanans, and my fellow Americans, I would like to extend our deepest gratitude for Kenneth's service to this Nation.

Kenneth was born in 1919 to Oliver and Tena Engbretson in South Gildford, MT. He was raised on the family farm that was homesteaded by his parents in 1910. Kenneth graduated from Gildford High School in 1937 and set out from home to explore his country.

After graduation he went to Dalton, MN, to work on his uncle's farm. He enlisted in the Army on October 16, 1941, out of Fergus Falls, MN. He was initially stationed at Fort Sill, OK, and then at Fort Leonard Wood, MO.

Kenneth went on to serve in World War II from 1941 to 1944 in the Philippines and New Guinea. While deployed, Kenneth contracted malaria and was hospitalized. As a result of the illness, Kenneth was discharged in November of 1945 and immediately returned to the Havre area to help on the family farm in Gildford, MT. He remained on the farm to raise a family of his own.

He was proudly involved in the Veterans of Foreign Wars organization and remained an active member until his passing on October 10, 1993. Kenneth left behind a deeply appreciative and loving family, and his memory is preserved in the living history of the Engbretson family farm.

Let us now take a moment to recognize the life of Kenneth Engbretson and the legacy he left behind. We deeply appreciate his service to the American people.●

#### TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH BRANNON

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Joseph Brannon, one of my Washington, DC, interns, for all of the hard work he has done for me and my staff at the Senate Republican Conference.

Joseph is a graduate of Stevens High School in Rapid City, SD. Currently, he is attending Auburn University in Auburn, AL, where he is majoring in sociology. Joseph is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO WILL JANKLOW

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Will Janklow, one of my Washington, DC, interns, for all of the hard work he has done for me and my staff at the Senate Republican Conference.

Will is a graduate of Northland Pines High School in Eagle River, WI. Currently, he is attending the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, MN, where he is majoring in mathematics. Will is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO DREW LINGLE

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Drew Lingle, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Drew is a graduate of Century High School in Bismarck, ND. Currently, he is attending Minnesota State University Moorhead, where he is majoring in history. Drew is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

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

#### TRIBUTE TO ELIZABETH MACLACHLAN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Elizabeth MacLachlan, a legal intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Elizabeth is a graduate of Brigham Young University in Provo, UT, having earned a degree in family life. Currently, she is pursuing a law degree at J. Reuben Clark Law School, Brigham Young University. Elizabeth is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Elizabeth MacLachlan for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

## TRIBUTE TO NICK MONTIETH

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Nick Montieth, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Nick is a recent graduate of Black Hills State University in Spearfish, SD, having earned a degree in political science. After a gap year, he plans to attend the University of South Dakota School of Law. Nick is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

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

## TRIBUTE TO SCOTT SIMONS

• Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Scott Simons, an intern in my Washington, DC, office for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Scott is a graduate of Roosevelt High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where he is majoring in economics. Scott is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of his experience.

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

## TRIBUTE TO CAPTAIN PETER A. MACHTEL

• Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to honor an outstanding American, Captain Peter A. Machtel, on his retirement from American Airlines.

Captain Machtel distinguished himself with over 30 years of safe commercial airline flying for Piedmont, USAirways, and American Airlines. In addition, he served the American public as a Federal flight deck duty officer, beginning with that program as soon as it was implemented following the attacks on 9/11. His work for more than 15 years with that vital security program demonstrated his selfless duty and commitment to the safety of the American people.

Over the years, I have relied on Captain Machtel's knowledge and insights on issues relating to airlines, pensions, and aviation safety. I know that his wisdom and dedication to our country will be sorely missed.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Captain Machtel for his distinguished service and congratulating him on his retirement.●

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1492. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice.

H.R. 1719. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2200. An act to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2430. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2480. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include an additional permissible use of amounts provided as grants under the Byrne JAG program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2664. An act to direct the Secretary of Labor to train certain Department of Labor personnel how to effectively detect and assist law enforcement in preventing human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1492. An act to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the Attorney General to register practitioners to transport controlled substances to States in which the practitioner is not registered under the Act for the purpose of administering the substances (under applicable State law) at locations other than principal places of business or professional practice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2200. An act to reauthorize the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2480. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to include an additional permissible use of amounts provided as grants under the Byrne JAG program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2664. An act to direct the Secretary of Labor to train certain Department of Labor personnel how to effectively detect and as-

sist law enforcement in preventing human trafficking during the course of their primary roles and responsibilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

## MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

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

H.R. 1719. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, for inclusion in the John Muir National Historic Site, and for other purposes.

## MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 2430. An act to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-2163. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flonicamid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9962-15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2164. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prosulfuron; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9962-97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2165. A communication from the Chairman, Farm Credit System Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Corporation's annual report for calendar year 2016; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2166. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report to Congress on Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2016 Purchases from Foreign Entities"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2167. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Karen E. Dyson, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2168. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Flora D. Darpino, United States Army, and her advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2169. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on



the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Nora W. Tyson, United States Navy, and her advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2170. A communication from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 2016 Annual Report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation (SIPC); to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2171. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility (Carbon County, MT, et al.)" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2017-0002)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 14, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2172. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Emissions Statement Rule Certification for the 2008 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9964-65-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2173. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Redesignation of the Muncie Area to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard; Withdrawal of Direct Final Rule" (FRL No. 9964-63-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2174. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Control of Emissions of Organic Materials That Are Not Regulated by VOC RACT Rules" (FRL No. 9964-46-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2175. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; TN; Non-interference Demonstration for Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement in Shelby County" (FRL No. 9964-56-Region 4) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2176. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Volatile Organic Compound Reasonably Available Control Technology for 1997 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9964-58-Region 3) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2177. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Chemical Risk Evaluation Under the Amended Toxic Substances Control Act" ((RIN2070-AK20) (FRL No. 9964-38)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2178. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safe Harbor for Service Agreements Providing Electricity to Federal Government Generated by Solar Equipment" (Rev. Proc. 2017-19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2179. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017 Calendar Year Resident Population Figures" (Notice 2017-19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2180. A communication from the Chief of the Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, Bureau of Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Import Restrictions Imposed on Archaeological Objects and Ecclesiastical and Ritual Ethnological Materials from Cyprus" (RIN1515-AE31) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2181. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Conditions of Participation for Home Health Agencies; Delay of Effective Date" ((RIN0938-AG81) (CMS-3819-F2)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2182. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Secretary of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2183. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2184. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification, of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2017-0724); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2185. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2017-0123-2017-0128); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2186. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the status of the Government of Cuba's compliance with the United States-Cuba September 1994 "Joint Communiqué," and on the treatment of persons returned to Cuba in accordance with the United States-Cuba May 1995 "Joint Statement," and the United States-Cuba January

2017 "Joint Statement"; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2187. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Commissioner of Food and Drugs, Department of Health and Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2188. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Spirulina Extract" (Docket No. FDA-2016-C-2570) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2189. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Food Labeling; Nutrition Labeling of Standard Menu Items in Restaurants and Similar Retail Food Establishments; Extension of Comment Period" ((RIN0910-AG57) (Docket No. FDA-2011-F-0172)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2190. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Division of Select Agents and Toxins, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Control of Communicable Diseases; Correction" (RIN0920-AA63) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2191. A communication from the Acting Chief Privacy Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Department of Homeland Security Privacy Office's Fiscal Year 2017 Semiannual Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2192. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Homeland Security, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2193. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled, "Metropolitan Police Monitor Nearly 2,500 Demonstrations in 2014-2016 and Report No First Amendment Inquiries"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2194. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Entrepreneur Rule: Delay of Effective Date" (RIN1615-AC04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 11, 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2195. A communication from the Director, National Legislative Division, The American Legion, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the financial condition of The American Legion as of December



31, 2016 and 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2196. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fishing Capacity Reduction Program for the Crab Species Covered by the Fishery Management Plan for the Bering Sea/Aleutian Islands King and Tanner Crabs" (RIN0648-AP25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2197. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fireworks Displays at Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary" (RIN0648-BG50) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2198. A communication from the Deputy Chief Counsel, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hollings Manufacturing Extension Partnership—Amendments to the Terms and Schedule of Financial Assistance" (RIN0693-AB64) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2199. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Transition Progress Report Form and Filing Requirements for Stations Not Eligible for Reimbursement from the TV Broadcast Relocation Fund" ((MB Docket No. 16-306 and GN Docket No. 12-268) (DA 17-484)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 5, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2200. A communication from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Arbitration Agreements" (RIN3170-AA51) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 10, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

POM-54. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 129

Whereas, the value of the domestic beef industry is a vital and integral part of the United States economy; and

Whereas, the 2016 economic impact was approximately sixty-seven billion in farm cash receipts for cattle and calves; and

Whereas, there are over nine hundred thousand total cattle and calf operations in the United States of which ninety-one percent

are family owned or individually operated, and eleven percent are operated by women; and

Whereas, domestic beef production in 2017 is estimated to be approximately twenty-five billion eight hundred million pounds; and

Whereas, the amount of beef consumed in the United States in 2016 was approximately twenty-five billion six hundred million pounds; and

Whereas, it is essential to the success of the domestic beef industry to increase international trade to key export markets; and

Whereas, the promotion of policies which highlight the quality, safety, sustainability, and nutritional value of domestic beef will drive growth in domestic beef exports; and

Whereas, it is in the nation's best interest to protect against legislative policies or agency regulations that have a negative impact on the economic health of the domestic beef industry; and

Whereas, minor changes in future domestic beef import or export levels can significantly change the net beef supply and beef prices; and

Whereas, important steps to supporting the domestic beef industry include developing a comprehensive national strategy for including beef in future dietary guidelines and investing in necessary research to improve productivity and efficiency; and

Whereas, it is critical to the success of the domestic beef industry to identify barriers and develop strategies to attract and enable the next generation of farmers into the domestic beef industry; and

Whereas, terrorist attacks have heightened the nation's awareness of agriterrorism and placed a renewed focus on ensuring the protection of the nation's critical infrastructures, including the domestic beef food supply; and

Whereas, an intentional contamination of the domestic beef food supply could harm millions of people and cripple our vast agriculture system; and

Whereas, it is critical to preserve the United States domestic beef supply and prevent reliance on foreign nations for food; and

Whereas, it will be necessary to develop a variety of federal actions to support the domestic beef industry including proposals which encourage domestic beef production, improve consumer demand, protect our nation's critical infrastructure, attract new farmers, improve the business climate, and increase trade to export markets. Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana memorializes the Congress of the United States to take such actions as are necessary to support the domestic beef industry. Be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM-55. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing the support of the Nevada Legislature for the enactment and use of the Antiquities Act and the designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument in this State; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

Whereas, The provisions of 54 U.S.C. 320301, commonly referred to as the "Antiquities Act," authorize the President of the United States to designate as national monuments any historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures and other objects of his-

toric or scientific interest that are located on land owned or controlled by the Federal Government; and

Whereas, The Gold Butte National Monument was designated as a national monument under the Antiquities Act to protect and preserve approximately 300,000 acres of public lands in Clark County, Nevada; and

Whereas, Desert Bighorn Sheep, Gila Monsters, Desert Tortoises and other species of concern live in the Gold Butte National Monument; and

Whereas, As a way to honor their ancestral lands, the Moapa Band of Paiute Indians and the Las Vegas Paiute Tribe have supported the designation of the Gold Butte National Monument because it is rich with cultural artifacts and sublime petroglyphs; and

Whereas, The Basin and Range National Monument was designated as a national monument under the Antiquities Act to protect and preserve approximately 700,000 acres of public land in Lincoln and Nye Counties, Nevada; and

Whereas, The Basin and Range National Monument provides vital habitat for Desert Bighorn Sheep, Gila Monsters, Rocky Mountain Elk, mule deer, various kinds of sagebrush and many other species of concern; and

Whereas, The Basin and Range National Monument protects many cultural artifacts which date from the early human inhabitants of the area encompassed by the Basin and Range National Monument to the creation of one of the world's greatest works of art, entitled "City," by world renowned artist Michael Heizer; and

Whereas, Hunting, hiking and hundreds of miles of motorized access are allowed in both the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument; and

Whereas, The residents of this State have long benefitted from the designation of the Lehman Caves National Monument by former President of the United States Warren G. Harding and the subsequent inclusion of the Lehman Caves National Monument in the Great Basin National Park; and

Whereas, Outdoor recreation activities generate approximately \$15 billion dollars in direct consumer spending each year in the State of Nevada and approximately \$1 billion dollars in state and local tax revenue; and

Whereas, The designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte Monument will increase tourism and protect important wildlife habitat and cultural resources in this State; and

Whereas, Former President of the United States Theodore Roosevelt first used the Antiquities Act in 1906 and 16 former presidents in the last 111 years, of whom 8 were Republicans and 8 were Democrats, have used the Antiquities Act to protect the natural, cultural, and historic heritage of the United States; and

Whereas, The designation of national monuments is a uniquely American idea and the Antiquities Act was enacted to preserve worthy public lands as national monuments for future generations; and

Whereas, Many unique sites, including, without limitation, the Grand Canyon, the Statue of Liberty and sites that celebrate and memorialize American history from slavery to civil rights battles, have been protected under the Antiquities Act; and

Whereas, The designation of national monuments provides additional protections for public lands which are held in trust for all Americans, including public lands which are available for traditional uses such as hunting, fishing, grazing, tribal wood and herbal gathering and other historical uses; and

Whereas, The beneficial use of renewable land, water and wildlife resources is essential to the long-term economy of this State; and

Whereas, The management of national monuments is guided by plans developed with input from state, local and tribal governments, members of the public and other stakeholders; and

Whereas, Landscapes which are protected and remain intact are important to cultural and traditional activities for all residents of this State; and

Whereas, National monuments which recognize and protect the contributions, histories, cultures and spiritual beliefs of tribal communities and communities of color are some of the most precious public lands of the United States and are deserving of protection and are important in telling a more complete and inclusive history of the United States; and

Whereas, Recent polls indicate that approximately 81 percent of the residents of this State support keeping in place existing national monuments such as the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument; now, therefore, be it,

*Resolved*, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature affirm and support the designation of the Basin and Range National Monument and the Gold Butte National Monument under the Antiquities Act; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Nevada Legislature supports the enactment and use of the Antiquities Act as a critical tool for protecting the public good by authorizing the designation of national monuments under the Antiquities Act; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Nevada Legislature urges Congress to oppose efforts to weaken the Antiquities Act or to reverse the designation of any national monument under the Antiquities Act; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation.

POM-56. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing opposition to the development of a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 10

Whereas, Since 1954, when the Atomic Energy Act was passed by Congress, the Federal Government has been responsible for the disposal of radioactive waste, yet few environmental challenges have proven more daunting than the problems posed by the disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; and

Whereas, Pursuant to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §§10101 et seq., as amended, the Department of Energy has been studying Yucca Mountain in southern Nevada as a possible site for a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; and

Whereas, In 1987, Congress amended the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982, 42 U.S.C. §§10101 et seq., specifying Yucca Mountain as the sole location for the placement of a national repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; and

Whereas, The State of Nevada has since opposed the placement of a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the State due to the extremely dangerous nature of such waste, the persistence of that

danger for an extended period of time, the potential harm to the environment of the State and the serious and unacceptable hazard to the health and welfare of the people of Nevada that is posed by the placement of such a repository in the State; and

Whereas, The transportation of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste to a repository at Yucca Mountain poses serious and unacceptable risks to the environment, economy and residents of Las Vegas, Nevada, the largest city in the State; and

Whereas, In 2001, the Nevada Legislature enacted NRS 353.2655 creating the Nevada Protection Account which must be used to protect the State of Nevada and its residents through funding activities to prevent the location of a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain; and

Whereas, In 2002, the United States Senate and House of Representatives approved the site at Yucca Mountain as a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste, thereby overriding the notice of disapproval submitted by the Governor of the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, On June 3, 2008, the Department of Energy submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission a license application for construction authorization of a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain; and

Whereas, On March 3, 2010, the Department of Energy filed a motion with the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission whereby the Department moved to withdraw the pending license application that was filed in 2008 and asked the Board to dismiss its application with prejudice; and

Whereas, The Atomic Safety and Licensing Board denied the Department of Energy's motion on June 29, 2010; and

Whereas, In 2011, after stating that it found itself evenly divided on whether to take the affirmative action of overturning or upholding the June 29, 2010, decision by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission suspended the licensing adjudicatory proceeding that began with such decision; and

Whereas, For the Fiscal Year 2012, the United States Congress ended funding of the repository at Yucca Mountain and has not subsequently appropriated any new funds to the Department of Energy the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for this purpose; and

Whereas, In 2012, the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future, in fulfilling its purpose to conduct a comprehensive review of the policies for managing nuclear waste, reported that any future repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste should be selected with the consent of the potentially affected state, tribal and local governments; and

Whereas, In 2013, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *In re Aiken County*, 725 F.3d 255, 259 (D.C. Cir. 2013), ruled that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission had an obligation to resume the licensing proceeding for the repository at Yucca Mountain that was suspended in 2011 using the remaining funds from previous appropriations, notwithstanding the objections by the Commission that the funds were insufficient to complete the licensing proceeding; and

Whereas, The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has insufficient funds to complete the licensing proceeding for the repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain, has expended the majority of its remaining funds for the licensing proceeding for such a repository and has not received any additional funds to continue the licensing proceeding for such a repository; and

Whereas, The United States Congress is considering various legislation concerning nuclear waste, including S. 95, introduced by Senator Dean Heller, and H.R. 456, introduced by Representative Dina Titus, both of which are entitled the Nuclear Waste Informed Consent Act and which would extend the right of consent to the State of Nevada before the repository at Yucca Mountain could be authorized for development; now, therefore be it

*Resolved*, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the Nevada Legislature protests, in the strongest possible terms, any attempt by the United States Congress to resurrect the dangerous and ill-conceived repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Nevada Legislature calls on President Donald J. Trump to veto any legislation that would attempt to locate any temporary, interim or permanent repository or storage facility for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the State of Nevada; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Nevada Legislature calls on Rick Perry, the Secretary of Energy, to find the proposed repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste at Yucca Mountain unsuitable, to abandon consideration of Yucca Mountain as a repository site, and to initiate a process whereby the nation can again engage in innovative and ultimately successful strategies for dealing with the problems of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Nevada Legislature formally restates its strong and unyielding opposition to the development of Yucca Mountain as a repository for spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste and to the storage or disposal of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste in the State of Nevada; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of Energy and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage and constitutes the official position of the Nevada Legislature.

POM-57. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Michigan expressing support for the construction of a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and urge the President of the United States and United States Congress to fully fund the project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 2

Whereas, The Soo Locks at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, are of the utmost importance to Michigan and play a critical role in our nation's economy and security. Each year, approximately 10,000 Great Lakes vessels, carrying 80 million tons of iron ore, coal, grain, and other cargo, safely and efficiently traverse the locks. Nearly 80 percent of domestic iron ore—the primary material used to manufacture steel critical to the auto industry, construction, and other industries—travels from mines in Minnesota and Michigan's Upper Peninsula through the Soo Locks; and

Whereas, Only one of the four Soo Locks is large enough to accommodate the modern vessels that commonly traverse the Great Lakes. Sixty percent of the American and Canadian fleet—carrying 70 percent of the

cargo traversing the locks—can only pass through the Poe Lock. The remainder of cargo goes through the smaller MacArthur Lock, with the smallest 100-year-old Davis and Sabin locks rarely used; and

Whereas, The reliance on one lock poses a serious risk to national security and the economies of the state of Michigan and the United States. A long-term outage of the Poe Lock due to lock failure or terrorist attack would disrupt steel production in the United States, crippling the economy and plunging the country into recession. Because no viable transportation alternatives exist, the United States Department of Homeland Security estimated nearly 11 million jobs would be lost. Other studies indicate that even a short-term failure of 30 days could result in economic losses of \$160 million; and

Whereas, The United States Congress has authorized the construction of a second large, Poe-sized lock at Sault Ste. Marie. The project was originally authorized in 1986, and in 2007. Congress authorized the construction at full federal expense. Though the project has been authorized and preliminary work conducted, a lack of federal funding has stalled further work; and

Whereas, The economic benefits to Michigan, the Great Lakes region, and the entire country far outweigh the cost of constructing a new lock. A 2017 report to the United States Department of Treasury estimated that the \$626 million investment in a new lock would provide a return of up to four times that amount; and

Whereas, The construction of a new lock would be a boon for the northern Michigan economy and create good jobs in a region that continues to suffer from higher than average unemployment rates. At its peak, the project would employ up to 250 workers and require 1.5 million man hours over the 10 years of construction; and

Whereas, It is long past time to construct a new lock. The investment of federal funds in this critical infrastructure makes sound economic sense and is vital to ensure our national security. Every year we delay, the Poe Lock gets another year older, increasing the total project costs and the chances of an unanticipated closure; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, by the House of Representatives (The Senate Concurring). That we express support for the construction of a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and urge the President and Congress of the United States to fully fund the project; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the members of the Michigan congressional delegation.

POM-58. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada expressing the opposition of the Nevada Legislature to certain proposed changes to the federal laws relating to Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

#### ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 7

Whereas, For generations, after a lifetime of work and dedication to this county, many older Nevadans were forced to live in poverty without adequate health care available to them during retirement; and

Whereas, When Congress passed the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act in 1935, countless older Nevadans were lifted out of poverty and provided with an adequate, dependable source of income for their retirement; and

Whereas, When Congress passed the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965, crucial

health insurance coverage through Medicare was made available to all Nevadans over the age of 65 years, regardless of their income or medical history; and

Whereas, Subsequent amendments by Congress to Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act established near-universal health care coverage under these programs and provided many older Nevadans with additional benefits, including, without limitation, yearly cost-of-living adjustments to account for inflation, prescription drug assistance and the extension of Medicare to certain Nevadans under the age of 65 years who have long-term disabilities; and

Whereas, When Congress passed the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act in 2010, Medicare beneficiaries were able to receive certain preventive health care services and reduced costs; and

Whereas, In Fiscal Year 2015, spending on Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act constituted over one-third of the \$3.7 trillion budget of the Federal Government; and

Whereas, Wide-ranging changes to the Medicare program are being considered by the 115th Congress, including, without limitation, raising the age of eligibility to receive benefits from 65 to 67 years and repealing certain improvements that were made to this program by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; and

Whereas, Wide-ranging changes to the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act are also being considered by the 115th Congress, including, without limitation, raising the age for full retirement from 67 to 69 years, moving towards a cost-of-living adjustment based on the chained consumer price index and means testing benefits for certain recipients; and

Whereas, The 115th Congress is also considering the potential privatization of many of the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance benefits that older Nevadans have earned during decades of work; and

Whereas, The changes being considered by Congress could have a damaging effect on the standard of living of Nevadans who retire; and

Whereas, A bipartisan solution is needed to ensure the future sustainability of Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act which fully preserves the critical benefits that many older Nevadans have come to rely upon, is fiscally responsible and ensures that all Nevadans have a reliable source of income and health care during their retirement; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, By the Assembly and Senate of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge Congress to fully preserve the critical benefits which many older Nevadans have come to rely upon; and be it further

*Resolved*, That Congress should work towards establishing a bipartisan solution which avoids the privatization of Medicare and the Old-Age and Survivors Insurance provisions of the Social Security Act and strengthens these essential programs for future generations of Nevadans; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States, as the presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the Chairman of the United States House Committee on Ways and Means, the Chairman of the United States Senate Committee on Finance, the Secretary of the United States Department of Health and Human Services, the Commissioner of Social Security and

each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-59. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging Congress to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to allow the governments of the United States and the individual states to regulate and limit political contributions and expenditures to protect the integrity of elections and the equal right of all Americans to effective representation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

Whereas, The growing influence of large independent political expenditures is a great and growing concern to the people of the United States and the State of Nevada; and

Whereas, In a democracy, the assurance of a fair and uncorrupted election process is of the utmost importance, and the Nevada Legislature believes that it is a legitimate and vital role of government to regulate political expenditures in an even-handed manner; and

Whereas, In fulfillment of this important role, the government of the United States and a majority of states have regulated and limited independent and other political contributions and expenditures; and

Whereas, The Supreme Court of the United States in *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010), held that the First Amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits Congress and the states from limiting or restricting independent political expenditures by corporations and unions; and

Whereas, *Citizens United* overturned a long-standing precedent of allowing regulation of independent political expenditures; and

Whereas, *Citizens United* has served as a precedent for further legal decisions which have harmed our democratic system of government, including *American Tradition Partnership v. Bullock*, 567 U.S. 516 (2012), which struck down a long-standing Montana campaign finance law, denying a state the right to regulate independent political expenditures by corporations in state elections, and *McCutcheon v. Federal Election Commission*, 134 S.Ct. 1434 (2014), which struck down aggregate individual contribution limits; and

Whereas, The people of Nevada and all other states should have the power to limit by law the influence of money in their political systems; and

Whereas, In the wake of *Citizens United*, there has been an exponential increase in large political contributions and expenditures which threatens the integrity of the election process, corrupts our candidates, dilutes the power of individual voters and distorts the public discourse: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 79th Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution to allow the governments of the United States and the individual states to regulate political contributions and expenditures; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

*Resolved*, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MORAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1557. An original bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-130).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

\*Richard V. Spencer, of Wyoming, to be Secretary of the Navy.

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

John Kenneth Bush, of Kentucky, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Timothy J. Kelly, of the District of Columbia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

Kevin Christopher Newsom, of Alabama, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Damien Michael Schiff, of California, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

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

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

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1548. A bill to designate certain land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service in the State of Oregon as wilderness and national recreation areas and to make additional wild and scenic river designations in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 1549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a safe harbor for determinations of worker classification, to require increased reporting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. STRANGE (for himself, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1550. A bill to improve the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire and retain physicians and other employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. 1551. A bill to provide for the establishment of free market enterprise zones in order to help facilitate the creation of new jobs, entrepreneurial opportunities, enhanced and renewed educational opportuni-

ties, and increased community involvement in bankrupt or economically distressed areas; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1553. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl analogues as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1554. A bill to require certain practitioners authorized to prescribe controlled substances to complete continuing education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1555. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the administration of Post-9/11 Educational Assistance by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. UDALL, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1556. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use designated funding to pay for construction of authorized rural water projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 1557. An original bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 1558. A bill to amend section 203 of Public Law 94-305 to ensure proper authority for the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 1559. A bill to ensure a complete analysis of the potential impacts of rules on small entities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1560. A bill to ensure the integrity of border and immigration enforcement efforts by requiring U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to administer law enforcement polygraph examinations to all applicants for law enforcement positions and to require post-hire polygraph examinations for law enforcement personnel as part of periodic re-investigations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1561. A bill to repeal the Jones Act restrictions on coastwise trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 1562. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and any enablers of the activities of that Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MANCHIN:

S. 1563. A bill to authorize the Office of Fossil Energy to develop advanced separation technologies for the extraction and recovery of rare earth elements and minerals from coal and coal byproducts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARPER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. HARRIS, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1564. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for returns outside the 3-year limitation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FRANKEN:

S. 1565. A bill to support the preparation and retention of outstanding educators in all fields to ensure a bright future for children in under-resourced, under-served communities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MANCHIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1566. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for mental health services from the Department of Veterans Affairs to include members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1567. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify the authority of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to disclose certain patient information to state controlled substance monitoring programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 219. A resolution designating July 13, 2017, as "Summer Learning Day", a day to reflect on the importance of providing young people with safe, productive, and enriching activities every summer, ensuring the young people return to school in the fall with the skills vital to succeed in the year ahead; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 220. A resolution expressing solidarity with Falun Gong practitioners who have lost lives, freedoms, and rights for adhering to their beliefs and practices and condemning the practice of non-consenting organ harvesting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the ability of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to interdict fentanyl, other synthetic opioids, and other narcotics and psychoactive substances that are illegally imported into the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 926

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

S. 1002

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1002, a bill to enhance the ability of community financial institutions to foster economic growth and serve their communities, boost small businesses, increase individual savings, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reform the rights and processes relating to appeals of decisions regarding claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1024, *supra*.

S. 1028

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1028, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1050

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) 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. 1182

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1182, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

S. 1307

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility to receive refundable tax credits for coverage under a qualified health plan.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1353, a bill to require States to automatically register eligible voters to vote in elections for Federal offices, and for other purposes.

S. 1391

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1391, a bill to amend title IV of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 to restore Medicaid coverage for citizens of the Freely Associated States lawfully residing in the United States under the Compacts of Free Association between the Government of the United States and the Governments of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau.

S. 1426

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1426, a bill to amend the Ted Stevens Olympic and Amateur Sports Act to expand the purposes of the corporation, to designate the United States Center for Safe Sport, and for other purposes.

S. 1455

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1455, a bill to amend the United States Energy Storage Competitiveness Act of 2007 to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish new goals for the Department of Energy relating to energy storage and to carry out certain demonstration projects relating to energy storage.

S. 1457

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr.

RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1457, a bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out demonstration projects relating to advanced nuclear reactor technologies to support domestic energy needs.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Energy, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality from considering, in taking any action, the social cost of carbon, the social cost of methane, the social cost of nitrous oxide, or the social cost of any other greenhouse gas, unless compliant with Office of Management and Budget guidance, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1529, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand eligibility for the refundable credit for coverage under a qualified health plan.

S. 1532

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1532, a bill to disqualify from operating a commercial motor vehicle for life an individual who uses a commercial motor vehicle in committing a felony involving human trafficking.

S. 1536

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1536, a bill to designate a human trafficking prevention coordinator and to expand the scope of activities authorized under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's outreach and education program to include human trafficking prevention activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1540

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1540, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for investments in qualified production facilities.

S. RES. 211

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 211, a resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. FLAKE:

S. 1552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals to designate that up to 10 percent of their income tax liability be used to reduce the national debt, and to require spending reductions equal to the amounts so designated; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a critical subject too often overlooked by Congress. It is the Federal debt and our deficit.

It is no secret that our national debt will soon surpass \$20 trillion. To provide some context for that figure, \$20 trillion represents the largest amount of debt ever owed by any nation in history. This fact, coupled with the fast-approaching end to our fiscal year, will leave Congress facing an unavoidable debt debate.

Our looming debt and deficit are two of our country's most urgent challenges, but the legislative branch does not treat them like the crises they really are. Since January alone, Congress has added \$284 billion to the debt over the next 10 years. The Congressional Budget Office recently projected that if Congress continues on its current path, deficits will increase dramatically over the next decade. Specifically, by 2027, the deficit will grow from 3.6 percent of the Nation's GDP to 5.2 percent of the Nation's GDP, totaling \$1.4 trillion. Yet, as the National Debt Clock continues to click upward toward \$20 trillion, the Federal Government continues to spend money that it simply does not have.

If Congress continues to legislate in this current state of denial, one day soon, we may well wake up to discover that the financial markets have declared that the United States is no longer a good bet. We must also remember that Congress's failure to address this fiscal train wreck today will force our children and grandchildren to deal with its consequences tomorrow. Unless Congress can get this fundamental issue under control, nothing else will matter very much.

There ought to be an option that allows taxpayers to take matters into their own hands. That is why today I am reintroducing the Debt Buy-Down Act. The Debt Buy-Down Act is a commonsense bill that allows taxpayers to rein in the national debt with the simple check of a box. If passed, this bill would require the IRS to include an option on individuals' tax forms that allow them to voluntarily designate up to 10 percent of their tax liabilities to go specifically toward reducing the national debt. The bill would then require Congress to reduce Federal spending by an amount equivalent to that designated by the taxpayers. If Congress fails to make these necessary spending reductions designated by taxpayers, then across-the-board spending cuts would be imposed.

This is not a good way to reduce the Federal debt. The better way would be to make priorities as we consider our spending bills, but it is better than just

letting these spending bills go and doing nothing. We ought to use a scalpel and go in and treat these programs as we should and make sure they are doing what they were intended to. If we cannot do that, then we need to take dramatic measures to get our debt and deficit under control.

The Debt Buy-Down Act would protect Social Security benefits, benefits for those in the uniformed services, and payments for net interest on the national debt from being included in any of these across-the-board cuts.

Simply put, in the absence of responsible Federal budget solutions, this bill allows taxpayers to take matters into their own hands. In 2014, Americans paid over \$1.37 trillion in individual income taxes. If every one of these individuals had contributed 10 percent of their tax liability, Congress would have been required to have cut \$137 billion in spending. While \$137 billion does not solve our \$20 trillion debt problem, it is certainly a good place to start.

Congress has been so desensitized to the growing national debt that the word "trillion" does not even raise alarm bells anymore. In fact, after I introduced the Debt Buy-Down Act in 2010, I began sending a weekly, pun-laden press release to help put the then-\$13 trillion national debt—just in 2010—into perspective. It was called "So Just How Broke Are We?" Maybe it is time to bring it back.

So 7 years and \$7 trillion in added debt later, just how broke are we today? We are so broke that, with our \$20 trillion national debt, we could book 570,000 trips to the Moon on SpaceX. It is a pretty expensive excursion, but we could do it 570,000 times. We are so broke that, with our \$20 trillion national debt, we could buy every seat at Chase Field in Phoenix for the next 22 million Arizona Diamondbacks games. Of course, that is just a ballpark figure, but it is the last pun. I promise. We are so broke that with our \$20 trillion national debt we could buy 20 billion tickets to see Hamilton.

My love of bad puns and jokes aside, instead of thinking about how \$20 trillion could be spent, maybe we ought to start thinking about how \$20 trillion could be saved.

That is why I am calling on my colleagues to support the Debt Buy-Down Act and empower taxpayers to reduce the national debt. Just think, a simple check of a box would help save billions of dollars and preserve the strength of our national economy. It would save future generations from the consequences of our crippling national debt.

At any rate, I hope this bill makes like the debt and grows a lot of interest.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

S. 1553. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to list fentanyl analogues as schedule I controlled substances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an epidemic that is sweeping our Nation. From big cities to small towns, communities across our country have been ravaged by drug addiction and the multiple problems caused by it. Opioid overdoses have quadrupled since 1999 and were responsible for over 33,000 deaths in 2015 alone.

We have all seen the dangers posed by the overprescription of highly addictive prescription opioids. According to the CDC, addiction to prescription opioid painkillers is the primary gateway to heroin abuse. In fact, Michael Botticelli, President Obama's drug czar, testified in my committee last year that people who are addicted and abuse prescription opioids are 40 times more likely to abuse heroin.

Almost all of the heroin sold on the streets of the United States today enters the country illegally from Mexico. It is trafficked by drug cartels into our communities through our porous southwest border.

It is a problem that continues to grow. Even as heroin has increased, it has remained available and affordable because increased production in Mexico has ensured a reliable supply of low-cost heroin. As long as there is a demand, the enormous profit potential of the drug trade will ensure that there is a sufficient supply. A kilogram of heroin can be produced in Mexico for around \$5,000. It can be sold to dealers for as much as \$80,000—a 1,500 percent profit.

At another committee hearing, we learned that heroin has significantly dropped in price. In 1981, the nationwide average price was \$3,260 per gram of pure heroin. Today, it is between \$100 and \$150 per gram. That translates into as little as \$10 for one hit, making heroin a very affordable and very destructive addiction. While prices have dropped, the potency has increased. Heroin sold in Wisconsin has increased from 5 percent purity in the 1980s to somewhere between 20 percent and 80 percent purity today.

As awful as that reality is, imported heroin is only one front in our fight against opioids. Another equally dangerous front is synthetic or man-made opioids—particularly fentanyl and its analogs—which are now commonly mixed into the heroin sold in our communities. Since fentanyl is 50 times more potent than heroin and 100 times more potent than morphine, it only takes a minuscule amount of fentanyl—just 2 milligrams, less than one one-thousandth of the weight of a penny—to be potentially lethal.

Even more alarming, we are now beginning to see carfentanil, often used to sedate elephants, also being blended into heroin and fentanyl on the streets. Carfentanil is 100 times more potent than fentanyl and 10,000 times more potent than morphine. A dose of carfentanil the size of a grain of salt can lead to a deadly overdose.



Just as we are seeing an increase in drugs coming across our southwest border, man-made opioids are on the rise as well. The profit potential of fentanyl is even more staggering than heroin's. According to an article in the Wall Street Journal, 25 grams of fentanyl costs approximately \$810 to produce and has a market value of \$800,000.

In 2013, 3,097 people died from overdoses involving synthetic opioids. Just 1 year later, we lost 5,544 people to that same drug—a 79-percent increase in just 1 year. My home State of Wisconsin has been particularly hard hit by the introduction of fentanyl and its analogs.

In April, 2016, I met Lauri Badura. Lauri is from Oconomowoc, WI, a suburb in Milwaukee. She lost her son Archie to a heroin overdose.

Here is a picture of Archie. He doesn't exactly look like a heroin addict, does he? Archie was just 19 years old when he died. He began using marijuana during his freshman year in high school and discovered opioids the summer after his high school graduation. After overdosing multiple times and trying to quit, Archie had stayed sober for 77 days before he relapsed again and finally overdosed on May 15, 2014.

In Archie's memory, Lauri started a foundation called Saving Others For Archie, or SOFA. Her organization raises awareness throughout Wisconsin of the dangers of drug abuse. It offers support for families battling addiction. Lauri is constantly being contacted by and providing comfort to other parents coping with similar tragedies.

Lauri's story is moving, and I applaud her for being such a strong advocate for those struggling with addiction. Unfortunately, her tragedy is not unique. The scourge of addiction and overdose deaths has devastated thousands of families, including my own.

In January, 2016, I lost a nephew to a fentanyl overdose. The legislation I am introducing this afternoon is in memory of my nephew, of Archie, and of all of the families in Wisconsin and throughout America who have lost loved ones in this epidemic.

Today I am proud to introduce the Stopping Overdoses of Fentanyl Analogues Act, or SOFA Act. Sharing an acronym with Lauri Badura's organization, the SOFA Act will give law enforcement a set of enhanced tools to combat the opioid epidemic by closing a loophole that criminal drug manufacturers are exploiting.

Fentanyl is a synthetic, or man-made, opioid—the result of complex chemistry that brings together multiple building blocks. Criminal chemists need change only one small piece of the chemical bond to be one step ahead of the law. The fentanyl analogs on the street today serve no known medical purpose and are contributing to the alarming overdose rates throughout the country. My legislation would classify these analogs under schedule I and give the DEA tools to quickly schedule additional fentanyl

analogues as they are identified in our communities.

This body took a step forward last Congress when we passed the CARA legislation to improve addiction treatment programs throughout the United States. We can now take another important step forward by providing law enforcement with the tools it needs to get these dangerous synthetic opioids, such as fentanyl and carfentanil, off the streets.

In addition to Lauri Badura, I also want to thank Dr. Tim Westlake for working with me to craft this legislation. Tim has testified at a committee field hearing in Pewaukee, and he participated in an opioid roundtable in Milwaukee I convened in September. His leadership in Wisconsin and on this issue has been invaluable.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this legislation and additional opportunities to combat this serious problem that has plagued our Nation.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 1560. A bill to ensure the integrity of border and immigration enforcement efforts by requiring U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to administer law enforcement polygraph examinations to all applicants for law enforcement positions and to require post-hire polygraph examinations for law enforcement personnel as part of periodic reinvestigations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

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

S. 1560

*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 "Integrity in Border and Immigration Enforcement Act".

**SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.**

In this Act:

(1) **LAW ENFORCEMENT POSITION.**—The term "law enforcement position" means any law enforcement position in U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") or U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement ("ICE").

(2) **POLYGRAPH EXAMINATION.**—The term "polygraph examination" means the Law Enforcement Pre-Employment Test certified by the National Center for Credibility Assessment.

**SEC. 3. POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL.**

(a) **APPLICANTS.**—Beginning not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security—

(1) shall require that polygraph examinations are conducted on all applicants for law enforcement positions; and

(2) may not hire any applicant for a law enforcement position who does not pass a polygraph examination.

(b) **TARGETED POLYGRAPH REINVESTIGATIONS.**—Beginning not later than 90 days

after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, as part of each background reinvestigation, shall administer a polygraph examination to—

(1) every CBP law enforcement employee who is determined by the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to be part of a population at risk of corruption or misconduct, based on an analysis of past incidents of misconduct and corruption; and

(2) every ICE law enforcement employee who is determined by the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to be part of a population at risk of corruption or misconduct, based on an analysis of past incidents of misconduct and corruption.

(c) **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO DETERMINE TARGETED POLYGRAPH EXAMINATIONS.**—The Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security may—

(1) delegate the authority under subsection (b)(1) to the CBP Office of Professional Responsibility; and

(2) delegate the authority under subsection (b)(2) to the ICE Office of Professional Responsibility.

(d) **RANDOM POLYGRAPH REINVESTIGATIONS.**—Beginning not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) randomly administer a polygraph examination each year to at least 5 percent of CBP law enforcement employees who are undergoing background reinvestigations during that year and have not been selected for a targeted polygraph examination under subsection (b)(1); and

(2) randomly administer a polygraph examination each year to at least 5 percent of ICE law enforcement employees who are undergoing background reinvestigations during that year and have not been selected for a targeted polygraph examination under subsection (b)(2).

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1561. A bill to repeal the Jones Act restrictions on coastwise trade, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to introduce the Open America's Waters Act of 2017. This bill would repeal the Merchant Marine Act of 1920, better known as the Jones Act, an archaic and burdensome law that hinders free trade, stifles the economy and ultimately hurts consumers, largely for the benefit of labor unions. If this legislation becomes law, U.S. shippers will no longer be required to patronize market inefficiency but rather, effectively leverage the global shipping market.

As many of my colleagues know, the Jones Act is one of many of laws passed over time that addresses port-to-port coastal shipping, drafted in order to protect the U.S. domestic shipping industry. While the Jones Act may have had some rationale back in the 1920s when it was enacted, today it serves only to raise shipping costs, making U.S. farmers and businesses less competitive in the global marketplace and increasing costs for American consumers. This protectionist mentality directly contradicts the lessons our nation has learned about the many benefits of a free and open market. Repeatedly, it has been proven that trade liberalization has created



jobs, expanded economic growth and provided consumers with access to lower cost goods and services.

The forced purchase of American vessels combined with the immense cost associated with U.S. shipbuilding has forced U.S. shippers to act against their best interests to the detriment of their businesses. While foreign-built coastal-sized ships typically cost between \$25–30 million, a U.S.-made ship of the same size can cost anywhere between \$190–250 million. A repeal of the Jones Act, over time, would have broad impact. According to a 2002 U.S. International Trade Commission study, repealing the Jones Act would lower shipping costs by about 22 percent. The Commission also found that repealing the Jones Act would have an annual positive effect of \$656 million on the overall U.S. economy. Though this decade-and-a-half-old study provides some of the most recent statistics available, it is not hard to imagine the modern affect that maritime deregulation would contribute to this industry.

Congress must take action to repeal laws that have outlived their usefulness and are no longer relevant to modern commerce. It is unacceptable that millions of dollars in the U.S. economy are lost every year to an antiquated policy, and unacceptable that this body is unable to disengage from special interests in order to participate in a productive debate on this issue. I encourage my colleagues to reflect on our responsibility as lawmakers and see the Jones Act for what it really is: an outdated and protectionist policy that only serves to harm the American economy and consumer.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

**SENATE RESOLUTION 219—DESIGNATING JULY 13, 2017, AS “SUMMER LEARNING DAY”, A DAY TO REFLECT ON THE IMPORTANCE OF PROVIDING YOUNG PEOPLE WITH SAFE, PRODUCTIVE, AND ENRICHING ACTIVITIES EVERY SUMMER, ENSURING THE YOUNG PEOPLE RETURN TO SCHOOL IN THE FALL WITH THE SKILLS VITAL TO SUCCEED IN THE YEAR AHEAD**

Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 219

Whereas summer learning loss widens an already existing achievement gap that stays constant during the 9-month school year;

Whereas summer learning loss disproportionately impacts the learning of children from lower-income households or with special educational needs;

Whereas, during the summer, students lose approximately 2 months of grade level equivalency in math computation skills and low-income students lose an additional 2 months in reading achievement;

Whereas effective summer programs can bridge the eighth to ninth grade transition and strategically decrease dropout rates of high risk students;

Whereas only 1 in 7 students received the nutrition and meals they needed during the summer of 2016;

Whereas summer learning programs contribute to the academic and social growth of students, provide safe and healthy spaces for children during the summer, and give young people the tools necessary for success in school;

Whereas summer youth employment programs provide young people with access to meaningful experiences that foster interest in potential careers, encourage financial and personal responsibility, and emphasize community engagement;

Whereas many organizations, including public agencies, schools, libraries, museums, recreation centers, camps, and businesses, assist with the personal development of young people through summer activities;

Whereas students who do not receive supervision during the summer are far more likely to receive poor grades, exhibit behavioral issues, and drop out of school;

Whereas summer learning contributes to increasing high school graduation rates; and

Whereas summer learning is a crucial component in ensuring that all students graduate from high school and emerge ready for the next endeavor, which may be to attend college or start a career: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate designates July 13, 2017, as “Summer Learning Day”.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 220—EXPRESSING SOLIDARITY WITH FALUN GONG PRACTITIONERS WHO HAVE LOST LIVES, FREEDOMS, AND RIGHTS FOR ADHERING TO THEIR BELIEFS AND PRACTICES AND CONDEMNING THE PRACTICE OF NON-CONSENTING ORGAN HARVESTING, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 220

Whereas Falun Gong (also known as Falun Dafa) is a Chinese spiritual discipline founded by Li Hongzhi in 1992 that consists of spiritual and moral teachings, meditation, and exercise, and is based upon the universal principles of truthfulness, compassion, and forbearance;

Whereas, during the mid-1990s, Falun Gong acquired a large and diverse following, with as many as 70,000,000 practitioners at its peak;

Whereas, on April 25, 1999, an estimated 10,000 to 30,000 Falun Gong practitioners gathered in Beijing to protest growing restrictions by the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the activities of Falun Gong practitioners, and the Government of the People’s Republic of China responded with an intensive, comprehensive, and unforgiving campaign against the movement that began on July 20, 1999, with the banning of Falun Gong;

Whereas the Constitution of the People’s Republic of China guarantees basic rights, including the freedoms of speech, association, demonstration, and religion;

Whereas, in 1993, the Government of the People’s Republic of China praised Li Hongzhi for his contributions in “safeguarding social order and security” and “promoting rectitude in society”;

Whereas, in many detention facilities and labor camps, Falun Gong prisoners of conscience have at times comprised the majority of the population, and have been said to receive the longest sentences and the worst treatment, including torture;

Whereas, according to overseas Falun Gong and human rights organizations, since 1999, from several hundred to a few thousand Falun Gong adherents have died in custody from torture, abuse, and neglect;

Whereas a review of the Government of the People’s Republic of China by the United Nations Human Rights Council’s Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review in October 2013 recommended that China “[s]top the prosecution and persecution of people for the practice of their religion or belief including Catholics, other Christians, Tibetans, Uyghurs, and Falun Gong”;

Whereas the United Nations Committee Against Torture and the Special Rapporteur on Torture have expressed concern over the allegations of organ harvesting from Falun Gong prisoners, and have called on the Government of the People’s Republic of China to increase accountability and transparency in the organ transplant system and punish those responsible for abuses;

Whereas the killing of religious or political prisoners for the purpose of selling their organs for transplant is an egregious and intolerable violation of the fundamental right to life;

Whereas voluntary and informed consent is the precondition for ethical organ donation, and international medical organizations state that prisoners, deprived of their freedom, are not in the position to give free consent and that the practice of sourcing organs from prisoners is a violation of ethical guidelines in medicine;

Whereas the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Communist Party of China continue to deny reports that many organs are taken without the consent of prisoners, yet at the same time prevent independent verification of its transplant system;

Whereas the organ transplantation system in China does not comply with the World Health Organization’s requirement of transparency and traceability in organ procurement pathways;

Whereas the United States Department of State Country Report on Human Rights for China for 2014 stated, “Advocacy groups continued to report instances of organ harvesting from prisoners.”;

Whereas Huang Jiefu, director of the China Organ Donation Committee, announced in December 2014 that China would end the practice of organ harvesting from executed prisoners by January 1, 2015, but did not directly address organ harvesting from prisoners of conscience;

Whereas Freedom House reported in 2015 that Falun Gong practitioners comprise the largest portion of prisoners of conscience in China, and face an elevated risk of dying or being killed in custody;

Whereas the Department of State Country Report on Human Rights for China for 2016 reported that “some international medical professionals and human rights researchers questioned the voluntary nature of the (transplantation) system, the accuracy of official statistics, and official claims about the source of organs”;

Whereas the Congressional-Executive Commission on China (CECC) stated in 2016 that “international observers, including the U.S. House of Representatives and the European

Parliament, expressed concern over reports that numerous organ transplantations have used the organs of detained prisoners, including Falun Gong practitioners" and also noted that international medical professionals "expressed skepticism of reforms raised by discrepancies in official data"; and

Whereas a 2017 report by Freedom House concluded that there was "credible evidence suggesting that beginning in the early 2000s, Falun Gong detainees were killed for their organs on a large scale": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) expresses solidarity with Falun Gong practitioners and their families for the lives, freedoms, and rights they lost for adhering to their beliefs and practices;

(2) emphasizes to the Government of the People's Republic of China that freedom of religion includes the right of Falun Gong practitioners to freely practice Falun Gong in China;

(3) calls upon the Communist Party of China to immediately cease and desist from its campaign to persecute Falun Gong practitioners and promptly release all Falun Gong practitioners who have been confined, detained, or imprisoned for pursuing their right to hold and exercise their spiritual beliefs;

(4) condemns the practice of non-consenting organ harvesting in the People's Republic of China;

(5) calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China to immediately end the practice of organ harvesting from all prisoners of conscience; and

(6) calls on the People's Republic of China to allow an independent and transparent investigation into organ transplant abuses.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 258. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

**SA 258.** Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 1519, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title VII, add the following:

**SEC. 710. EXCEPTION TO INCREASE IN COST-SHARING REQUIREMENTS FOR TRICARE PHARMACY BENEFITS PROGRAM FOR BENEFICIARIES WHO LIVE MORE THAN 40 MILES FROM A MILITARY TREATMENT FACILITY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding paragraph (6) of section 1074g(a) of title 10, United States Code, as amended by section 706(a), the Secretary of Defense may not increase after the date of the enactment of this Act any cost-sharing amounts under such paragraph with respect to covered beneficiaries described in subsection (b).

(b) COVERED BENEFICIARIES DESCRIBED.—Covered beneficiaries described in this subsection are eligible covered beneficiaries (as defined in section 1074g(g) of title 10, United States Code) who live more than 40 miles driving distance from the closest military treatment facility to the residence of the beneficiary.

(c) REPORT ON EFFECT OF INCREASE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on the potential effect, without regard to subsection (a), of the increase in cost-sharing amounts under section 1074g(a)(6) of title 10, United States Code, on covered beneficiaries described in subsection (b).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of how much additional costs would be required of covered beneficiaries described in subsection (b) per year as a result of increases in cost-sharing amounts described in such paragraph, including the average amount per individual and the aggregate amount.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have 9 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017 at 10 a.m., in 328A Russell Senate Office Building, in order to conduct a hearing entitled "Opportunities in Global and Local Markets, Specialty Crops, and Organics: Perspectives for the 2018 Farm Bill."

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in open session, to receive testimony on the attempted coup in Montenegro and malign Russian influence in Europe.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017 at 9:30 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, "The Semiannual Monetary Policy Report to the Congress."

#### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 10:15 a.m., in 215 Dirksen Senate Office Building, to consider the nomination of Kevin K. McAleenan, of Hawaii, to be Commissioner of United States Customs and Border Protection Department of Homeland Security.

#### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017 at 9:30 a.m., to hold a hearing entitled "Review of the 2017 Trafficking in Persons Report."

#### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate, in order to conduct a hearing entitled "Nomination Hearing for Deputy Secretary of Labor and Members of the National Labor Relations Board" on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room 430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

#### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on July 13, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct an executive business meeting.

#### COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Senate Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the 115th Congress of the U.S. Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017 from 2 p.m., in room SH-219 of the Senate Hart Office Building to hold a closed hearing.

#### COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate on Thursday, July 13, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room 253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The Committee will hold a Subcommittee Hearing on "Reopening the American Frontier: Promoting Partnerships Between Commercial Space and the U.S. Government to Advance Exploration and Settlement."

#### PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Felicia Lucci, an AAAS fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's session of the Senate.

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

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 2430

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2430) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to revise and extend the user-fee programs for prescription drugs, medical devices, generic drugs, and biosimilar biological products, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place

the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

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

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JULY 17, 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, July 17; 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; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Shanahan nomination; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote on the Shanahan nomination occur at 5:30 p.m., Monday, July 17.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JULY 17, 2017, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:57 p.m., adjourned until Monday, July 17, 2017, at 3 p.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

##### COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

ROSTIN BEHNAM, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF THE COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 19, 2021. VICE MARK P. WETJEN, RESIGNED.

##### THE JUDICIARY

MICHAEL LAWRENCE BROWN, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE JULIE E. CARNES, ELEVATED.

WILLIAM L. CAMPBELL, JR., OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE KEVIN HUNTER SHARP, RESIGNED.

THOMAS ALVIN FARR, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, VICE MALCOLM J. HOWARD, RETIRED.

CHARLES BARNES GOODWIN, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA, VICE ROBIN J. CAUTHRON, RETIRED.

MARK SAALFIELD NORRIS, SR., OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE J. DANIEL BREEN, RETIRED.

THOMAS LEE ROBINSON PARKER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE SAMUEL H. MAYS, JR., RETIRED.

WILLIAM M. RAY II, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE HAROLD L. MURPHY, RETIRED.

ELI JEREMY RICHARDSON, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, VICE TODD CAMPBELL, RETIRED.

TILMAN EUGENE SELF III, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE C. ASHLEY ROYAL, RETIRED.

##### IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE

OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

##### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JOHN D. SLOCUM

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

##### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ANTHONY J. CARRELLI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be major general

BRIG. GEN. SAM C. BARRETT

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

##### To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL N. ADAME  
COL. JAIME A. AREIZAGA  
COL. THOMAS G. BEHLING  
COL. KAREN A. BERRY  
COL. ROBYN J. BLADER  
COL. DARRELL L. BUTTERS  
COL. ROBERT B. DAVIS  
COL. STEPHEN M. DOYLE  
COL. JOHN J. DRISCOLL  
COL. LARRY D. FLETCHER  
COL. DAVID A. GAGNON  
COL. TERRY L. GRISHAM  
COL. ANDREW M. HARRIS  
COL. HERMAN W. HOLT  
COL. TODD H. HUBBARD  
COL. JONATHAN S. HUBBARD  
COL. MANLEY JAMES  
COL. DAVID M. JENKINS  
COL. JOHN T. KELLY  
COL. STEVEN J. KREMER  
COL. SCOTT M. MACLEOD  
COL. SHARON A. MARTIN  
COL. BRIAN R. NESVIK  
COL. DONALD D. PEREZ  
COL. STEPHEN M. RADULSKI  
COL. CARL T. REESE  
COL. ROBERT K. RYAN  
COL. LAWRENCE E. SCHLOEGL  
COL. GRANT C. SLAYDEN  
COL. TROY J. SOUKUP  
COL. BRIAN E. TATE  
COL. JEFFREY M. TERRILL  
COL. PATRICK C. THIBODEAU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

##### To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN C. ANDONIE  
COL. JIMMIE L. COLE  
COL. WILLIAM T. CONWAY  
COL. JEFFREY L. COPELAND  
COL. PETER B. CROSS  
COL. JON M. HARRISON  
COL. STEFANIE K. HORVATH  
COL. LOWELL E. KRUSE  
COL. HALDANE B. LAMBERTON  
COL. STEPHEN F. LOGAN  
COL. FRANKLIN D. POWELL  
COL. CARLTON G. SMITH  
COL. TIMOTHY N. THOMBLESON  
COL. CYNTHIA K. TINKHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

##### To be brigadier general

COL. SAMUEL AGOSTOSANTIAGO  
COL. HERBERT J. BROCK IV  
COL. CHARLES G. CODY  
COL. CHARLES T. CROSBY  
COL. JAKIE R. DAVIS, JR.  
COL. MARK D. DROWN  
COL. CURTIS W. FAULK  
COL. TIMOTHY A. GLYNN  
COL. RICHARD A. GRAY  
COL. GREGORY J. HADFIELD  
COL. THOMAS W. HANLEY  
COL. SHAWN W. HARRIS  
COL. RALPH F. HEDENBERG  
COL. JACKIE A. HUBER  
COL. DAVID T. HUNFREDI  
COL. JUDITH D. MARTIN  
COL. JOHN K. MULLER  
COL. WILLIAM M. MYER  
COL. RALPH R. MYERS, JR.  
COL. ERIC J. OH  
COL. AMOS F. PARKER, JR.  
COL. JOSEPH K. PEARCE  
COL. DEBRA D. RICE  
COL. DOUGLAS C. ROSE, JR.  
COL. MARK J. SCHINDLER  
COL. FARIN D. SCHWARTZ  
COL. RONALD F. TAYLOR  
COL. DANIEL L. TOWNSEND

COL. WILLIAM L. ZANA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. RYAN F. GONSALVES

##### IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) WILLIAM R. MERZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JOHN D. ALEXANDER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. PAUL A. STADER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

##### To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOHN C. AQUILINO

##### IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

##### To be lieutenant colonel

WILLIAM O. MURRAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be lieutenant colonel

PATRICK R. WILDE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be colonel

JEFF H. MCDONALD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

##### To be lieutenant colonel

EDWARD V. ABRAHAMSON  
THOMAS C. ADKINS  
MICHELLE I. AETONU  
DAVID M. ALVAREZ  
TREG E. ANGLETZ  
HEIDI E. ANDERSON  
CHARLES L. ARNOLD  
CHARLES D. AUSMAN  
MICHELLE D. BARBEE  
BEAU J. BARKER  
ISAAC L. BATES  
JOSEPH H. BASTISTE, JR.  
JOSHUA J. BAXTER  
CORINNE F. BELL  
PAUL N. BELMONT III  
DAMON F. BENNETT  
JEANETTE E. BERNAOLA  
KEN R. BERNIER  
RODNEY G. BILBREW  
TOBY A. BIRDSILL  
MATTHEW J. BISSWURM  
DAVID J. BLANCHARD  
JASON D. BOHANNON  
PERRY R. BOLDING  
WENY E. BOLTON  
DALE P. BOND, JR.  
BENJAMIN D. BORING  
MICHAEL D. BOYLES  
ERIC A. BROOKS  
WILLIAM D. BROSEY  
DEVIN J. BROWN  
KENNETH R. BULTHUIS  
JENNIFER A. BURGESS  
KEVIN R. BURGESS  
ERIC M. BURKE  
THADDEUS L. BURNETT  
STEPHEN M. BUSSELL  
THEODORE G. CAPRA  
CRYSTAL L. CARBERRY  
JEFFREY T. CARLSON  
JASON E. CARNEY  
JESSICA R. CARTER  
KURSTEEN N. CHAMPAGNE  
EDWARD CHO  
TENN R. CHOWFEN  
LUKE R. CLOVER  
JENNIE E. CONLON  
JOE CONTRERAS

CHARLES W. CONWAY, JR.  
 JERIMIAH J. CORBIN  
 PHILIP D. CORDARO  
 MARK R. CORN  
 AARON M. CORNETT  
 JAVIER A. CORTEZ  
 THOMAS U. CRARY III  
 JOSE A. CRESPO  
 RICHARD CRUZ  
 KIZZY M. DANSER  
 SHAALIM H. DAVID  
 ALBERT W. DAVIS  
 JOSEPH H. DAVIS  
 MATTHEW W. DAVIS  
 THEODORE DAVIS, JR.  
 MAUREEN A. DAVISBERK  
 MARTIN J. DEBOCK  
 CHRISTINE A. DESAINE  
 CHRISTOPHER L. DIEDRICH  
 RODLIN D. DOYLE  
 JASON J. DUMSER  
 BRYAN R. DUNCAN  
 CLAYTON J. DUNCAN  
 JOSEPH P. DZVONIK  
 SAMUEL J. ESKEW  
 ROBIN R. EVANS  
 DENIS J. FAJARDO  
 KENDRICK D. FANNIEL  
 TAMMY A. FANNIEL  
 HUGHIE E. FEWELL  
 JAMES T. FISHER  
 CHANDLER G. FISK  
 CARLITO O. FLORES  
 MIGUEL A. FLORESRIVERA  
 FELICIA R. FLOYD  
 LATOSHA D. FLOYD  
 ERIN H. FRAZIER  
 DEANDRE L. GARNER  
 JULIE J. M. GILBERT  
 YOLANDA D. GORE  
 DANILLO A. GREEN  
 WILLIAM J. GREGORY  
 JEREMY A. GROOVER  
 EDWARD M. GUTIERREZ  
 EDWARD A. HALSTEAD  
 AAREN M. HANSON  
 DAVID O. HARLAN  
 DORIAN C. HATCHER  
 HEATH R. HAWKES  
 STEVEN T. HELM  
 PATRICK M. HENRICH  
 RUSSELL E. HENRY  
 DANIEL P. HENZIE  
 JEFFREY R. HERNANDEZ  
 ANDREW W. HESS  
 CHRISTOPHER M. HETZ  
 GEORGE A. HILL  
 TRAVIS W. HILL, SR.  
 LINWOOD R. HILTON  
 JEREMIAH S. HIRRAS  
 JOHN D. HNYDA  
 JASON R. HOLLAND  
 YEMSRACH B. HOLLEY  
 ROY K. HORIKAWA  
 MICHAEL E. HORKAY  
 JEREMIAH J. HULL  
 LAURA G. HUTCHINSON  
 CARMEN J. IGLESIAS  
 DELIA L. IHASZ  
 SUNG J. IN  
 ADRIAN F. JASSO  
 MATTHEW D. JOHNSON  
 JAMES R. JOHNSTON  
 AARON L. JONES  
 ANGELO G. KELLUM  
 BRENT D. KENNEDY  
 BENJAMIN L. KILGORE  
 TURMEL A. KINDRED  
 CARL K. KLEINHOLZ  
 JASON W. KLOPF  
 GEORGE P. KLOPPENBURG  
 VIRGINIA A. KNORR  
 PAMELA D. KOPPELMANN  
 EBONY S. LAMBERT  
 ERNEST J. LANE II  
 LATRINA D. LEE  
 MICHAEL J. LEE  
 TYRONE D. LEE  
 CHRISTINA M. LEWIS  
 MICHELLE A. LEWIS  
 PAUL Z. LICATA  
 MICHAEL A. LIND  
 ROSS B. LINDSEY  
 FLOR Y. LOPEZ  
 BRIAN I. LUST  
 KENSANDRA T. MACK  
 MELISSA N. MAJANO  
 THOMAS D. MALONE  
 CANDICE MARTIN  
 ELIZABETH S. MASON  
 CATHY L. MASSEY  
 JAMES B. MATTOX  
 GEORGE B. MAY, JR.  
 JEFFREY S. MAY  
 JAMES D. MCCONNELL  
 JUSTIN M. MCCOVERN  
 STUART I. MCMILLAN  
 SHAUN D. MCMURCHIE  
 CHATA MEADOR  
 DUSTIN A. MENHART  
 JUSTIN L. MILLER  
 MATTHEW C. MILLER  
 JOSEPH S. MINOR  
 MELVIN T. MITCHELL  
 MONICA S. MITCHELL  
 CHAD L. MONIZ  
 CLARENCE L. MONTAGUE

ANDRA A. MOORE  
 STACY L. MOORE  
 JONATHAN R. MORRIS  
 MERNA C. MORRIS  
 VINSON B. MORRIS  
 DONYA K. MOSLEY  
 JILL MOSS  
 PHILLIP P. MURRELL  
 WILLIAM NAVARRO  
 JOHNATHON W. NELSON  
 DOUGLAS S. NEWELL  
 RYAN P. NOBIS  
 ROBERT R. OLIVER  
 SETH M. OLMSTEAD  
 ERIC E. ORJH  
 SCOTT A. PARLOW  
 JAMES W. PAUL  
 FELIPE PEREZ, JR.  
 JULIAN PEREZ  
 MICHAEL O. PERRY  
 MATTHEW O. PETERSON  
 CHRISTOPHER D. PETREE  
 BRIAN J. PIEKIELKO  
 GEORGE J. PLYS  
 STEPHEN A. POLACEK  
 JAMES A. POLAK  
 JASON H. POLK  
 JOSHUA D. PORTER  
 WILLIAM PRINCE, JR.  
 KIMBERLY D. PRINGLE  
 LAKETHA D. PRIOLEAU  
 KEITH E. PRUETT  
 ALICIA L. PRUITT  
 PRESTON G. PYSH  
 DARE A. RAPANOTTI  
 JUSTIN M. REDFERN  
 ERIN M. REED  
 DONALD R. REEVES, JR.  
 HEATHER M. REILLY  
 TROY D. REITER  
 LUZILDA P. RESTREPO  
 WILLIAM J. RICHARDSON  
 CHRISTINA L. RIVAS  
 NADINE I. ROSS  
 RAMON C. SALAS  
 SCOTT D. SAVOIE  
 ERIC J. SCHILLING  
 MICHAEL K. SCHULTE  
 CURT H. SCHULTHEIS  
 HEATHER J. SHARPLESS  
 MICHAEL L. SHAW  
 DANIEL J. SHILL  
 BRIAN K. SHOEMAKER  
 KELVIN V. SIMMONS  
 MATTHEW E. SIMPSON  
 DONNA S. SIMS  
 BECKY SIU  
 MARIE F. SLACK  
 BRIAN J. SLOTNICK  
 ARJEAN A. SMITH  
 BRADLEY A. SMITH  
 DONALD P. SMITH  
 PAUL W. SMITH  
 SAMUEL D. SMITH, SR.  
 TARA D. SMITH  
 ANGELA L. SMOOT  
 KARL F. SONDERMANN  
 PETER J. STAMBERSKY  
 BRIAN C. STEELE  
 JULIE M. STOCKELMAN  
 NATHAN A. STROHM  
 JEFFREY J. STVAN  
 ADRIAN J. SULLIVAN  
 ERIC D. SUTTON  
 SHAWN M. SVOBODA  
 RYAN H. SWEDLOW  
 BRIAN C. TABAYOVONG  
 TYLER J. TAPELSKI  
 TYRON P. TAYLOR  
 DANIEL R. THETFORD  
 UTHER E. THOMAS  
 DEMETRIK L. THOMAS  
 VAUGHN C. THOMPSON  
 EVAN R. TIMMENS  
 RYAN B. TINC  
 FRANK C. TORTELLA, JR.  
 TOMISHA A. TOSON  
 DWIGHT F. TOWLER  
 JOHN C. TRAEGER  
 BILLY J. TUCKER  
 TAVARES A. TUKES  
 FAAMAO UMALITANIELU  
 BRANDON H. UNGETHEIM  
 RONALD A. VELDTHUIZEN, JR.  
 NICHOLE L. WILD  
 GORDON E. VINCENT  
 MICHAEL F. VOLPE III  
 COMANECI WALKER  
 GLORIA M. WALKER  
 BRANDON K. WALLACE  
 JASON W. WALSH  
 LAKESHA M. WARREN  
 MICHAEL L. WATSONFOWLES  
 NATASHA M. WAYNE  
 JAMES E. WEAVER  
 JASON A. WEIGLE  
 MARTIN E. WENNBLOM  
 SHERIDA Y. WHINDLETON  
 ERICA L. WHITE  
 ALTYAN L. WHITFIELD  
 DENNIS K. WILLIAMS II  
 MELONY L. WILLIAMS  
 NICOLE E. WILLIS  
 ANTHONY B. WILSON  
 SEAN R. WILSON  
 TODD A. WISE

LAURA P. WOOD  
 DELIAH M. WOODS  
 AARON T. WORKMAN  
 LOUWANNA D. WRIGHT  
 KATINA S. YARBOUGH  
 SHAWN R. YOUNG  
 D011855  
 D012359  
 D012726  
 D012929

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

SCOTT J. AKERLEY  
 PATRICK L. ALSUP  
 DANIEL J. ANDREWS  
 TODD W. ARNOLD  
 MATTHEW G. AUSTIN  
 ANDREW A. BAIR  
 JONATHAN D. BAKER  
 RAVI A. BALARAM  
 MICHAEL K. BARNETT  
 ANTHONY L. BARBERAS  
 JASON L. BARTLETT  
 JORDAN M. BECKER  
 WYNNE M. BEERS  
 RICHARD J. BENDELEWSKI  
 CRAIG M. BENKE  
 DAVID M. BESKOW  
 SHANEKA L. BIZZELL  
 JACOB A. BLANTON  
 GARY S. BLOUNT  
 DANIEL B. BOLTON  
 JARED V. BONDESSON  
 DEREK D. BOTHERN  
 JESSIE J. BRANSON  
 CHRISTOPHER R. BRAUTIGAM  
 WILLIAM D. BRICE  
 MARLE E. BRIDGES  
 CLEO T. BROWN  
 EARL C. BROWN  
 STEPHEN S. BROWN  
 TEMARKUS M. BROWN  
 CHRISTOPHEL S. BROWNING  
 VONTE Q. BRUMFIELD  
 PAUL A. BUBLIS  
 JASON A. BUCHANAN  
 RAVEN M. BUKOWSKI  
 JOSHUA T. BURDETT  
 STEPHEN J. BURROUGHS  
 JAMES D. BUSKIRK  
 LOREN A. BYMER  
 JEFFREY A. BYRD  
 DEVON M. CALLAHAN  
 MATTHEW J. CANNON  
 BRETT A. CAREY  
 DEREK J. CARSON  
 JAMEL R. CARR  
 TARA S. CARR  
 THOMAS W. CASEY  
 TYLER M. CATE  
 NANCY C. CECH  
 TREVOR J. CHARTIER  
 RICHARD T. CHEN  
 WILLIAM J. CHERKAUSKAS  
 JOHN D. CHILDRESS  
 MICHAEL J. CHILDS  
 MIN K. CHOI  
 CRAIG A. CHRISTIAN  
 NANCY E. CLAUS  
 CAMALA L. COATS  
 ERIC L. COGER  
 GEORGE H. COLEMAN  
 RONALD A. COLOMBO, JR.  
 LAKEETRA COLVIN  
 JOSHUA M. CONANT  
 SHANE W. CORCORAN  
 TRAVIS R. COX  
 MARTYNY Y. CRIGHTON  
 IRA L. CROFFORD, JR.  
 MATTHEW J. CROWE  
 AARON D. CUMMINGS  
 STEVEN J. CURTIS  
 TROY G. DANDERSON  
 BRIAN C. DARNELL  
 CARSON E. DAVIS  
 JAY B. DAVIS  
 MICHAEL H. DAVIS  
 BRANDON B. DAWALT  
 JACOB H. DAY  
 ASHOK K. DEB  
 MICHAEL A. DECICCO  
 EDDIE J. DIAZRIVERA  
 BRENT B. DODD  
 AGUSTIN E. DOMINGUEZ  
 KENNETH H. DONNOLLY  
 DEBRA M. DOOLITTLE  
 JEFFREY M. DUPLANTIS  
 RODERICK M. DWYER  
 MICHAEL F. DYER  
 ANTHONNIE D. EASON  
 TYLER Q. EDDY  
 ERIN N. EIKE  
 STEVEN L. ELGAN  
 CHAD M. ENGLISH  
 SERANEL N. ENGUILLADO  
 ROBERT W. ERDMAN  
 NEAL R. ERICKSON  
 PETER R. EXLINE  
 TAMMY J. FEARNOW  
 PAUL J. FEDAK, JR.  
 ERIC P. FEKETE  
 JOEL M. FELTZ  
 SAMUEL T. FISHBURNE

JAMES R. FOURNIER  
 RUSSELL H. FOX  
 WILFREDO FRANCESCHINI  
 CRAIG E. FRANK  
 LUCAS N. FRANK  
 TIMOTHY C. FRIEDRICH  
 JOHN P. FRIEL  
 TERRY W. FRY  
 RASHAD J. FULCHER  
 ROBERT J. GABLE  
 SEAN GIBBS  
 JAMES H. GIFFORD  
 MICHAEL A. GIORDANO  
 KELLY D. GLEASON  
 DAVID L. GOMEZ  
 CHRISTOPHER A. GONZALES  
 CONTRELL D. GOODE  
 DERRICK L. GOODWIN  
 JESSICA D. GRASSETTI  
 CLAUDETTE D. GRAVES  
 MICHAEL A. GRYGAR  
 KRISTA J. GUELLER  
 JEREMY D. GUY  
 STARRIA HAIGOOD  
 ADAM D. HALLMARK  
 ARNOLD V. HAMMARI  
 PIERRE N. HAN  
 BRIAN M. HANLEY  
 THOR K. HANSON  
 JOHN L. HARRELL  
 WALTER R. J. HARRISON  
 BRIAN M. HART  
 MATTHEW E. HARTMAN  
 BRIAN K. HAWKINS  
 JEFFREY D. HAY  
 AARON P. HEBERLEIN  
 JOSEPH L. HEYMAN  
 PATRICK J. HOFMANN  
 JASON P. HOGAN  
 DENNIS L. HOLIDAY  
 AMBER J. HOLMES  
 GREGORY M. HOLMES  
 JAMES P. L. HOLZGREFE  
 DAVID W. HUGHES  
 MICHAEL J. ISBELL  
 BENJAMIN F. IVERSON  
 LANCE E. JACKSON  
 JOSEF M. JACOBSEN  
 ROBERT J. JAMES  
 HAERYONG JI  
 CARL P. JOHNSON  
 CHRISTOPHER M. JOHNSON  
 JEFFREY W. JOHNSON  
 MICHAEL C. JONES  
 TYLER L. JONES  
 ANTHONY S. JORDAN  
 MATTHEW P. KASKY  
 SCOT R. KEITH  
 SHANE P. KELLEY  
 TERENCE M. KELLEY  
 JEFFREY C. KENDLELL  
 JOSHUA S. KHOURY  
 BRIAN S. KILGORE  
 DONALD D. KIM  
 JASON J. KIM  
 JESSICA E. KING  
 ROSS S. KINKEAD  
 CHRISTOPHER F. KIZINSKI  
 CHRISTOPHER R. KOBYRA  
 MONTE A. KOONTZ  
 CHRISTOPHER A. KREILER  
 CHRISTOPHER G. KRUPAR  
 JAMES A. LACOVARA  
 THOMAS J. LANEY  
 ANDREW C. LEE  
 JOHN C. H. LEE  
 HERB LEGGETTE  
 ROBERT C. LICHT, JR.  
 JOSEPH J. LEMAY  
 NICHOLAS A. LONG  
 HECTOR J. LOPEZ  
 MARCO J. LYONS  
 MATTHEW D. MACKAY  
 WILLIAM A. MACUGAY  
 JOSHUA D. MADLINGER  
 CHEVELLE F. MALONE  
 GAETANO C. MANGANO  
 ANTHONY D. MARCHAND  
 ALBERT J. MARCKWARDT  
 GUALBERTO J. MARRERO  
 MATTHEW T. MASON  
 ADRIAN D. MASSEY  
 JAMES R. MATTHESON  
 MARTRELL G. MATTHEWS  
 DAVID C. MCCAGHRIN  
 ANNE C. MCCLAIN  
 BRIAN C. MCDOWELL  
 SIMON A. MCKENZIE  
 ROBERT E. MCMAHON  
 THOMAS H. MCMURTRIE III  
 DAVID L. MCNATT  
 GLENN A. MEDLOCK  
 JOHN A. MEISTER  
 DERRICK D. MELTON  
 CARIE M. MENDIOLA  
 PAUL E. MEYER  
 JAMES R. MILRES  
 BRIAN J. MILLER  
 CATHERINE J. MILLER  
 KEITH B. MILLER  
 MATTHEW G. MILLER  
 ERICA M. MITCHELL  
 ANDRE S. MONGE  
 ANTHONY A. MOORE  
 JOEL L. MOORE  
 HAROLD L. MORRIS  
 SHYLO R. MORRISON

SCOTT D. MOSLEY  
 ROBERT C. MOYER  
 VINCENT J. MUCKER  
 KEVIN M. MURPHY  
 HURCULES MURRAY II  
 ALEXANDER J. MUSEL  
 ERIC M. MUSGRAVE  
 LOUIS P. NEMEC  
 PETER A. NESBITT  
 RUBIN R. NEYPES  
 LEE M. NORTH  
 JASON S. NORTHRUP  
 BRIAN E. NORTHPUR  
 RAHMUN J. NORWOOD  
 YAHMIN N. NORWOOD  
 LAWRENCE R. NUNN  
 RACHAEL L. OCONNELL  
 DANIEL J. OH  
 RICARDO J. ORTEGA  
 MOISES ORTIZ  
 PEDRO J. ORTIZ  
 MARK L. OSANO  
 CHRISTOPHER E. OSGOOD  
 BRIAN L. PARKER  
 LOLETA L. PARKER  
 DEIDRE E. PATTERSON  
 JASON G. PEPPER  
 PAUL J. PETERS  
 BRIAN J. PETERSON  
 WILLIAM M. PETULLO  
 ANDREW R. PFLUGER  
 JANET L. PHILLIPS  
 STEVEN S. PHIPPS  
 GARY W. PICKENS  
 RYAN M. PIFER  
 STEPHAN J. PIKNER  
 PONGPAT D. PILUEK  
 JEREMY F. PITANIELLO  
 CHANTE D. PONDEXTER  
 SCOTT J. PORTER  
 RILEY J. POST  
 HAYLI D. POTTER  
 MATTHEW J. RADIK  
 PETER L. RANGEL  
 MATTHEW B. RAPP  
 ROBERT J. REDMON  
 ERIC M. REID  
 REGINALD H. RICE  
 DERRICK L. RICHARDSON  
 ROBERT M. RICHARDSON  
 JAMES R. RIGBY  
 FRED RIGGS, JR.  
 DAVID J. RISIUS  
 DAVID E. RITTENHOUSE, JR.  
 CARLOS E. RIVERA  
 RUSTY W. ROBINSON  
 DANIEL J. ROGNE  
 GAMALIEL ROSA  
 ABDIEL ROSADOMENDEZ  
 MICHAEL S. ROSOL  
 AARON M. ROSPENDOWSKI  
 BRIAN J. RYAN  
 KELLY K. RYAN  
 JARED D. SAINATO  
 KRISTIN C. SAILING  
 ANDREW P. SANDERS  
 JOHN L. SANDERS  
 WAYNE A. SANDERS  
 ROBERTO A. SANTAMARIA  
 STEPHAN A. SCHOENBORN  
 PATRICK SCHORPP  
 ERIC R. SCHWARTZ  
 STEVEN J. SCHWOERKE  
 BRIAN J. SCIGLUNA  
 SHANE P. SCOTT  
 LAWRENCE SERAJIPO  
 KRISTAL G. G. SESSOMS  
 NICOLE Y. SHADLEY  
 MATTHEW D. SHIFRIN  
 STEPHEN C. SHORT  
 PETER T. SINCLAIR II  
 BRIAN D. SLOSMAN  
 DAVID W. SMARTT  
 BETH R. SMITH  
 SLADE K. SMITH  
 SUAN E. SOMMERS  
 MICHAEL E. STADNYK  
 TYLER J. STANDISH  
 SCOTT H. STARR  
 JONATHAN L. STCLAIR  
 JASON J. STEGER  
 BENJAMIN J. STEICHEN  
 DAVID M. STURGIS  
 DOUGLAS M. SWEET  
 THOMAS J. SWINT  
 KAMIL SZTALKOPER  
 ROBERT I. TABER  
 COLIN M. TANSEY  
 ISAAC L. TAYLOR  
 SEAN R. TAYLOR  
 WILLIAM TAYLOR  
 KEVIN L. THOMPSON  
 SARAH E. THOMPSON  
 MICHAEL C. THORPE  
 BRIAN W. TINKLEPAUGH  
 KENDRA T. TIPPETT  
 HOWARD C. TITZEL  
 MICHAEL T. TOBIAS  
 MATTHEW D. TOBIN  
 LAWRENCE A. TOMAZIEFSKI  
 MICHAEL B. TONEY  
 RAMON B. TORRES  
 MICHELLE H. TOYOFUKU  
 JAMES E. TRIMBLE, JR.  
 GARRETT W. TROTT  
 JOHN B. TURNER  
 TROY A. UHLMAN

RAPHAEL VASQUEZ  
 JEREMY D. VAUGHAN  
 DALE T. VERRAN  
 MICHAEL R. WACKER  
 ANGEL L. WADE  
 SCOTT R. WADE  
 KYLE M. WALTON  
 JAMES D. WATT  
 JASON L. WEBB  
 TERRI N. WEBB  
 ETHAN T. WEBER  
 DAVID I. WEST  
 WILLIAM D. WHALEY  
 JAMES C. WHITE  
 CHRISTY L. WHITFIELD  
 JACKIE A. WILLIAMS  
 RENOR S. WILLIAMS  
 JEFFREY M. WILSON  
 MASON J. WILSON  
 TIA C. WINSTON  
 MICHAEL D. WISE  
 GRAHAM D. WOOD  
 ROBERT J. WOODRUFF  
 KENNETH T. WOODS  
 GREGORY J. WORDEN  
 KYLE R. YATES  
 D012842  
 D013349  
 D010068  
 G010300  
 D010151  
 D003100  
 D012481  
 D013279  
 G010044  
 D010918  
 D012997  
 G010369  
 G001318  
 G010423  
 D012603  
 D012930  
 D011270  
 G010263  
 G010196  
 D004194  
 G010111  
 D010806  
 G010356  
 D011238  
 G010438  
 D010177  
 D012147  
 G001244  
 D012728  
 D011941  
 G010033  
 D002220

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

RYAN C. AGEE  
 JERRID K. ALLEN  
 JONAS ANAZAGASTY  
 MERLIN F. ANDERSON  
 THOMAS N. ANDERSON  
 ERIK A. ANDREASEN  
 ERIK S. ARCHER  
 JOHN D. ARMSTRONG  
 KEVIN P. ARNETT  
 EDWARD L. ARNTSON  
 ERIC E. ARTEMIS  
 JACOB A. ATKINS  
 BOWE T. AVERILL  
 SONNY B. AVICHALL  
 CATHERINE M. BABBITT  
 DOUGLAS F. BAKER, JR.  
 EDWARD B. BANKST  
 KRISTOPHER R. BARRITEAU  
 JOHN R. BARTHOLOMEW  
 SCOTT A. BASSO  
 JOHN L. BECK, JR.  
 JAMES A. BECKER  
 KEVIN M. BEHLER  
 RICHARD BELL III  
 CARL E. BENANDER  
 CORY J. BIGANEK  
 PATRICK M. BIGGS  
 ACHIM M. BILLER  
 CHRISTOPHER L. BLAHA  
 JUDE M. BLAKE  
 JESSE A. BLANTON  
 JOEL A. BLASCHKE  
 NORMA A. BOHATY  
 JUSTIN A. BOSANKO  
 CHRISTOPHER E. BRADEN  
 CHRISTOPHER E. BRAWLEY  
 JULIA A. BRENNAN  
 CORRIE S. BRICE  
 JONATHAN M. BRITTON  
 JOHN W. BROCK II  
 ANDREW J. BROWN  
 JOSHUA W. BROWN  
 RODGERS BROWN, JR.  
 VANCE M. BRUNNER  
 JAMES P. BRYANT, JR.  
 TRAVIS D. BUEHNER  
 RYAN J. BULGER  
 JASON P. BURKE  
 CHRISTOPHER W. BURKHART  
 MARCUS J. BYNUM  
 NATALIE A. BYNUM  
 CURTIS L. BYRON, JR.  
 RICARLOS M. CALDWELL

JOSHUA L. CAMPBELL  
SALVATORE E. CANDELA  
SCOTT L. CANTLON  
BRIAN C. CAPLIN  
MATTHEW S. S. CARL  
DAVID C. CASTILLO  
BRANDON C. CAVE  
ADAM S. CECIL  
STEVEN L. CHADWICK  
MATTHEW A. CHANEY  
JAMES E. CHAPMAN, JR.  
JONATHAN M. CHAVOUS  
DALLAS Q. CHEATHAM  
STEVEN C. CHETCUTI  
YOUNG M. CHO  
CHRISTOPHER M. CHURCH  
EDWIN L. CLARKE  
ROSANNA M. CLEMENTE  
MATTHEW J. CLEMENTZ  
TYLER J. CODY  
MATTHEW J. COLE  
PATRICK D. COLLINS  
SHAUN S. CONLIN  
STEVE CONRAD  
KEVIN J. CONSEDINE  
JOSEPH D. COOLMAN  
MICHAEL S. COOMBES  
KING E. COOPER, JR.  
ANDREW J. CORNWELL  
LOURDES A. COSTAS  
JAMES C. CREMIN  
ADAM B. CRONKHITE  
NATHANIEL D. CROW  
JOHN D. CUNNINGHAM  
ROBERT B. CUSICK  
HENRY J. DAILY  
SAMUEL DALLAS, JR.  
SHAWN D. DALTON  
GREGORY A. DANIEL  
PATRICK W. DARDIS  
THOMAS C. DARRROW  
JOSEPH V. DASILVA  
DONALD C. DAVIDSON  
IAN R. DAVIS  
JASON E. DAVIS  
NATHANIEL B. DAVIS  
PHILIP J. DEAGUILERA  
JASON O. DEGEORGE  
JAMES DEMONSTRANTI  
FRANKLIN D. DENNIS  
HAROLD W. DENNIS  
MARK F. DESANTIS  
KENDRICK S. DEVERA  
STEVEN M. DEVITT  
ANDREW J. DIAL  
ROBERT W. DICKERSON  
DANIEL A. DIGATI  
ROBERT A. DION, JR.  
TYLER R. DONNELL  
SHANE R. DOOLAN  
MICHAEL J. DRYLE  
JASON G. DUDLEY  
KIRK A. DUNCAN  
KYLE E. DUNCAN  
CHRISTIAN A. DURHAM  
JUSTIN A. DUVALL  
NICHOLAS H. DVONCH  
JEREMY W. EASLEY  
JOSHUA A. EATON  
JEFFREY A. EDGINGTON  
CHRISTOPHER M. EFAW  
WAYNE E. EHMER  
JASON A. ENGELBRECHT  
GREGORY P. ESCOBAR  
SAMUEL A. ESCOBARPEREZ  
JENNIFER L. ETTERS  
CHRISTOPHER P. EVANS  
JEREL D. EVANS  
ROBERT R. FAIREL, JR.  
NICHOLAS J. FALCETTO  
JOHN I. FAUNCE  
AARON D. FELTER  
BENJAMIN J. FERGUSON  
KENNETH A. FERGUSON  
LUCAS M. FISCHER  
MICHAEL E. FISHER  
JOSHUA M. FISHMAN  
MATTHEW P. FIX  
STEPHEN C. FLANAGAN  
MARCUS R. FORMAN  
KENRICK D. FORRESTER  
RYAN H. FORSHEE  
JEREMIAH C. FRITZ  
LOUIS B. FRKETTIC  
JEFFREY R. FULLER  
DOUGLAS K. FULLERTON  
MARK O. FULMER  
JONATHAN M. FURSMAN  
ANDREW J. FUTSCHER  
GREGORY L. GABEL  
RICHARD A. GALEANO  
DIANA B. GARCIA  
JOSUE C. GARCIA  
STEWART U. GAST  
EDWARD P. GAVIN  
STANLEY J. GAYLORD  
JOHN GERVAIS  
TIMOTHY J. GHORMLEY  
MARK E. GLASPELL  
JASON A. GLERSON  
TRAVIS S. GODFREY  
EDWARD GOMEZ  
GEOFFREY T. GORSUCH  
JENNIFER L. GOTIE  
JOHN R. GRABOWSKI  
DOUGLAS M. GRAHAM  
MIRELLA GRAVITT

MAURICE GREEN CC  
DANIEL D. GRIEVE  
NICHOLAS A. GRIFFITHS  
RICHARD Z. GROEN  
DANIEL J. GROSS  
JONATHAN D. GUINN  
GARRETT J. GUTTREAU  
MICHAEL J. GUNTHER  
LAWRENCE P. GUSZKOWSKI  
JOHN C. GWINN  
JOHN L. HAAKE  
MATTHEW P. HALL  
SETH G. HALL  
SARA M. HALLBERG  
CHRISTOPHER J. C. HALLOWS  
JEFFREY S. HAN  
TIMOTHY A. HARLOFF  
BRYAN A. HARMON  
WILLIAM D. HARRIS, JR.  
DAVID L. HAWK  
DANIEL A. HAYDEN  
JEFFREY W. HAZARD  
JOEL M. HELGERSON  
DAVID W. HENSEL  
GREGORY P. HENZ  
ANDREW M. HERCIC  
WILLIAM R. HERMANN III  
ANDREW L. HERZBERG  
JASON S. HETZEL  
JEFFERY C. HIGGINS  
DENNIS K. HILL  
LUSTER R. HOBBS  
CHRISTOPHER M. HODL  
MATTHEW T. HOFMANN  
ROBERT S. HOLCROFT  
NEIL A. HOLLENBECK  
RACHEL A. HONDERD  
ERIC S. HONG  
FRANK A. HOOKER  
JASON D. HOPKINS  
JAMES A. HORN  
RICK A. HOWRY  
JENNIFER O. HUNTER  
WILLIAM C. HUNTER III  
STEPHAN W. HUTNIK  
STEVEN C. HYDER  
JARROD A. ISON  
STEVEN E. JACKOWSKI  
MELVIN S. JACKSON  
JASON D. JAMES  
MELVIN B. JETER  
ARTHUR E. JIMENEZ  
AARON J. JOHNSON  
CHARLES S. JOHNSON  
JOEL M. JOHNSON  
JACOB M. JOHNSTON  
DRIAN H. JONES  
SHANE R. JONES  
THOMAS M. JONES  
MIGUEL A. JUAREZ  
GARY R. KATZ  
MARK A. KATZ  
NICHOLAS S. KAUFFELD  
BRIAN F. KAVANAGH  
BRYCE K. KAWAGUCHI  
ANTHONY J. KAZOR  
SEAN C. KEEFE  
DANIEL A. KEENER  
SHAWN C. KELLER  
CARINA L. KELLEY  
DAVID L. KENNEY  
JEREMY E. KERFOOT  
CARLA A. KIERNAN  
MIRANDA L. KILLINGSWORTH  
BYUNG C. KIM  
DONALD R. KIRK  
BRIAN A. KLEAR  
CHRISTOPHER P. KLEMAN  
CALVIN A. KNOX  
MICHAEL A. KLAMER  
GEORGE P. LACHICOTTE  
DAVID M. LAMBORN  
CHRISTINE A. LANCIA  
JERRY E. LANDRUM  
JEREMY E. LANE  
JONATHAN M. LARMORE  
ERIC D. LARSEN  
MARK E. LARSON  
PAUL I. LASHLEY  
ADAM F. LATHAM  
MATTHEW R. LEBLANC  
MATTHEW P. LECLAIR  
ASHLEY S. M. LEE  
GREGORY G. LEE  
KACIE M. LEE  
JASON A. LEGRO  
ANDREW E. LEMBKE  
RUSSELL P. LEMLER  
LANCE S. LEONARD  
TIMOTHY J. LEWIS  
RYAN F. LIEBHABER  
JASON A. LITTLE  
CLAY J. LIVINGSTON  
JUSTIN D. LOGAN  
JASON R. LOJKA  
DAVID R. LOMBARDI  
MICHAEL B. LONG  
WILLIAM H. LOVE  
THOMAS C. LUDWIG  
SEAN P. LYONS  
ADAM E. MACALLISTER  
GLEN A. MACDONALD  
STEPHEN P. MAGENNIS  
STEVEN R. MAJAJUSKAS  
MICHAEL S. MASSMANN  
SEAN P. MCBRIDE  
SEAN C. MCCAFFERY

DAVID J. MCCARTHY  
BRAD C. MCCOY  
JOSHUA T. MCCULLY  
GARY P. MCDONALD  
MATTHEW L. MCGRAW  
SCOTT N. MCKAY  
MATTHEW J. MCKEE  
FREDRICK J. MCLEOD  
BRENDAN T. MCSHEA  
JEDEDIAH J. MEDLIN  
LUIS R. MEJIAROMAN  
JERROD E. MELANDER  
JASON R. MELCHIOR  
SETH D. MIDDLETON  
ANDREW G. MILLER  
JOSEPH M. MILLER  
NATHANIEL S. MILLER  
CRAIG W. MILLIRON  
JOHN C. MILLS  
PAUL B. MITCHELL III  
JOHN H. MOLTZ IV  
GAMBLE L. MONNEY  
MASON M. MOORE  
DONALD F. MOREY  
AARON F. MORRIS  
KAREL T. MORRIS  
RAPHAEL J. MORRISON  
MARK P. MUDRINICH  
JOSEPH R. MUKES  
MICHAEL D. MURPHY  
ISMAEL B. NATIVIDAD  
DONALD R. NEAL  
RONALD L. NIEWERT  
ANDREW T. NIEWOHNER  
KARL M. NILSEN  
JASON H. NOBLE  
DEREK R. NOEL  
CHARLES E. NOLL  
JEFFREY R. NORDIN  
ALEJANDRO M. NUÑEZ  
KITEFRE K. OBOJO  
CLEMENCE C. OBORSKI  
BRENDAN B. OHERN  
DARRYL T. OLDEN II  
DAVID R. OLEARY  
MICHAEL J. OLESON  
MARIO A. OLIVA  
MATTHEW S. ONEILL  
SEAN M. ONTIVEROS  
JOHN D. C. ORDONIO  
BRENDAN D. ORMOND  
PAUL G. OTTO  
STEVE A. PADILLA  
TIMOTHY R. PALMER  
HEATH E. PANKOV  
DAVID C. PARK  
JACY A. PARK  
TYLER B. PARTRIDGE  
NATHANAL J. PATTON  
SENECA PENACOLLAZO  
MICHAEL Q. PENNEY  
FRANCIS B. PERA  
ANTONIO PEREZ  
WILLIAM R. PERRY  
THOMAS V. PETRINI  
MATHEW J. PEZZULLO  
ERIC M. PHILLIPS  
MICHAEL J. PHILLIPS, JR.  
ROBERT J. PHILLIPSON  
JEFFREY W. PICKLER  
ROGELIO A. PINEDA  
LONNIE PIRTLE  
JASON R. POSEY  
LEE A. PRUITT  
JAMES A. RAMAGE  
MICHAEL S. RAMSEY, JR.  
GERALD E. RESMONDO, JR.  
KARL A. REUTER  
ADAM P. REYNOLDS  
WILLIAM D. RICHARDSON  
INGEBRIGT A. RIIS  
REYNALDO A. RIVERA  
CHRISTOPHER J. RIVERS  
TRAVIS E. ROBISON  
CARLOS F. ROCKSHEAD  
FELIX O. RODRIGUEZ  
JUAN C. RODRIGUEZ  
BEAU G. ROLLIE  
BRANDAN T. ROONEY  
JORGE A. ROSARIO  
CHRISTOPHER M. ROWE  
KEVIN P. RYAN  
ROBERTO R. SANCHEZ  
ANDREW W. SANDERS  
EDWARD J. SANFORD  
STEVEN D. SANTAMARIA  
RAYMOND SANTIAGORIVERA  
MICHAEL S. SAXON  
MARK J. SCHERBRING  
RICHARD H. SCHILDMAN III  
ERIC G. SCHNABEL  
ERIC B. SCHNEIDER  
JOHN M. SCHOENFELDT  
TIMOTHY M. SCHUMACHER  
ANGELA L. SCOTT  
JOEL P. SEARS  
JEREMY O. SECREST  
MICHAEL M. SEMMENS  
DOUGLAS F. SERIE  
ANDRE J. SESSOMS  
TRAVIS D. SHAIN  
KELCEY R. SHAW  
MICHAEL C. SHAW  
BENJAMIN L. SHEPHERD  
SEAN R. SHIELDS  
JASON M. SHULTZ  
TIMOTHY A. SIKORSKI



BRITTANY E. SIMMONS  
 CHUNKA A. SMITH  
 JAMES R. SMITH  
 LANDGRAVE T. SMITH  
 MARK K. SNAKENBERG  
 JOHN P. SNOW  
 SCOTT D. SNYDER  
 TERRENCE L. SOULE  
 AARON J. SOUTHARD  
 WESLEY M. SPEAR  
 BRENDA J. SPENCE  
 RONALD W. SPRANG  
 TANNER J. SPRY  
 DWAYNE W. STAPLES  
 JASON R. STARAITIS  
 RICHARD D. STEARNS  
 MARGARET G. W. STICK  
 BRADLEY R. STREMLAU  
 JAMES C. STULTZ  
 RONALD J. STURGEON  
 MEGHANN E. SULLIVAN  
 ROBERT M. SUMMERS  
 TODD S. SUNDAY  
 ADAM J. SWEDENBURG  
 GEORGE T. TATUM  
 STEVEN B. TEMPLETON  
 BRANDON S. TENNIMON  
 PETER A. THAYER  
 AARON M. THOMAS  
 TROY P. THOMAS  
 VINCENT A. THOMAS  
 ANDREW A. THUEME  
 DAVIS D. TINDOLL  
 GREGORY M. TOMLIN  
 JOHN T. TOOHEY  
 ROBERT K. TRACY  
 TRAVIS I. TRAMMELL III  
 MICHAEL P. TUMLIN  
 ANTOINETTE C. TURNER  
 CHARLES C. TURNER  
 JENNIFER L. UYESHIRO  
 PHILIP J. VALENTI  
 RUSSELL W. VANDERLUGT  
 JOSHUA E. VANETTEN  
 MARK J. VANHANEHAN  
 JOSE R. VASQUEZ  
 ERICK R. VELASQUEZ  
 RENATO VIEIRA  
 DANIEL J. VONBENKEN  
 SETH W. WACKER  
 CHRISTOPHER K. WAGAR  
 NEILSON W. WAHAB  
 KENNETH W. WAINWRIGHT  
 JERMAINE M. WALKER  
 JERON J. WASHINGTON  
 JOSEPH D. WEINBURGH  
 SHANE M. WELLER  
 CHARLES W. WELLS  
 JOHNATHAN H. WESTBROOK  
 JAMES A. WESTGATE  
 JARON S. WHARTON  
 SHANA M. WHATLEY  
 ANDREW A. WHITE  
 JACOB A. WHITESIDE  
 CLARENCE W. WILHITE  
 JEREMY P. WILLIAMS  
 JOHN R. WILLIAMS  
 NATHAN B. WILLIAMS  
 RYAN T. WILLIAMS  
 DOUGLAS M. WILLIG  
 EDWARD B. WITHERELL  
 SEAN A. WITTMER  
 RICHARD E. WITWER  
 JOHN A. WOMACK  
 LILLIAN I. I. WOODINGTON  
 JASON T. WOODWARD  
 VASHAUN A. WRICE  
 D013658  
 D013297  
 D011241  
 D011563  
 D010451  
 D011888  
 D013209  
 D012269  
 D013418  
 D013263  
 D012599  
 D011242  
 D012382  
 D013351  
 D013196  
 D011536

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be major*

ERIK C. ALFSEN

LUIS N. ANDA  
 TAIWO A. AROWOSGEBE  
 JON R. BAILEY  
 ROBERT D. BILLINGSLEY  
 TROY J. BLAN  
 DEXTER J. BROCK  
 MARLON W. BROWN  
 SHARON BROWNE  
 JORGE H. BUDEZ  
 ERIC B. BUNDRICK  
 CHRISTOPHER CAMPBELL  
 ANTHONY CECH  
 DANIEL A. CHASE  
 KEVIN M. CHERWINSKI  
 DAVID CHRISTENSEN  
 BRENT A. CROSSWHITE  
 GENE R. DAVIDSON  
 MICHAEL B. DAWSON  
 FREDERICK B. DENNING  
 BRUCE R. DUTY  
 ROBERT ELKOWITZ  
 JEFFREY P. ELLIS  
 MICHAEL A. FERGUSON  
 KEITH D. FERRELL  
 JASON V. FORTE  
 LUDOVIC O. FOYOU  
 ROBERT GINSBURG  
 GRAHAM B. GLOVER  
 BRIAN T. HARGIS  
 JODY L. HARLOW  
 EDWARD S. HARRIS  
 SHANE J. HENDERSON  
 ROBERT B. HENSLEY  
 JAY F. HUDSON  
 OYEDEJI IDOWU  
 DOUGLAS J. INMAN  
 PATRICK D. IRELAND  
 CHESTER E. IRWIN  
 JOHN G. JACOBSEN  
 MICHAEL J. JOHNSON  
 MARK A. JOHNSTON  
 CARSON M. JUMP  
 RAJA KANDANADA  
 CHANG J. KIM  
 TAYLOR KIM  
 MICHAEL J. KROG  
 JOHN B. L. LEE  
 TOBY E. LOFTON  
 WILLIAM G. LUTZ  
 TONY M. LUXEM  
 JOHN P. MCDUGALL  
 JONATHAN R. MCPHERSON  
 JONATHAN MELENDEZ  
 HOCHANG MIN  
 JOHN A. MUTH  
 PATRICIA G. NICHOLS  
 MARK E. NIKONT  
 SAMUEL OLMOS  
 CHESTER W. OLSON III  
 ROGER E. OSBORN  
 RICK PAK  
 SANG W. PAK  
 JOSEPH P. PALERMO  
 JUSTIN G. PICKERING  
 JEFF S. PYUN  
 THEODORE F. RANDALL  
 HANS C. RUSKA  
 RUBEN G. SALDANA  
 ISMAEL O. SERRANO  
 MATTHEW F. SHENTON  
 PETER P. STONE  
 STEPHEN C. TAYLOR  
 KEVIN W. TRIMBLE  
 ANTHONY A. TURPIN  
 KIRBY L. VIDRINE  
 EDGAR G. VILLANUEVA  
 JARED L. VINEYARD  
 MICHAEL P. VOUDOURIS  
 JESUS O. WALLACE  
 MATTHEW W. WEATHERS  
 CHRISTOPHER W. WEINRICH  
 RICHARD D. WILLIAMS  
 MARK D. WORRELL  
 GLEN D. WURDEMAN  
 JERRY B. YOUNG  
 JOSHUA J. ZIEGLER  
 D013346

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be colonel*

BRADFORD A. BAUMANN  
 DAVID A. BOWLUS  
 ROBERT S. BROWN  
 JOEY T. BYRD  
 STEVEN E. CANTRELL  
 BRIAN W. CHEPEY

SHMUEL L. FELZENBERG  
 GARY T. FISHER  
 KEVIN S. FORRESTER  
 ROBERT J. GLAZENER  
 DAVID V. GREEN  
 DENNIS E. HYSOM  
 RAJMUND KOPEC  
 CHRISTOPHER G. MORRIS  
 JIMMY D. NICHOLS  
 TONY S. PETROS  
 TERRY E. ROMINE  
 ALLEN W. STALEY  
 THOMAS B. VAUGHN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 716:

*To be colonel*

JAY A. JOHANNIGMAN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

*To be lieutenant commander*

PATRICK R. ADAMS  
 JOSHUA M. ANDERSON  
 JAMES S. BALL  
 MARK A. BEALE  
 WILLIAM G. BICKEL  
 SYLVESTER CAMPOS III  
 CAMERON A. CARLSON  
 JACOB R. CATES  
 DEIRDRE E. COLLINS  
 TIMOTHY J. DEVALI  
 BRIAN P. FIANAGAN  
 JOSHUA J. GLENN  
 JOHN T. GOFF  
 DANIEL S. GRAY  
 CHRISTOPHER J. HALL  
 SEAN L. HARRIS  
 CHRISTOPHER J. HART  
 DANIEL J. HOOGE  
 STEVEN D. HOPKINS  
 PAUL G. HUCKABY  
 ANDREW L. HUTCHISON  
 GEOFFREY B. JOHNSON  
 RYAN P. KELLY  
 KRISTOPHER J. KYZAR  
 ERIC W. LARSON  
 KASEY B. LEWIS  
 WAYNE D. LILLEKS  
 NICOLE L. LOBECKER  
 TYLER E. MANESS  
 KYLE E. MCFADDEN  
 JAMES B. MONTGOMERY  
 GREGORY W. MOSLEY II  
 VICTOR H. MOYA  
 JAMES L. ONEAL  
 NATHAN S. PITSCH  
 ANDREW L. POLLACK  
 ERIC S. QUIRK  
 CHRISTOPHER W. RAKOSKI  
 JAIME E. RAMIREZ  
 SETH A. ROMO  
 JOHN R. SCHAEFFER II  
 CLINTON T. SCHUHART  
 RYAN J. SISLER  
 STEPHEN J. SKAHEN, JR.  
 DANNY G. SLOVER II  
 STEPHANIE A. SMIROS  
 JACOB A. UPTEGROVE  
 BLAKE M. WANIER  
 JAMES T. WATTERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

RANDALL G. SCHIMPF

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate July 13, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

WILLIAM FRANCIS HAGERTY IV, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO JAPAN.