



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2018

No. 23

## Senate

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

### PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we fix our minds on You, the Author and Perfector of our faith. Remind our lawmakers that a Heavenly focus brings joy. Give them the wisdom to see that those who have done the most good in this present world often have thought most about the world to come. May our Senators permit the diligent focus of their hearts on Heaven to preserve the vigor of their work on Earth. May Your Kingdom come, may Your will be done on Earth even as it is done in Heaven.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the time until 12 noon equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

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

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### FUNDING OUR MILITARY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we are one day closer to Thursday's government funding deadline. I am pleased to report that our bipartisan talks are continuing to progress toward an agreement on spending caps and important priorities all of us are eager to address. But as we continue the negotiations, we have the opportunity to make real progress with an immediate step that every Senator in the Chamber should support; that is, passing a fiscal year 2018 Defense appropriations bill.

We can vote to remove the uncertainty that is hanging over our Armed Forces and secure the current year funding that our servicemembers deserve. Funding cuts have fallen disproportionately on our men and women in uniform. Current funding levels are not adequate to support Secretary Mattis's new national defense strategy, and our military leaders have made clear that short-term continuing resolutions are hardly the optimal way for Congress to fund our warfighters.

Senators on both sides of the aisle say they agree that our warfighters deserve sufficient, stable funding to fulfill the missions and tasks their country assigns them. Today, each of us will have a chance to back that up with our vote. The Senate will take up a noncontroversial measure that passed the House with a comfortable bipartisan majority. It presents an opportunity for us to unite and give our all-volunteer military a full fiscal year of funding while we finalize our talks on other subjects.

We should seize the opportunity and not delay any longer securing current-year funding for the men and women who bravely keep us safe.

### TAX REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, we have been talking for weeks about the millions of Americans who are already benefiting from tax reform. Already, millions of workers have received a tax reform bonus, pay increase, or other benefit.

I understand that a \$1,000, \$2,000, or \$3,000 bonus might not seem like much to our colleagues from New York or San Francisco. I understand why people who are already very wealthy might agree with my friends the House and Senate Democratic leaders who said these bonuses and benefits are merely "crumbs." But, look, I can assure them that the working families I represent do not see a permanent raise or a multithousand-dollar bonus as a crumb to sweep off the table. In millions of households, thanks to tax reform, paying the bills has already gotten a little less painful and planning for the future has already gotten a little easier. And this is just the beginning.

Soon, millions and millions more Americans will see the impact of tax reform in their paychecks. IRS withholding is going down, take-home pay is going up, and families everywhere will be keeping more of their hard-earned money. This is great news for middle-class Americans. So why are our Democratic friends afraid to acknowledge it? The reason is simple. Every single one of them voted against tax reform.

Every Democrat in the House and in the Senate voted against these new benefits for American workers. Every one of them voted against a pay raise for the 90 percent of American workers who, according to a Treasury Department estimate, are about to see their take-home pay go up. I don't envy their position. I don't envy having to explain why they voted to keep more money in Washington rather than give their constituents a raise.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S617

Tax reform bonuses and more take-home pay aren't the only ways tax reform will help American workers. The law also includes a creative new solution to directly help the communities that are struggling the most. We all know that too few new jobs were created during the Obama years. Through heavy taxing and excessive regulation, Washington had its foot on the brake of the U.S. economy. Job creation and wage growth were weaker than they should have been, but another aspect of this often goes overlooked.

Of the new jobs that were created from 2010 to 2016, according to one estimate, three-quarters went to major metropolitan areas. Let me say that again. Of the new jobs that were created between 2010 and 2016, three-quarters went to major metropolitan areas. Only 3 percent of those new jobs went to rural America. Across the Nation—including my home State of Kentucky, particularly in Eastern Kentucky—many rural areas, small cities, and suburbs were left behind in the Obama economy. It is time to change that.

That is why my colleague the junior Senator from South Carolina made sure that tax reform included a provision to create "opportunity zones" across the United States. My Republican colleagues and I were proud to support this policy. It allows State Governors to designate economically depressed areas for special tax incentives that will make them more attractive places to invest and create jobs. It will empower communities that have been passed over time and again to put up, in effect, big neon signs that say: "We are open for business." It will help these struggling communities reach their full potential.

This Congress is determined to reignite an economy that works for everyone. That is why tax reform lets families across the country keep more of what they earn. That is why tax reform makes America a more attractive place to create jobs, and it gives our businesses a fairer fight with foreign competitors. That is why tax reform includes this "opportunity zones" provision, which will help deliver targeted relief to communities that need it the most.

To most Americans, all this sounds like common sense. Republicans in Congress thought so too. We came together to deliver these historic achievements for the American people. It is too bad that not one single Democrat got on board with any of this.

But at least the bigger paychecks, new bonuses, and new investments will continue to roll in, and our constituents know exactly who stood up for them.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1551, H.R. 2372, and H.R. 2579

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1551) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for production from advanced nuclear power facilities.

A bill (H.R. 2372) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit.

A bill (H.R. 2579) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

#### REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, here is just a brief note on taxes in answer to what my friend the Republican leader has said. The reason that 48 Democrats voted against the bill and the reason that at this point, despite huge amounts of ads paid for by the wealthiest of Americans, the bill is still unpopular with the American people is very simple: The vast majority of the breaks go to the very wealthy and to big, powerful corporations and their lobbyists. That is who wins on this bill more than anybody else.

If a bill focused on the middle class gave 80 percent of the breaks to the middle class, there would be loads of Democrats voting for it. We are happy that there are a lot of wealthy people in America. God bless them. They don't need the huge tax break—the disproportionate tax break that our Republican friends gave them. That is why the bill is unpopular.

Again, people like the Koch brothers and the thousand very, very wealthy—many of them so greedy—billionaires who don't want to pay any taxes put all of these ads on TV and have a whole propaganda machine. They still can't convince the American people.

Our Republican colleagues are afraid to talk about what they really mean in the tax bill—trickle-down economics. When they talk among themselves, they say: Give the wealthy a lot of money, give the big corporations a lot of money, and everyone will do fine. They don't have an honest debate on this because they are afraid to say it. So they act like they aim most of this at the middle class.

The only way this is aimed at the middle class is trickle down: Give the money disproportionately to the

wealthy and the big corporations, and the middle class will benefit. We don't believe that. We would rather give the money directly to the middle class and be sure they are getting the benefit.

#### FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as we continue discussions about another extension of government funding, Senate negotiators are working on a deal to lift the spending caps for both defense and urgent domestic priorities.

From the very beginning of the budget debate, Democrats have made our position in these negotiations very clear. We support an increase in funding for our military and our middle class. The two are not mutually exclusive. We don't want to do just one and leave the other behind. The sequester caps have arbitrarily imposed austerity on both sides of the ledger, defense and the nondefense programs that benefit middle-class people, such as education, infrastructure, and medical research. The caps have hamstrung the Pentagon's ability to make reliable investments, no doubt, but they have also cut support harshly and unintelligently from middle-class programs.

We ought to get out from sequestration entirely because our men and women in uniform deserve the resources they need to keep our country safe—as do our veterans waiting for better healthcare; as do young men and women, many of them veterans, seeking treatment for opioid addiction; as do rural families waiting for high-speed internet to connect themselves and their kids to the world; as do hard-working pensioners who forewent salary increases and bonuses to secure a pension that is now evaporating before their very eyes.

That is why Democrats have pushed consistently to increase funding to fight the scourge of opioids, to improve veterans healthcare, to build rural infrastructure, to shore up pensions, and to deal with childcare. These are the kinds of things we are pushing for in addition to, not to the exclusion of, increasing defense.

Some of our Republican colleagues, particularly in the House, think that only defense should get the help it needs, not the middle class. We Democrats have stood against that for years and will continue to stand against it.

House Republicans continue marching down a very partisan road, proposing a CROmnibus that will raise defense spending but leave everything else behind. As I have said many times before, a CROmnibus will not pass the Senate.

Speaker RYAN and House Republicans keep running into the same brick wall. When will House Republicans learn that they must chart a bipartisan course to get a bill through the Senate? I don't think a single Democrat—that I am aware of, at least—has been consulted on the Republican bill. It is done because Speaker RYAN is in a

pickle. How is he going to pass a bill with just Republican votes? It is not easy. So they come up with this distorted, unfair proposal—unfair to so many people in the middle class who depend on our help.

Hopefully, House Republicans will change their tune, because even though a deal has eluded us for months, negotiators are now making significant progress. The Republican leader and I have been working together quite productively. Of course, there are still some outstanding issues to be resolved, but we are closer to an agreement than we have ever been.

I would like to express my appreciation to the Republican leader, in addition, for his invitation to address the McConnell Center next week in Louisville, which I have accepted.

As leaders, the two of us can work together to get things done around here, and the best opportunity to work together is the budget. It is an opportunity not just for us but for our country, not only to escape the terrible damage of sequestration but to condemn it to the past, and we should seize that opportunity.

#### RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now for a word on the Russia investigation, last night the House Intelligence Committee voted to release the contents of the Schiff memo. Now that the House Intelligence Committee has acted, President Trump should move—in conjunction with the DOJ and the FBI—and release the Schiff memo to the public. The American people deserve the chance to make their own judgment on the facts of this small piece of the broader case of Russia's interference in our election.

The President decided the public deserved to see the Nunes memo before he had even read it. So he ought to be just as eager for the American people to see this memo, which refutes—effectively, devastatingly—so much in the Nunes memo.

Given that the Schiff memo is based on the same underlying documents as the Republicans' partisan memo, there should be no question as to whether or not the President should approve its release. If he decides to keep the Democratic memo under wraps, the American people are going to be forced to wonder: What is the President trying to hide? What is he afraid of?

President Trump should release the Schiff memo—and quickly. It will illustrate what a sham the Nunes memo is. Then, we can all move on and, as some of my good Republican colleagues have had the courage to say—not enough, but some: Let Mueller do his investigation unimpeded, and let's see where the results end up.

We need to move on. The Nunes memo is only the latest in a long line of distractions manufactured by the most extreme elements of the Republican Party and the conservative media

to distract from the special counsel's investigation. It started with conspiracies about “deep state” leaks and unmasking requests, phone taps at Trump Tower, and Uranium One, and now it is this memo. They don't quit with all these conspiracy theories, with all these ridiculous fomentations. They don't quit, perhaps because they are afraid of what a real investigation, which Mueller is doing and will continue to do, will reveal.

What the American people want to know are three simple things: One, what did the Russians do to interfere in our elections; two, were there Americans involved in helping the Russians; and three, what are we doing to prevent the Russians from interfering in 2018 and beyond? To that point, Americans should be much more concerned about this administration's tepid response to Putin's interference in our election than about a memo of Republican talking points.

Any other administration, any other President, I believe, would have made punishing Putin and protecting our democracy a primary issue in the first term, but this President began his first year in office by downplaying Putin's involvement in the 2016 election, and then he repeatedly accepted Putin's words of denial over the consensus of the American intelligence community.

When the administration tried to wiggle out of existing sanctions against Russia, Congress overwhelmingly and almost unanimously passed legislation strengthening the existing sanctions and adding new ones to address the interference. We are still waiting for President Trump to implement the new round of sanctions. What is he waiting for? Why does he refuse to get tough with Putin? We look to the President of the United States to stand up for our democracy against all threats, but unfortunately and sadly—bad for America—President Trump has abdicated this responsibility when it comes to Putin.

I yield the floor.

I know my good friend from Illinois will have his usual thoughtful and articulate remarks to give.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I don't know if you want to announce the business of the day or if you have already done that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in a period of morning business.

The assistant Democratic leader is recognized.

#### DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak of an issue which really defines America. With the exception of Native Americans who preceded us, with the exception of many African Americans who were brought here in bondage, virtually all of the rest of us are the sons and daughters of immigrants to America, immigrants from literally all over the world who have come to this Nation

and made us different—different in a positive way. They have given life to this democracy. They have given hope when it comes to our future. They have inspired us.

I will be the first to admit that I do not come to this debate without strong personal feelings. Like millions of Americans, I am the son of an immigrant. In 1911—107 years ago—my grandmother came to this country with three little kids. One of those kids was my mother. She was 2 years old when their ship landed in Baltimore. My grandmother didn't speak a word of English, but somehow she managed to take those three kids and make her way to join my grandfather in East St. Louis, IL.

On the credenza behind my desk in the Capitol is my mother's naturalization certificate. I keep that as a reminder of my heritage. That is my story. That is my family's story. That is America's story. Because of my family history, I really believe in immigration. I believe it has been a positive force in America.

I remember going to Jurbarkas, Lithuania, which was a tiny village in 1911, and being taken on a tour of my mom's birthplace. She never made it back there, but I was able to see the church where she was baptized. They pointed out the well in the town square which people used. I thought to myself what it must have been like that evening when my grandparents called their friends and relatives together to tell them the news: They were leaving their home in Lithuania. They were leaving the church that had served their family for generations. They were leaving all of their friends and relatives. They were leaving behind every stick of furniture, the dogs, the cats, the chickens—everything—to go to a place where they didn't speak the language. They were going to this place called America. They had heard great stories about the land of opportunity, and they had heard about some Lithuanians who had gone to the city of East St. Louis, IL, and that is where they were headed.

I am sure those friends and relatives, walking away from that meeting, turned to one another and said: What ever got into their minds? They are giving up everything to go to a place where they don't even speak the language. They will be back.

Well, they never returned. Like millions and millions of Americans, they had the courage to come to America and to weather crisis after crisis in our family and to build a future. I stand here because of that decision.

How can you tell when a country is in decline? When immigrants stop wanting to come to that country, when they can't wait to leave that country. Many other developed countries have had this experience and watched their economies decline as a result. That has never been our experience in the history of America.

Look at our history. In every generation, immigrants have come to our

shores from around the world and made us a better and stronger nation. Immigrants are not a drain on America; immigrants are the future of America. They are hard-working men and women who leave behind everything they know to build a new and better life for themselves and their children. They breathe new life into our country and help revitalize the American dream.

You have heard the stories. They go to Silicon Valley and take a look at some of the best and brightest when it comes to high-tech, and they marvel at how many of them were immigrants to this country who were finally able to take that great idea and turn it into a great business with a lot of well-paid employees, helping this country move forward.

It was 17 years ago that I introduced a bill called the DREAM Act. It was bipartisan legislation that gave a path to citizenship to immigrants who came to the United States as children. These young people have come to be known as Dreamers.

I know the President went to a Republican retreat last week and mocked the term “Dreamers.” He did the same in the State of the Union address. I will tell you, I am proud of the term “Dreamers.” Before this bill was introduced, if you asked about Dreamers and who they were, most people would answer: Isn’t that a British rock group? Today, Dreamers symbolize something in America—young people brought here who have grown up pledging allegiance to that flag, singing the only national anthem they ever have known, who want to be part of our future. Those are Dreamers.

Eight years ago, I sent a letter to President Obama. Dick Lugar, Republican Senator from Indiana, joined me in signing that letter. On a bipartisan basis, we asked for President Obama to find a way to protect the Dreamers. The President responded to our request. He established the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, better known as DACA.

DACA provides temporary legal status to Dreamers if they step up, identify themselves, register with the government, pay a \$500 filing fee, and submit themselves to a criminal background check and then a national security background check. If they passed all of those things, under DACA, they were given temporary, renewable 2-year protection to stay in the United States, not be deported, and have the legal right to work.

DACA has been an extraordinary success. Almost 800,000 Dreamers have come forward and received DACA protection. It has allowed them to contribute more to this country that they love, as teachers and nurses and engineers and first responders and members of our military. Yes, these DACA individuals have stepped up, even though they do not have the legal rights of citizenship, raised their hands, and sworn to put their lives on the line for America. How many of us have done

that? We should admire them for their commitment to this country. Instead, on September 5, Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the Trump administration was putting an end to this DACA Program. That same day, the President called on Congress to “legalize DACA.”

Now the deportation clock is literally ticking on these young people. As we gather here today, more than 18,000 of these young people have lost their protection under DACA. Beginning in less than a month, on March 5 of this year, every day for the next 2 years, 1,000 Dreamers will lose their work permits and be subject to deportation because of President Trump’s decision.

The administration itself has warned us that if we do come up with legalization of DACA, they need time—maybe as long as 6 months—to make it work. What has Congress done in response to this challenge, in response to the fact that thousands of young people are losing this protection? The answer is one word: nothing. Nothing. Not a single bill has passed the Senate or the House in response to the President’s challenge, despite the fact that every single day 122 of these Dreamers, because of President Trump’s decision, lose the protection of DACA. Teachers—almost 20,000 of them nationwide who are DACA recipients—are going to be in a situation where they have to leave behind their classrooms and their students. Nurses will be forced to leave behind their patients because of President Trump’s decision. First responders, who have written an enviable record of courage in serving their communities, will be forced to leave those posts. Soldiers willing to die for America will be forced to leave the Army—forced to leave the Army they have volunteered to serve.

This isn’t just a looming humanitarian crisis; it is an economic crisis as well. More than 91 percent of DACA Dreamers are gainfully employed and paying taxes to our government. The nonpartisan Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy reports that DACA-eligible individuals contribute an estimated \$2 billion a year in State and local taxes. The Cato Institute, a conservative think tank, estimates that ending DACA and deporting DACA recipients will cost \$60 billion and result in a \$280 billion reduction in economic growth over the next decade. Are the DACA protectees a drain on society? Not according to the conservative Cato Institute. They are a plus for America, a plus for our economy.

Poll after poll shows overwhelming bipartisan support for the Dreamers. Even FOX News—no liberal media outlet—found that 79 percent of Americans support a path to citizenship for Dreamers. That includes 63 percent of those who identify as Trump voters.

When the Trump administration shut down the DACA Program, the President called on Congress to legalize the program. We have done nothing. The

day after repealing DACA, President Trump reached a tentative agreement on DACA and border security with Senator SCHUMER, the Senate Democratic leader, and NANCY PELOSI, the House Democratic leader. President Trump said: “Chuck and Nancy would like to see something happen, and so do I.” But very quickly, President Trump walked away from those words.

In October, the White House released 7 pages of what they called “Immigration Principles”—their wish list when it came to immigration. It was a list of hard-line, anti-immigrant proposals, many of which have been opposed by both political parties in Congress. Then, 4 weeks ago, I was invited to a meeting on January 9 at the White House, to sit next to President Trump and about two dozen Members of Congress. The President said at that meeting, broadcast on live television, that he wanted to protect DACA recipients and he would sign any bipartisan bill that Congress sent to him. The President said: Send me a bill and I will sign it, and I will take the political heat. I heard it. So did America. He also said that Congress should first pass DACA legislation and that other immigration issues should wait for “phase two, which would be comprehensive.” That was good news for me and good news for Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, a Republican from South Carolina. We had been working for 4 months on a bipartisan plan.

We came back to the Hill after that meeting on January 9. That evening and the next day, we hammered out an agreement—six Senators, three Democrats and three Republicans. We called the President on January 11. I personally called him to tell him we had a bill, a bipartisan bill. I wanted him to hear about it, to know the details, and I hoped that it would solve the problem and challenge that we faced. It was a real compromise. The day after we finalized that agreement, after the House meeting, we addressed all of the priorities that the President had laid before us, including protection for the Dreamers and a significant, multibillion-dollar downpayment on our border security.

The President said he looked forward to Senator GRAHAM’s briefing him on that plan and would be back in touch with me. Then I received word, within minutes, that the President wanted me to join Senator GRAHAM in going to the White House. Two hours later, Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM and I were at the White House, hoping that the President might embrace our bipartisan plan, but we were surprised and disappointed when we entered the Oval Office. In a matter of an hour and a half, five of the congressional hard-liners on immigration had been invited in to shoot down our plan. The President’s views, in a matter of less than 2 hours, had changed radically.

During our meeting, the President demanded \$20 billion to build a wall on our southern border. He kept saying

over and over: Give me \$20 billion. I will build this wall in 1 year. The President reacted negatively to the agreement that we had reached in terms of protecting immigrants from Haiti from deportation and ensuring that immigrants from Africa would be permitted to come to our country. What I heard at that meeting had nothing to do with security and American jobs. It was a sad commentary by the President on his vision of immigration.

Then, 2 weeks ago, Senator SCHUMER, our Democratic leader, made another good-faith attempt to work with the White House. He made a generous offer to President Trump to fund the border wall, but after a promising meeting, within 2 hours, the President called and withdrew any offer. That was the third time Senate Democrats had offered to fund President Trump's wall in exchange for the Dream Act. In other words, we have been willing to support a broadly unpopular and partisan proposal—the wall—in exchange for a broadly popular and bipartisan proposal—the Dream Act. The President will not take “yes” for an answer. It is no wonder that Senator SCHUMER has said that trying to reach an immigration agreement with the President is “like trying to negotiate with Jell-O.”

Two weeks ago, the White House released a 1-page “Framework on Immigration Reform & Border Security.” The White House claims this is a compromise because it includes a path to citizenship for some Dreamers. I might add that it is an issue that is supported by the overwhelming majority of American people. The plan would put the administration's entire hard-line immigration agenda on the backs of these young people.

For example, the White House wants to dramatically reduce legal immigration by prohibiting American citizens from sponsoring their parents, siblings, and adult or married children as immigrants. We are talking about, literally, millions of relatives of American citizens who have done the right thing, followed our immigration laws, and have been waiting patiently in line for as long as 20 years to come to the United States.

Listen to what the Cato Institute says about the White House proposal:

[I]n the most likely scenario, the new plan would cut the number of legal immigrants by up to 44 percent or half a million immigrants annually—the largest policy-driven legal immigration cut since the 1920s. Compared to current law, it would exclude—[the President's proposal]—nearly 22 million people from the opportunity to immigrate legally to the United States over the next [50 years].

This proposal would gut the 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act, which established our current immigration system, with its focus on reuniting families.

When you think about the bedrock principles of America—faith, family, love of country—why would we assault this effort to unify and strengthen our families in America with those who are following this process in a legal manner?

The 1965 law, which this would change dramatically, replaced the strict national origin quotas of the 1924 immigration law. The 1924 immigration law was written to specifically exclude people whom the Congress and President, in those days, thought should not be part of America's future. They were focusing on people from my part of the world. My family came from the Baltics. They focused on the Baltics and Eastern European countries—to restrict their immigration to this country. Luckily for me, my family got over before the 1924 law. They also wanted to exclude Italians in their belief that we had had enough from that country, and they wanted to exclude Jews. That is what that 1924 National Security Act was about.

When President Lyndon Johnson signed the 1965 law, he said: “It corrects a cruel and enduring wrong. . . . For over four decades the immigration policy of the United States has been twisted and distorted by the harsh injustice of the national origins quota system.”

Listen to what Presidential Calvin Coolidge said when he signed the 1924 law, the last major reduction in legal immigration in America:

There are racial considerations too grave to be brushed aside. Biological laws tell us that certain people will not mix or blend. The Nordics propagate themselves successfully. With other races, the outcome shows deterioration on both sides.

I cannot understand why Attorney General Sessions, at one point, praised that 1924 law and said it was “good for America.”

The President's immigration framework would also fast-track the deportations of women and children who come to our border in their fleeing gang and sexual violence. Since our tragic failure during World War II to aid Jewish refugees who fled the Holocaust, the United States has led the world, since then, in providing a safe haven to people who flee war, terrorism, and persecution. Now we are in the midst of the worst refugee crisis on record, with 65 million people worldwide being forcibly displaced, including child refugees from Central America, the Northern Triangle, who are fleeing horrific violence.

Consider the opinion of General John Kelly back in 2015, the current White House Chief of Staff, when he headed the U.S. Southern Command. General Kelly said then that the children from Central America who are arriving on the U.S.-Mexico border are “the direct result of our drug consumption” in the United States. General Kelly said, “In many ways [parents] are trying to save their children” from the violence in their own countries. General Kelly was right in 2015.

In the past, Democrats have supported some of the President's proposals, like changes in our family immigration system and eliminating the diversity visa lottery. I might remind my colleagues that that was all part of

a significantly comprehensive immigration reform bill.

I was part of the Gang of 8 that drafted the original bill—four Republicans, four Democrats. We brought that bill to this floor in 2013 and won a vote—68 to 32. The bill was a product of months of negotiations and compromise. Unfortunately, the Republican leadership in the House of Representatives refused to even consider it.

Now we are being asked to accept this administration's proposals with no conditions and no give-and-take. If the administration wants to reform our legal immigration system, we have some priorities that we care for as well.

If we are talking about protecting national security, why aren't we closing the loopholes in the Visa Waiver Program? There are 20 million people from 38 nations who travel to America every year on the Visa Waiver Program—one-third of all of the visitors to the United States. They arrive in American airports without undergoing biometric checks or consular interviews. Zacarias Moussaoui, the so-called 20th hijacker of 9/11, tried to enter the U.S. through the Visa Waiver Program. So did Richard Reid, the Shoe Bomber. We should strengthen the Visa Waiver Program by requiring biometric checks of travelers before they land in America so that we know who they are before they board the airplanes.

If you are really sincere about the security of our Nation, this is an obvious need. Congress should also close the loophole that lets people enter the United States through the Visa Waiver Program. Remember, there are 20 million a year. We allow them to buy guns, even assault weapons, even if they are on the FBI's terrorist watch list. When it comes to security, that is an obvious loophole that needs to be closed.

With the President's failing to lead, the responsibility to fix the DACA crisis falls on our shoulders here in Congress.

I see my colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN. He and I have talked extensively about this. I still hold out hope that we may be able to find some way to resolve this in a bipartisan fashion. We have to do it because, to date, Congress—the Senate and the House—have done nothing.

Three weeks ago, a bipartisan group of Senate Republicans and Democrats finally persuaded Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, to commit to addressing DACA. I salute him for doing that. He made a statement on the floor twice, unequivocally, that we would bring this measure up if we had not reached an agreement by this Friday and that we would consider starting with what he called a level playing field—amendments on both sides—on the issue of immigration and DACA. We haven't seen that kind of debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate in over 1 year.

If it comes to that, I look forward to it. I would like to see the Senate work its will, and I hope that we will come up with a positive and constructive compromise. We have only 3 days from today for that process to start, and I hope that we can make some progress. Bipartisan legislation to protect the Dreamers has been pending in Congress, and it has overwhelming support from the people we represent, including President Trump's own voters. It would pass on a strong bipartisan vote in both the House and the Senate if Republican leaders would bring it to a vote.

I look forward to that debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

#### FUNDING THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I spoke yesterday about the deadline we have coming up in 2 days. The question is, Are we going to fund the Federal Government? Are we going to keep the lights on, the parks open, the military protecting us, the Border Patrol protecting our borders, or are we going to shut down the government again over an unrelated issue?

I listened to my friend, the Senator from Illinois, talk at some length about DACA. I do want to respond to that, but there is no reason we have to do DACA first, because we are engaged in good-faith negotiations, and, indeed, the majority leader has promised that he would take up a bill on the floor of the Senate in our failing to reach an agreement.

The fact is that our friends across the aisle have, basically, shut down the government and are now threatening to hold hostage a number of very important measures, which I will talk about momentarily, over this issue that is unrelated to the funding of the government or to these other matters.

So what have we had to do?

We have had to pass short-term continuing resolutions. We have had five of them since September alone. The impact of these continuing resolutions was brought home to me again yesterday.

Usually, I would think about our military and General Mattis, who has pleaded with us to help provide the additional resources that are necessary to make sure that our military is ready, is trained, has the equipment it needs in order to fight and win wars but, hopefully, to maintain our strength so that we will never have to fight a war. That is how Ronald Reagan viewed it. I agree with General Mattis: Peace through strength is the right formula.

Yet, when our adversaries look at us with our military—just a pale reflection of what it used to be in terms of readiness because of the lack of funding we have provided—that is a provocation or, at least, an invitation for others to step in and fill the void, and it leads to a more dangerous world.

As I said, the harm caused by these continuing resolutions was brought home to me again yesterday when I had a number of people with the Texas Association of Community Health Centers come visit. These community health centers are a vital link and safety net for many Texans and many Americans who don't otherwise have a place they can go for their medical care. They treat people based on a sliding scale, based on the ability to pay, so they are accessible to virtually everyone.

What my constituents with the Texas Association of Community Health Centers told me was because of the funding cliff with the continuing resolutions, they don't know how to plan. Their doctors, their medical assistants, and other support staff don't know if they are going to have a job after Thursday, February 8, when the current continuing resolution expires.

They don't know whether the patients they treat will actually have a place to go to get that treatment. This is a miserable way for Congress to do business, and it should not continue. We need to provide more certainty and predictability.

General Mattis himself said that this basically wastes money because we have to plan to shut down portions of our activities if, in fact, government does shut down. So then we have to restart it again—stop it, start it. It is a waste, it is inefficient, and it is unnecessary.

Our friends across the aisle need to release another hostage, too, in addition to the spending caps agreement and the funding needed for our military and the funding needed for community health centers and all the other important functions that are served by the Federal Government. They need to release the hostage of disaster relief.

In December, the House passed an \$81 billion relief package, but so far our Democratic colleagues have refused to allow us to bring that disaster relief bill up. Again, why? Because of DACA, this unrelated immigration issue that they think is more important than all the people who were hurt by Hurricane Maria, Hurricane Harvey, and the wildfires out West.

We do need to address DACA, and we will, but why hurt the victims of these natural disasters in the interim by holding this disaster relief hostage? It is time we stand up in a bipartisan fashion and show these folks in Texas, Florida, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and out West that we remember, and we are going to help them. Why should they have to wait any further? There is no good answer to that question, but I think it is important that somebody come out on the floor of the U.S. Senate and ask the question.

#### IMMIGRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I said I wanted to talk about the issue our Democratic colleagues shut down the

government over last month, and that issue is immigration and the path forward on DACA. DACA, again, is Deferred Action on Childhood Arrivals. This is something President Obama did unilaterally, circumventing Congress, assuring that in a new administration, it would be called into question, not only in the courts but also by the new administration.

President Trump, recognizing that the courts had effectively said what President Obama tried to do was illegal, basically continued it for a time to give Congress a chance to try to respond, and he has given us a deadline of March 5. I heard my friend from Illinois blame President Trump for trying to fix a problem that was caused by an overreach by the previous administration. Don't take my word for it, take the courts which struck down the DACA Program.

President Trump has continued it long enough to give Congress a chance to fix it. That is the appropriate response. It is not helpful just to engage in the blame game. We actually need to step up and not just give speeches on the floor of the Senate; we need to actually enter into a good-faith negotiation.

To date, President Trump has issued a reasonable framework that will not only give protection to those who were brought here illegally by their parents as children but also fixes other gaps in our broken immigration system—border security, the diversity lottery visa, and ensures that people who are waiting in line patiently can be unified with their family by narrowing the scope of family-based immigration in the future. That is prospective only. One proposal has been to plow those additional green cards into accelerating the passage of people who are patiently waiting in line—some as many as 10 and 20 years.

President Trump has done something President Obama never did. He has offered 1.8 million young adults who are currently DACA recipients and DACA-eligible an opportunity to get on a pathway to American citizenship. That is three times more than the young adults who were addressed by the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program that President Obama did unilaterally. That is an incredibly generous offer.

What has the President requested in return or in addition? He said: Secondly, I want to secure our borders, and I want to address legal loopholes in the current law. That is important because we have to protect our citizens and regain the public trust. One of the very reasons this President was elected is because people are angry that the Federal Government has failed them when it comes to securing our borders and enforcing our laws. I believe the second pillar of what President Trump has talked about, border security, is really a system of physical infrastructure—fence, walls, barriers—but also technology and personnel; that those

are the three essential ingredients in border security. We have to ensure that people don't flout the law and enter the country illegally. We all know a porous border is an opportunity for drug traffickers, human traffickers, and other criminals to exploit our porous border. As I said, it is not one-dimensional, it is not just about a wall or a fence or a barrier, it is about technology, personnel, and physical infrastructure as well, and the President has acknowledged as much.

I have heard our colleagues across the aisle bridle at what the President has requested in terms of not only a plan for border security but also for the funding. He said he wants \$25 billion to make sure the Federal Government finally steps up and lives up to its responsibility on the border. It wasn't that long ago when the Gang of 8—Senator DURBIN my friend from Illinois was one of the gang members—proposed and the Senate passed a bill by 68 votes that provided \$50 billion for border security. It had other problems, but they were more than generous in providing for border security. Today they chafe and resist and refuse basically to negotiate on this item, when they voted for double that amount in the so-called Gang of 8 bill just a few years ago.

The President's third pillar relates to what is known as the diversity lottery visa. Many, including the President, have questioned whether it makes sense to just give out 50,000 green cards a year based on a lottery—a game of chance. They have suggested and the President has proposed that we use those green cards to reward skill and merit.

We ought to look at immigration as a way for us to attract the best and brightest, the people who have skills, talents, education, something to offer their new country when they come here. We don't have to end the diversity part, but we can add to it the skills that would help make our country better and allow these new citizens to contribute in a substantial way to their adopted country.

The fourth pillar addresses family unification. I say "family unification" because I think the recently adopted alternative term of "chain migration" has become a pejorative and oversimplifies a very complex area of the law. What the President has proposed is, in the future, we allow people to immigrate to the country based on family relationships, and we confine that to the nuclear family—mom, dad, and the kids. One suggestion has been that the green cards we would save by not allowing collateral family members to come in—married adult children, aunts, uncles, cousins, and the like, based strictly on the family relationship—we could plow those green cards back into the backlog because there are people who have been playing by the rules and waiting patiently in line, some for 10 or 20 years because of the caps we put on country immigration.

Why doesn't it make sense to let them reunite with their family members even faster so they don't have to wait so long? I think that makes an awful lot of sense. During the time that backlog clears, there really wouldn't be any reduction in legal immigration.

I don't know what the right number is for legal immigration. We naturalize roughly about 1 million people a year. I support legal immigration. I think it makes our country better, but I am not sure exactly what the right number is, and I am not sure exactly what the right formula is. A number of countries, such as Australia and Canada, look at the skills and merit-based system, in addition to family relationships. I think that makes a lot of sense to me.

While we are continuing to have this discussion about what should be the long-term rate of legal immigration, it makes sense to plow these additional green cards—that will not be used prospectively by collateral family members based strictly on that family relationship—back into the backlog and unify the families who have been waiting for their loved one who has been waiting in line, waiting to immigrate legally into the United States.

One thing I really appreciate about the President's proposal is, it addresses shortcomings of the so-called Gang of 8 bill that was considered back in 2013. This is where I differ again from my colleague from Illinois. He celebrates the fact that they were able to get 68 votes in the Senate, but it didn't pass the House, and it never got to the President. I am not sure that is a cause for celebration. What I would actually like to see is us take the President's four pillars and actually get a Presidential signature on a law that passes not only the Senate but the House and that the President will sign. I thought that was the goal, not just to go through some futile gesture or to pass one branch of the legislature only to fail in the House.

The reason the Gang of 8 bill failed in the House was because it had some serious problems. It had no real objective metrics to determine where technology and infrastructure would be the most effective. It didn't allow the Department of Homeland Security to achieve 24/7 situational awareness and 100 percent operational control of the border. It didn't adequately address the personnel and infrastructure improvements we know are desperately needed at our northern borders and our ports of entry.

Finally, even though the Gang of 8 bill contains some provisions to address criminal gangs, drunk drivers, and aggravated felons, it also had generous waivers and still allowed some criminals to qualify for legal status. That didn't make any sense to me then, and it makes no sense to me now. Why would we allow people with criminal records to immigrate into the United States?

Worse, the Gang of 8 bill didn't end catch-and-release of criminal aliens,

and it did nothing to deter the influx of people who are exploiting a loophole in the law relating to unaccompanied minors. By way of contrast, the new White House proposal addresses these concerns in ways the flawed Gang of 8 bill did not, and I predict, if we embrace the President's four pillars and pass a bill that reflects those requirements, the House of Representatives could pass it, and the President would sign it, which would actually then provide a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million young people.

I don't know how some of our friends can look these young people in the face and say: We had the chance. You had the opportunity to receive one of the greatest gifts a human being could possibly accept, and that is a pathway to American citizenship, but we turned it down. Perhaps, we miscalculated, and we figured that, maybe, we can get it through the Senate but we can't get it through the House and we can't get a Presidential signature. So we ended up emptyhanded, and you remain in the same box you were in in the first place. How is that helping these young people? It is not.

Well, the White House proposal closes loopholes in the current law that are being exploited by criminal gangs and human traffickers. Let me explain. Under the current law, if somebody is under 18 years of age and shows up at the border, the Border Patrol processes them, and then they are given to Health and Human Services. If they make a claim of some immigration benefit, they are given a notice to appear before an immigration judge, but the backlog there is so great that it could be years down the road, and then they are placed with a sponsor.

Here is the problem. First of all, there is no adequate monitoring of these individuals to make sure they actually show up for their court hearing. Current law allows them to be placed with a sponsor that is not legally present in the country in the first place. There are no criminal background checks. So we don't know whether these unaccompanied children are being placed with people who would abuse them, traffic them, or recruit them into criminal gangs.

In 2017 alone, the Department of Homeland Security apprehended 41,000 unaccompanied minors across the southern border, and 37 percent were between the ages of 15 and 16, and another 32 percent were 17 years old. So we are not talking about young children. We are talking about, by and large, grown young men. As I mentioned earlier, this number has increased significantly, with more than 11,000 unaccompanied minors being apprehended in the last 4 months alone.

They have figured this out. The transnational criminal organizations that traffic in human beings, drugs, weapons, and anything else that is worth a buck have figured this out. They have a loophole in the U.S. law that allows them to charge a fee to

bring in these young men, who may or may not be a member of MS-13, one of the most violent criminal gangs in Central America. Now they are unfortunately in the United States, and there is no way for the U.S. Government to keep them out even if they are gang members, under current law.

Well, I don't know how our colleagues who refuse to take up this issue and address it justify it. I just can't understand it. In my opinion, we have a real problem that our colleagues either don't want to fix or they are deliberately ignoring. We can't solve these problems by just putting our head in the sand and hoping that the problem goes away. It will not. This is just one example of a loophole, which a border security bill that I introduced months ago, called the Building America's Trust Act, would fix.

So if our colleagues are serious about coming up with a solution to our immigration problems and providing a lifeline to these young adults who are DACA recipients and, indeed, everyone who is DACA-eligible, they need to work with us. They need to recognize the reality that President Trump has laid out a pathway for that to happen, but they can't just cherry-pick and pick the parts they like and ignore the rest and expect that we are going to get an outcome.

Again, the basic failure in the Gang of 8 bill was that they got 68 votes in the Senate, including \$50 billion for border security, but they couldn't get it through the House and couldn't get it to the President for signature. I don't know how to sugar-coat it, but that is failure. That is not success. Success is to get a bill through both Houses and to get the President to sign it. President Trump has given all of us a map, a pathway for how to do that. To my knowledge, there has never been a counteroffer that addresses the four pillars that the President has proposed.

Again, I think the people with the most to lose out of this proposition, in addition to the great American people, are these young adults who would benefit from the stability and predictability and a path forward and would receive a gift, as I said, that would be the greatest gift that any human being could possibly aspire to, which is the gift of American citizenship, eventually. But it is going to be squandered. The President's generous offer will be squandered because our colleagues don't like his proposal, but they are unwilling to come up with a counteroffer so that we can actually have a negotiation. The President, I am sure, would welcome that counteroffer, and we would too.

We welcome an opportunity to actually get a result here, to make a law and not just go through a political exercise that is destined to end in failure and then become a political issue in the next election. That is not what we should be about here.

So I hope that reality will set in. President Trump has offered a pro-

posal. Our colleagues on the other side, who don't like the proposal, have not offered a counteroffer that meets the four pillars. They don't even want to pay attention to the last two—the diversity visa issue or the so-called family unification, sometimes called chain migration. They want to act like that doesn't exist, and I just don't get it.

I come from a State of 28 million people, with 38 percent, roughly, of Hispanic origin. We have a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico. Texas taxpayers pay for the border security that the Federal Government fails to fund and facilitate. I want to see a solution. I am happy to vote in favor of a pathway to citizenship for 1.8 million people, but I can't go back home and look my constituents in the face unless I tell them that this is the last time we are going to have to do this because we fixed the underlying problem—border insecurity, gaps that are exploited by criminal gang members and the transnational criminal organizations that traffic in them, and these other issues that the President has put on the table.

So I hope reality does set in because I really would like to get a bill that we could pass in the House and the Senate and get to the President for his signature and move on to these other important issues: How do we fund our military? How do we fund the community health centers? How do we provide some predictability to the rest of America that is being held hostage to this issue?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG). The Senator from West Virginia.

#### CIVILITY AND TRUST

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss something extremely important to each one of us in this wonderful body, which is called civility and trust. I rise to discuss them because they have been lost in Washington. I look around and we are all friends, and for some reason we lost trust in each other. We don't seem to spend enough time with each other.

I can remember Senator Robert C. Byrd, who was the longest serving Senator in the history of the U.S. Senate, and he always told me what a place this was. He said that the Senate is something special. He even wrote a book about it, about how the Senate was to operate, what the Founding Fathers' intent was for the bipartisan, bicameral body that George Washington explained so eloquently, and what our role was as the most deliberative body in the world. The whole world depends on us kind of cooling things off and making things work. But as we have seen, it hasn't done what it is supposed to do, and it is not to blame one person or the other or one party or the other. I guess we can all say that it is all of our fault for letting it denigrate to this point.

Several years ago, I took a personal pledge. I just knew something was wrong. When I first got here, I looked around and I saw that we were all expected to make phone calls raising money every day to our respective parties, and that money would be used for a couple of purposes. The purpose was basically to set an agenda or explain your priorities and your policies, but a lot of that money was directed toward defeating colleagues on the other side. So being in the Democratic caucus, the Democratic money was supposed to be raised and, if any one of my friends on the Republican side was up in this cycle, that money was supposed to be used against them. I thought that was wrong, and I know a lot of my Republican friends feel the same way—that they are supposed to be making phone calls to raise money to be used against me and everybody else who is up in this cycle. I am sure they feel the same as I do.

I have often said that I come to work in a hostile work environment, and I try to explain that in terms of how we in West Virginia would look upon this. If you go to work every day in my State of West Virginia and your colleague or some person with whom you are working is trying to undermine and undercut you to get you fired, and every day you go to work they are nice to your face but behind the scenes they are doing all they can to denigrate your work or to make your supervisors believe that you are not doing your job, back home in West Virginia, sooner or later, they are going to want a little talk. Can we talk in the parking lot? Can we have this disagreement worked out? That is just the way it would be settled, and, maybe, that is the way it should be settled here too. I don't know. I don't think so.

I have met too many wonderful people with whom I have been serving for the last 7 years who are bright, extremely capable, intelligent, and with a wealth of experience, and I would put them up against any people whom I have met anywhere in any occupation in the country. But for some reason, we are all blocked from doing the right thing or what we know is right—sitting down and not accusing each other, not working and conspiring against each other, and not getting basically to the point that it is so visceral. Perhaps, someone might be talking with me one day, but, then, that weekend they might be in my State campaigning against me. Then, we come back on Monday or Tuesday, and we are supposed to sit down and work through our problems and differences for the betterment of our country. I just think human nature doesn't let that happen, and it will not produce good results.

I have always looked forward to working with everybody. I am probably one of the most centrist, as far as being on more pieces of legislation in a bipartisan way. I have never looked at a Republican or a Democratic problem. I just looked at a problem that we had,



and I always said this: The best form of government—the best policies and the best form of politics, if you want to play hardcore politics—is good government. Everyone can take credit for doing something good, and I will assure you, if we do something wrong and we don't fix things, we all get blamed. We all get blamed. So nobody looks good when we sit and don't work on our differences, and we all get credit when we try to work together.

We are facing a lot of challenges right now. We do things that basically shun the other side because we don't want to share the glory with someone else if we think there is some good in the piece of legislation. Every piece of legislation we have voted for or against has good in it. Every piece of legislation has something good and worthwhile in it. What happens is that there are ways we can make something better, and that is where our differences are. If you can make something better, then, I need to sit down and work with you because I don't have all the answers, but we both have a desire to make the best piece of policy that we can in legislation. So we should be working together. I should be open to saying: OK, that makes sense to me; let's see if we can amend this and fix it. But it seems that we get set in our ways.

The place that Robert Byrd talked about many years ago was a place where people stayed and spent more time in Washington. They didn't come in on Monday night and leave on Thursday afternoon. They stayed and worked. On the weekends, they would even get together and have dinners together. Families would do things together during the days and the weekends, and they became friends. It is hard to say no to your friend. It is hard. All of us have been in situations that were very hurtful, when there was a friend with whom you disagreed. So you tried to find the most delicate way to see if there was a pathway forward without losing that friendship. It meant that much to us. That is what it should be here, too. But when you don't have that relationship—as a former Governor, I have my dear friend from South Dakota, and we are going to look for a way to stay together and be friends. We are not going to look for a way to disagree and diverge from that friendship that we built.

We built that over our terms working together as Governors. I have always said that Governors are the most bipartisan people I have ever met.

In our NGA—National Governors Association—when you had an education problem, when you had a Medicaid problem, when you had an infrastructure problem, when you had a veterans problem, if you looked around and you saw someone in one State who had found a pathway forward to fix that, you never hesitated to call them and say: Hey, Mike, what did you think about it? He would say: Well, I tried this, JOE. Why don't you try it? I will

send someone or you send someone out, and we will work together.

That is what I was used to doing as far as getting things done, and that is what I want to do here again. I think the place is right for it. The American people want it solved and want the States we represent to have a bipartisan pathway forward and to work together. I know the people of West Virginia want to see us get things accomplished.

I have a wonderful little State that has given their all. I often tell people in West Virginia—I tell the children: When someone asks you where you are from, I want you to puff up your chest. I want you to say: Oh, I come from a beautiful State, one of the most patriotic States in the Nation.

We have answered the call to duty more than most any State. We have more veterans per capita than most any State. We have fought more wars, shed more blood, lost more lives for the cause of freedom than any State. We have done the heavy lifting. We have mined the coal that made the steel that built the guns and ships that defend our country every day.

The Good Lord has been so kind to us and blessed us with one of the greatest venues that you will ever see in the mountains of West Virginia. My little State is called West Virginia, and we hope you will come and visit, and maybe you will even stay.

It is really who we are. And we all have that same pride; each one of us does. Whether it be Indiana, South Dakota, wherever it may be, we have a pride in our States, the people in our States, and they deserve better than what we are giving them right now.

I don't see anybody in public service, who is willing to put their name on the ballot, as my enemy. If you are willing to serve, then I am your comrade. I am going to work with you. If you are willing to take the heat that comes with these jobs, then let's make sure we get the results that the jobs should produce. These jobs should produce results so that the whole world can have a hope that America is the right place. They are the people who can solve the problems that we all have, and they still can lift us up and be the hope of the world.

With that, I am pledging to the people of West Virginia and to the American people that I will not campaign against a sitting colleague, that I will not directly fundraise against them, that I will not distribute any direct mail against them. I will not appear or endorse any advertisements directed at them. I will not use or endorse social media campaigns that attack them.

Washington will be dysfunctional until we all draw the line of truce and say that we are here for the same reason. We take the same oath. We swear on the Bible to the same Constitution—that we will uphold it. That is what we are here to do.

Since that civility has broken down because the system has changed and we

are not here and we don't know each other's families, spouses, children, we better control ourselves, hopefully through the rules we can change and the ethics laws we should live by, to treat each other in the manner that we would want to be treated.

With that, I am going to sign this pledge, and I would hope that all of my colleagues would consider signing the pledge the same way. We are the only ones who can change it. The power has changed. The pressure that comes within has changed. The way this place works has changed. The only way we can change it is to say we are not going to participate in denigrating each other and attacking each other anymore.

With that, I am going to sign the pledge. It says here:

Pledge to Return to Era of Bipartisan Cooperation and Agreement.

In order to restore civility to the United States Senate and our political discourse, we must pledge to return to an era of bipartisan cooperation and agreement.

I, Joe Manchin, pledge to the people of West Virginia and to the American people that I will not campaign against a sitting colleague, not directly fundraise against them, not distribute direct mail against them, not appear or endorse advertisements directed at them, and not use or endorse social media campaigns that attack them.

I would hope that each one of you would consider this. I think we have to take this into our own hands right now and make sure that we look at each other, that we look at each other with sincerity. You are my friend. We might disagree, but we can work through this, Mr. President. We can definitely work through this and remember what our purpose is for being here. The people want us to succeed. They depend on us to succeed, and that is the policy they need. Whether in Indiana, South Dakota, or West Virginia, they all want the same—they want America to be the hope of the world.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

MR. ROUNDS. Mr. President, let me respond to my colleague and good friend from West Virginia. He and I served as Governors at the same time. We have a friendship that has now lasted more than a decade. A lot of what the Senator has indicated I feel as well in terms of the reason why we came here and the focus we should have. In fact, I think one of the most important things we can do as Members of this institution, Members of this body, is to show respect for one another and defend one another in our responsibility to try to find a way forward. Until we have that respect for one another, it will be very difficult to expect others to have that same respect for us or for this institution.

I most certainly appreciate the sentiments expressed by my colleague from West Virginia, and I appreciate his bringing them to the floor today.

## DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, it is in that spirit that I bring this message to my fellow Members of the U.S. Senate. I rise today to ask for support for the Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2018.

I would like to start by thanking the majority leader for bringing the Defense appropriations bill to the floor. Now, just because the majority leader brings it to the floor doesn't mean we will necessarily get the opportunity to debate it. It requires either the unanimous consent of all the Members or at least 60 Members agreeing to have that debate. That is one of the reasons why we haven't had any appropriations measures on the floor. It takes 60 Members, Republicans and Democrats, just to begin the debate of each one of these 12 separate appropriations bills, which make up what we normally vote on during a year. This is also part of that process which has been broken for more than 44 years because it has only worked four times in 44 years. But you have to start someplace.

Providing long-term funding stability for our Armed Forces is vital to their ability to adequately train, equip, and maintain the force. In particular, under short-term, stop-gap funding measures known as continuing resolutions, which we are operating under right now, the Defense Department is restricted from starting new programs. These new programs are ones that we have already authorized through the National Defense Authorization Act on a bipartisan basis for 2018; we just haven't appropriated the money yet so that they can actually do the programs we have already agreed as a body are important to have in place. This is very concerning to me because in today's rapidly changing threat environment, these programs were designed to protect our Nation against those new threats.

If we are to adequately recover readiness levels that were lost over the last 8 years—really, in many cases, due to sequestration—as well as to modernize our Armed Forces in this increasingly dangerous and complex world, we must give them the funding, stability, and certainty that continuing resolutions fail to provide.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee Subcommittee on Readiness, I am pleased that the subcommittee has held two hearings this year on our services' readiness posture. To put that in non-DC terms, it means just exactly what their conditions are right now and their need for modernization.

Today, I would like to share just a few examples of readiness issues facing our military force. The first are issues plaguing our Navy, and both demonstrate the need to adequately fund not only our Navy but all branches of our Armed Forces.

The first issue concerns the F/A-18 Hornet aircraft. For any Members who are wondering which aircraft it is, this

is the one that people see on a regular basis on film clips and so forth showing them taking off of the carriers. This is our primary Navy attack aircraft. This is the one that we use for aerial combat. We also use this one to do the attacks in both Iraq and Syria.

The first issue is plaguing our Navy—and what they do is they demonstrate the need to adequately fund not only our Navy but, as I said, all of the different branches. So this is not only the Navy; all of the branches need this assistance.

Vice Chief of Naval Operations, ADM William Moran, stated that our legacy F/A-18A and D Hornets today take twice as many manhours as originally planned for repairs and maintenance. He has also stated that “on a typical day in the Navy, about 25 to 30 percent of our jets and our airplanes are in some kind of depot maintenance.” Overall, just over half are unavailable for operations today. So it is not just the F/A-18 Hornet, it is all of their aircraft that are in need of upgrading.

To sum up the Admiral's comments, the Navy is putting in twice the maintenance manhours to maintain a fleet that is less than 50 percent available.

In a crisis situation, the Vice Chief said, “We can and we do put airplanes and ready air crews forward,” but “there's no depth on the bench behind them if we had to surge forces.” In other words, all of the aircraft that are available right now, we have on the frontlines. These are the ones that are serving overseas. We don't have backups in case they start to go down.

The Marine Corps is also experiencing serious readiness issues with its F/A-18 fleet, and there is a human cost. On December 8, 2016, the Marine Corps announced that yet another pilot had been killed as a result of a training accident in the F/A-18 Hornet. This was the third Marine Corps F/A-18 Hornet class A mishap—which is defined as an accident resulting in a death or the complete loss of aircraft—over a month-and-a-half time period. In the previous 22 months, the Marine Corps had experienced seven class A mishaps flying legacy F/A-18 Hornets. Sadly, some or all of these mishaps might have been avoided with the additional training and maintenance that would have been forthcoming with the additional funding that had been recommended in the National Defense Authorization Act, which this body, on a bipartisan basis, has already voted on.

Returning to the Navy, its maintenance-related readiness concerns extend to its attack submarine fleet. Admiral Moran recently mentioned that attack submarines are sometimes sent to private shipyards for maintenance because government shipyards are already at capacity with higher priority work, especially and specifically on aircraft carriers and ballistic missiles submarines, but the private shipyards do not have the capacity to take on extra repair work. This lack of shipyard capacity is severely impacting our attack submarine fleet.

For example, the USS *Albany*, which is an attack submarine, spent 48 months in the repair yard due to repeated delays as the workforce focused its attention on aircraft carriers and on ballistic missile submarines. That means an entire crew spent years waiting for a deployment that never came.

Worse still, the USS *Boise* attack submarine wasn't even put in the shipyard last summer because the shipyard workload was so far over workforce capacity. As a result, that boat is currently sitting in Norfolk, VA, and is not certified to dive while it awaits maintenance. This is a taxpayer asset sitting at dock tied up, not being repaired, not even being worked on. Right now, it is so far out of shape, it is not even allowed to dive. In fact, the *Boise* will not be able to rejoin the fleet until 2020 or later. That means this vital Navy asset will be unavailable for at least another 48 months.

In fact, a maintenance backlog has docked 15 nuclear-powered attack submarines for a total of 177 months—or almost 15 years—in which those attack submarines have not been available in the protection of our country.

While I am discussing some serious Navy readiness challenges, all of our services face readiness challenges.

Air Force Secretary Heather Wilson recently said:

The fiscal year 2018 continuing resolution is actually delaying our efforts to increase readiness of the force, and risk accumulates over time. We are stretching the force to the limit, and we need to start turning the corner on readiness.

With a shortage of nearly 2,000 pilots, out of about 20,000 total, Secretary Wilson went on to say, current Active-Duty pilots were burning out because the Air Force was too small for what the Nation is asking.

“Our biggest need right now is for a higher and stable budget to provide security and solvency for the nation,” she went on to say.

According to Defense Secretary James Mattis, operating under a continuing resolution for 2018 runs the risk of delaying vital projects and increasing their costs, including 37 Navy projects, 16 Air Force projects, and 38 Army projects. The projects that could be impacted include progress on new trainer aircraft, weapons systems, and important training programs.

The most important things Congress can do to solve these problems are to provide funding stability and avoid arbitrary budget caps that constrain defense spending below that which is required to protect our Nation. This bill that is before us now does both. More specifically, only by removing these caps can we avoid the Department of Defense having to make difficult choices that are so devastating for our Armed Forces. In particular, we must avoid their having to make the false choice of paying for readiness while assuming the risk for modernization or vice versa.

The American people expect us to adequately defend America next year

and for every year to come. This requires us to put an end to continuing resolutions and remove arbitrary budget caps and the threat of sequestration. Only by doing so can Congress fulfill its No. 1 responsibility: keeping Americans safe.

I conclude by again thanking the majority leader for bringing the fiscal year 2018 Defense appropriations bill to the floor. He can't do it alone. He needs our cooperation. He needs our understanding as to just how critical this is. If there is not unanimous consent to move forward, it will require 60 of us to agree. It is time to bring this bill to the floor for full debate and passage.

I ask all of my colleagues to support it, get it to the President's desk as soon as possible, and finally bring an end to the defense component of a continuing resolution that, with arbitrary budget caps, is so severely impacting the readiness of our Armed Forces.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate has received a message from the House to accompany H.R. 695.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move that the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany H.R. 695.

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

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

*Resolved*, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill (H.R. 695) entitled "An Act to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes." and be it further

*Resolved*, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the aforementioned bill, with an amendment.

#### MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 695.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

I send a cloture motion to the desk on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Jerry Moran, Richard Burr, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, Shelley Moore Capito, Deb Fischer, James M. Inhofe, Pat Roberts, Roger F. Wicker, John Hoeven, John Barrasso, John Boozman, Steve Daines, Mike Rounds.

#### MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1922

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to refer the House message on H.R. 695 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to refer the House message on H.R. 695 to the Committee on Appropriations to report back forthwith with instructions, being amendment numbered 1922.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1923

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1923 to the instructions of the motion to refer.

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

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days"

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1924 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1923

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 1924 to amendment No. 1923.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "2" and insert "3"

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS DRILLING

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to join my colleagues, both Republican and Democrat, in raising the alarm about a decision I believe represents politicized policymaking at its very worst. Just a few weeks ago, we were notified that the Trump administration's Interior Department seeks to open up 90 percent—90 percent—of America's waters to oil and gas drilling.

This was startling news for Americans everywhere but particularly for those of us who come from States along the Atlantic and Pacific coastlines who had no expectation that our coastal waters were about to be subjected to the search for oil and gas. The objections to the Trump administration's decision came swiftly from elected officials in both parties, Republicans and Democrats, because protecting America's fragile coastlines isn't—or shouldn't be—a partisan issue.

This decision by President Trump and Secretary of the Interior Zinke was not rooted in public input or scientific analysis. This decision was not based on concerns about community safety or economic prosperity. This decision was our administration putting their "energy dominance" goals above all else.

I know several of my colleagues have already spoken out to discuss what this means for their States and how it will impact their constituents, but I am here today to raise my voice for mine, to fight for Delaware. In Delaware, our coasts are critical to our local environment and our robust economy. Delaware has 28 miles of Atlantic coastline—some of the most pristine, most beautiful beaches in the entire country.

As you can see in this graphic of our boardwalk at Rehoboth Beach, DE, our 28 miles of coastline employ 10 percent of our total State workforce. That is a remarkable amount of economic activity in a very small space. Our coastline generates \$6.9 billion in economic activity every year and hosts thousands of acres of protected land. It includes on our bay shore side two national wildlife refuges that serve as critical

habitat for bald eagles, white-tailed deer, and striped bass. The future of our coastal economy depends on recreational access, fishing, and tourism, which are now potentially at risk because of this ill-advised decision to open the coastline off of Delaware and the rest of the mid-Atlantic to potential oil and gas exploration and production.

My colleagues know that I make an effort to promote pragmatic and bipartisan ideas. It is one of my top priorities, day in and day out, to work across the aisle and do what is right for our constituents and for the United States.

Let me be clear. My view is not based on an anti-oil or anti-natural gas message. I support an “all of the above” energy strategy and have advanced legislation that will embrace an “all of the above” energy strategy, and I acknowledge there are many places in the United States where we can, and do, safely produce these resources, both onshore and offshore. But what if we happen to face a spill of the scale and size of Deepwater Horizon?

This is an overlay of the footprint of the 2010 oil disaster of the Deepwater Horizon and how it spread to impact the gulf coastline. It is perhaps a little hard to see here, but the State of Delaware and New Jersey and its fragile coastline are underneath that footprint. It suggests how we might end up facing dramatic impacts, negative impacts on tourism and fishing that depend on clean coastlines to support tens of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars of economic activity in my home State.

If we are going to think seriously about doing this, we need to think about the impacts. We need to ask whether the costs outweigh the benefits. When it comes to the Trump-Zinke plan to drill off the coast of Delaware, I am here to tell you that the potential costs dramatically outweigh the benefits. As you can see in this graphic, a spill the size of the Deepwater Horizon could devastate all of our beach communities and protected wildlife areas in Delaware and the region.

Again, protecting our coastlines, an idea supported by scientists and coastal residents alike, should not be a partisan issue. In Delaware alone, multiple city councils, all up and down our coast, have openly opposed offshore drilling through letters and resolutions they have sent to me and the rest of our congressional delegation.

Coastal lawmakers from both parties have opposed offshore drilling. I know for a fact the same is happening in virtually every other coastal State potentially impacted by this unwise decision. These are the people we should be listening to—the people who don’t just visit the coast for a week in the summer but who live on it, who rely on it, who have built their lives and their local economy around it.

Instead, as this decision shows, the Trump administration is prioritizing

the oil and gas industry and partisan politics over those of independent scientists, coastal residents, and the elected officials who speak for our coastal communities. That was made painfully clear when the Republican Governor of Florida, a close ally of the President, petitioned to shield just Florida from potential oil and gas exploration and production.

Sure enough, Florida promptly got a public promise from Secretary Zinke that its coastlines would be spared. I am sure Florida’s coastline is beautiful. In fact, I visited Florida’s coastline, and I can tell you it is beautiful. But guess what; so is Delaware’s. We deserve to be able to protect our coastline just as much as Floridians do. I invite Secretary Zinke to once again come to Delaware but to instead see the coastline and see these fragile resources and see what they have to offer for wildlife, for conservation, for fishing, for hunting, and for tourism.

Secretary Zinke promising to exempt Florida is the Trump administration deciding which States have to deal with oil and gas drilling based purely on partisan, political considerations. I think the state of our coastal communities and local economies shouldn’t be auctioned off to the highest bidder and shouldn’t be subject to partisan politics. Instead, they should be protected based on science and based on the views of coastal communities.

I am here today to voice my profound disappointment in this blatant neglect of local voices and the well-being of individual States and coastal communities. I came to the floor to fight for my State and to raise the local voices I have heard from our coastal communities. Our coastlines are just too fragile and too vital and too important to let partisan politics get in the way of their future.

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.

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

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

#### RECESS

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

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:29 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

#### CHILD PROTECTION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2017—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2386 are printed in today’s RECORD under

“Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

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

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

#### COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, it is no secret that our country faces a major healthcare crisis and, in fact, a dysfunctional healthcare system.

We have some 30 million people who have no health insurance, and that number is going to go up in the coming year. We have even more people who are underinsured, with high deductibles and copayments. Our people pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, which means that millions of people who go to the doctor to get a prescription are simply unable to afford the bill. In fact, the description of that is the definition of a dysfunctional, failing healthcare system.

In the midst of all of that, there is another particular crisis dealing with primary healthcare, and that is that even when people do have health insurance in many parts of our country, they are finding it very hard to go to a doctor and to get in to a doctor to treat the ailments that they have. We fall behind many other countries in terms of our lack of emphasis on primary healthcare, which should be the heart and soul of any strong healthcare system. The bottom line is that when you get sick, you should be able to get to the doctor when you need to and not have to wait weeks and months in order to do so.

In the midst of a failing primary healthcare system, there is one very strong bright spot, and that is that for many decades now, in every State in this country, we have had community health centers run by the people themselves—democratically run—addressing the healthcare needs of those given communities. Today, in America, we have about 27 million people—27 million men, women, and children—who are accessing community health centers. In my own State of Vermont, one out of four Vermonters gets their primary healthcare through a community health center.

These centers do more than provide primary healthcare. They also provide dental care, an issue that is too often ignored when we talk about the healthcare crisis. They provide mental health counseling, which is more important now than perhaps it has ever been because of the opioid and heroin epidemic our country is experiencing. Equally important, they provide low-cost prescription drugs at a time when so many Americans cannot afford the medicines they need. That is what community health centers do, and they

do it well, and they do it cost effectively.

To my mind, there is no question but that there is strong bipartisan support here in the Senate and in the House for community health centers. Yet now we have gone over 4 months into the 2018 fiscal year, and we still have not reauthorized funding for community health centers. Frankly, I do not understand how it happens that when we have strong bipartisan support in the House and the Senate for programs that are working extremely well in every State in this country, the Republican leadership still has not reauthorized the community health center program. There is good bipartisan legislation right here in the Senate that has, I think, the support of virtually everybody in the Democratic caucus. Seven or eight Republicans are supporting it. It is the Blunt-Stabenow bill. It is a 5-year extension of community health centers reauthorization with a modest increase in the budget. If that bill came to the floor today, my guess is that it would get 70, 80 votes—maybe even more. We have gone 4 months into the fiscal year, and we still have not seen that bill reauthorized.

What is happening all over this country is that community health centers, which often struggle with recruitment and retention, are finding it harder than ever to retain the doctors, nurses, and other medical staff they need because applicants are looking around and saying: Why should I work at a community health center if I don't even know if it is going to be there next year? Why should I stay at a community health center if I can get a better job offer and I don't know if this community health center will be funded?

As a result of 4 months of inaction, community health centers all over this country are hurting. I say enough is enough. Right now, as soon as possible, we need to reauthorize the community health center program for at least 5 years, and we need to make sure there is adequate funding so that they can continue to do the excellent work they are doing all over this country.

#### OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. President, there is another issue that I would like to briefly touch upon. There has been a lot of discussion—appropriately so—about the opioid epidemic that is sweeping the United States. We have lost some 63,000 Americans as a result of opioid overdoses in 2016 alone. Families by the millions are being impacted.

I was in Brattleboro, VT, a few weeks ago, and they talked to me about what is happening to the children whose parents are addicted to opioids. They need to find foster homes for those children.

This is clearly an epidemic that has to be dealt with. We have to increase funding for prevention to make sure young people don't get swept up into the epidemic and also for treatment for those people who are addicted.

There is an issue that we have not touched upon enough, and that is hold-

ing the drug companies responsible and accountable for the products they brought into the market. As some people may recall, in April of 1994, the CEOs of the seven largest tobacco companies testified before the House Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health and the Environment in a historic hearing. What that hearing was about was, under oath, demanding to know what the executives from the tobacco industry knew and when they knew it. Did they know that their product was addictive? Did they know that tobacco caused cancer, heart disease, and other medical problems? They were asked to hold their hands up and under oath tell the committee what they knew.

I think it is now appropriate for the Senate to do the same with those drug companies that are producing opioids. I think we need to know what the drug companies knew in terms of the addictive qualities of those drugs. There is some evidence out there that suggests that drug companies, in fact, did know that the product they were selling was in fact addictive, but they forgot to tell the doctors—and certainly not the patients.

It is one thing for somebody to do something in ignorance, not knowing the impact of what you produce. That happens all the time. It is something very different if, in fact, the manufacturer of a product understands that the product causes addiction, that the product causes death. We need to get to the root of that issue. We need to know what the drug companies knew and when they knew that.

I would hope very much that in the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, which has jurisdiction over this issue, we could bring the executives of those drug companies that produce these opioids before us, because not only are we talking about 60,000 people a year dying as a result of overdoses, but what we are talking about also is the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars in healthcare and law enforcement associated with opioid addiction.

I hope that we can move forward and have those executives come before us and tell us under oath what they knew and when they knew it, because I think the time is long overdue for us to hold them accountable.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

#### STEWARDSHIP FOR OUR DEMOCRACY

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, last fall I had the honor to stand in this Chamber and deliver remarks on the subject of a great and growing concern to me—the stewardship of our democracy at the hands of the most powerful figure in our government. I stand again today to sound the same alarm.

Words matter. Have we arrived at such a place of numb acceptance that we have nothing to say when the President of the United States casually suggests that those who choose not to

stand or applaud his speech are guilty of treason? I certainly hope not.

The one who levels such a charge knows neither the meaning of “treason” nor the power that the words of a President carry. If we are numb to such words, then we will surely regret that we failed to defend our colleagues in Congress against such a vile remark, but our silence will also mark the day we failed to recognize that this conduct in an American President simply is not normal.

I wish I could stand here today and say my words of last October have been proven wrong; that I had been unfair to inveigh against the daily sundering of our country; that I had been mistaken about the personal attacks; that I had exaggerated the threats against principles, freedoms, and institutions, the flagrant disregard for truth and decency, and the reckless provocations, most often for the pettiest and most personal reasons, reasons that have nothing whatsoever to do with the fortunes of the people we have all been elected to serve—I wish I could say I had been wrong, but I cannot.

I have seen the President's most ardent defenders use the now-weary argument that the President's comments were meant as a joke, just sarcasm, only tongue in cheek, but treason is not a punch line.

The President said the State of the Union Address was meant to promote and encourage unity in government. Then why, less than a week later, follow up with this divisive and harmful rhetoric? Unity is not secured in a speech. It must be pursued constantly through appropriate behavior, mutual respect, and gained by effective leadership. Respect is earned, not commanded. Applause signals approval of an idea, not loyalty to one's country.

Our Democratic colleagues love this country as much as we do. To suggest otherwise is simply unconscionable. None of us in Congress pledge loyalty or service to the President. This is not a royal court. Our oath is to the Constitution and to the people. As Members of Congress, we must never accept undignified discourse as normal because of the requirements of tribal party politics.

None of this behavior should ever be regarded as normal. We must never allow ourselves to lapse into thinking this is just the way things are now.

We will get through this period, and when we do, we will look back at the destruction of our discourse and the attacks on our democratic values as nothing but a tragedy. May we also be able to say they were an aberration. That, my colleagues, is up to us. We must recognize this is aberrant, destructive behavior, whatever rationale its defenders may offer, and we must never shrink from opposing it, for it is in opposing this behavior that we defend our norms, our ideals, and our values. It is in opposing this behavior that we stand for decency.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the good news for American workers continues to roll in. Just take a look at the headlines from the last week: “Pfizer Plans \$5 Billion Boost in U.S. Manufacturing From Tax Law Changes”; “Cigna raises wages, benefits following tax law”; “CEO: Lehigh Valley small businesses to benefit from federal tax overhaul”; “Altria Group will pay \$3,000 bonus to all non-executive employees”; “Ozarks workers to receive bonuses, benefits thanks to tax changes”; “Charter Sets \$15 Minimum Wage”; “Lowe’s to pay U.S. staff \$1,000 bonus following tax reform.”

The number of companies increasing wages, boosting retirement contributions, or handing out bonuses thanks to tax reform continues to soar. Last week at this time, the number was over 250; now it is up over 300, and it keeps growing. Businesses are making plans to invest in their workers, raise wages, create new jobs, and invest in the U.S. economy. Fiat Chrysler, AT&T, Boeing, Home Depot, Great Western Bank in my home State of South Dakota, AaLadin Industries, Southwest, Best Buy, AccuWeather, Visa, Nationwide Insurance, Jet Blue—the list of companies announcing good news for American workers thanks to tax reform goes on and on.

The Nation’s largest private employer, Walmart, announced an increase in its starting wage for hourly employees and bonuses for eligible employees. It also announced expanded maternity and parental leave benefits and the creation of a new adoption benefit for employees. More than 1 million Walmart employees will benefit from these changes.

JPMorgan Chase announced that it will raise wages for 22,000 workers, add thousands of jobs, and open 400 new branches in the United States. It also plans to increase its lending to small businesses.

Tech giant Apple announced that thanks to tax reform, it will bring home to the United States almost \$250 billion in cash it has been keeping overseas and finally now invest it here in the United States. It also announced that it will create 20,000 new jobs and provide \$2,500 stock bonuses to its employees.

FedEx announced plans to expedite raises and invest \$1.5 billion to expand its FedEx Express hub in Indianapolis. It is also making a \$1.5 billion contribution to its pension plan.

Last week, ExxonMobil announced that thanks in part to tax reform, it will invest an additional \$35 billion in the U.S. economy over the next 5 years. That means a lot of new jobs and opportunities for American workers.

As I said before, I could go on and on. It is important to remember that this is just the beginning. To date, compa-

nies have barely experienced the benefits of tax reform, and already they are moving to invest in their workers and in the economy. As the benefits of tax reform continue to sink in and accrue, we can expect to see more growth, more jobs, and more opportunities for American workers.

The past month of good news is the reason we made business tax reform a key part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. We are deeply committed to immediate relief for the American people, which is why we cut tax rates, doubled the standard deduction, and doubled the child tax credit, delivering immediate, meaningful tax relief to middle-class families in this country. But we want more for American workers than just a tax cut, as valuable as those are; we also want American workers to have access to the kinds of jobs and opportunities that will set them up for security and prosperity for the long term. Good jobs, good wages, and good opportunities were in short supply during the last Presidency, and we are determined to improve things for American workers. So we took action to improve the situation for American businesses since the only way individual Americans thrive is if American businesses and the American economy thrive.

Prior to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, American businesses large and small were weighed down by high tax rates and growth-killing tax provisions. Plus, our outdated international tax rules left America’s global businesses at a competitive disadvantage in the global economy.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act changed all that. We lowered tax rates across the board for owners with small- and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We expanded business owners’ ability to recover investments they make in their businesses, which will free up cash that they can invest in their operations and their workers. We lowered our Nation’s massive corporate tax rate, which, up until January 1 of this year, was the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world. We brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century by replacing our outdated worldwide system with a modernized territorial tax system so that American businesses are not operating at a disadvantage next to their foreign competitors.

Now, just a month and a half into the new tax law, we are already seeing the results: increased investment in the American economy, job creation, higher wages, and benefit increases. As the tax law helps U.S. businesses large and small grow and thrive, we can expect to see a lot more benefits and opportunities for American workers in the future.

Before I close, Mr. President, I would like to say a couple words about the Defense appropriations bill we are taking up this week.

By the end of the Obama administration, our military was facing a serious readiness shortfall. The Obama admin-

istration’s failure to prioritize defense left our Armed Forces with manpower deficits and delayed the acquisition of 21st-century weapons and equipment.

The Defense appropriations bill we will vote on this week provides critical funding for restoring military readiness and would be a downpayment on equipping our troops with the resources they need to meet the threats of the 21st century. Unfortunately, passage of this bill is in jeopardy here in the Senate, thanks to Senate Democrats. Democrats have blocked a Defense appropriations bill six times over the past almost 3 years now, and they look set to block that bill once again. That is not acceptable.

Funding the government by continuing resolution rather than by appropriations bills is never ideal, but it is particularly problematic for the military. Under a continuing resolution, new programs are delayed, and the military’s ability to transfer money between accounts—for acquisition purposes, for example—is restricted. That is a big problem when the security of our Nation depends on the very programs and purchases the military makes.

Defense Secretary James Mattis has warned that “long-term CRs impact the readiness of our forces and their equipment at a time when security threats are extraordinarily high”—not to mention at a time when our military is already under extra pressure as it works to repair the deficits of the Obama years.

Passing a defense appropriations bill, instead of subjecting the military to a constant procession of continuing resolutions, would go a long way toward ensuring our military men and women are prepared to confront the threats that are facing our Nation. It is too bad that Democrats seem to be unable to look beyond politics to the needs of our military. Democrats may not pay a price for opposing this bill this week, but our military will.

It is high time that we pass the Defense appropriations bill. We need to stop this obstruction, stop this blocking. Six times in the last 3 years already they have blocked passage of Defense appropriations, and here we are again faced this week with yet another opportunity to provide the critical and necessary funding for the American military—our men and women in uniform who every single day are out there defending our freedoms—and it looks as though yet again the Democrats intend to block that critical, important funding. This needs to come to an end. This isn’t about politics; this is about America’s national security interests. I hope we can come together and recognize that and put the best interests of America’s national security and our men and women in uniform ahead of politics.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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.

#### OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS DRILLING

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak against the Trump administration's egregious attack on our pristine coastlines in the Pacific, the Atlantic, Alaska, and the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

Dramatic increases in oil and gas development offshore pose a direct threat to our coastal economies in the United States, particularly in the Pacific Northwest. I know many of my colleagues are going to join me on the floor this afternoon to talk about this and about the specific impacts in their areas.

The draft leasing plan, which is what has been put forth by the Secretary of the Interior, is an unprecedented attempt to allow offshore oil and gas drilling in over 90 percent of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf, including in Washington and Oregon.

The truth is that instead of creating new jobs in the oil and gas sector, the administration is poised to choose big oil jobs over the ocean-dependent industries like fishing, shipbuilding, and tourism on our coasts. I know this because I just traveled to many of our coastal communities in the State of Washington, which make their livelihoods off of fishing or tourism, that are very concerned by this proposal. And just yesterday, a public hearing was supposed to take place in Tacoma, WA, which was canceled. The Trump administration failed to account for the value of the existing robust coastal and ocean economies that could be jeopardized by expanding offshore drilling in those areas.

Our ocean-related economy is so important to our State that expanding drilling directly threatens the ocean environment and marine resources that support millions of jobs in construction, fishing, shipbuilding, tourism, recreation, and maritime transport. The ocean-related industries in the areas targeted by the administration's plan contribute over 2.2 million direct jobs, nearly \$75 billion in wages, and over \$150 billion in GDP. The reason I bring this up is that the economic benefits of these industries cannot be overstated: nearly \$8 billion from fishing and seafood, nearly \$70 billion from marine transport, and over \$125 billion from tourism and recreation.

We know that oil spills or other natural disasters related to oil and gas activities, such as the Exxon Valdez or the Deepwater Horizon disaster, can disrupt entire coastal economies. For example, if you took just the Deepwater Horizon spill in size and compared it to the coastal areas of Washington and Oregon, the impacted area would cover all of Washington and a big chunk of Oregon. We know that these can be devastating.

The shore-adjacent counties in the targeted areas host over 39 million jobs and contribute over \$2 trillion in wages. The economies of the shore-adjacent counties represent 65 percent of the affected coastal States' GDPs. That is just one way of saying that coastal States and their economies are big drivers in our U.S. economy and that they are extremely dependent on clean water, coasts, our oceans, and our fisheries.

The Washington coast economy relies on healthy, sustainable oceans, which support our fisheries in places such as Grays Harbor and Pacific County and in many other parts of our State, to make sure they have seafood processing, recreation, and tourism. Our Washington maritime economy is worth \$50 billion in economic activity and 191,000 jobs, and tourism on the coast adds jobs for anglers, charter boats, cruise guides, restaurants, hotels, and more, which are so iconic in the Pacific Northwest. They are the culture and heritage of our coastal communities.

The fact that so many recreational fishermen can be out on our healthy oceans and attracting more people to come and explore is so much a part of the Northwest that putting it at risk to oilspill activities or activities related to exploration is just not something these communities want to do. Just this past week, I received resolutions from various communities on our Pacific coast that urged that this idea be turned down.

The Washington and Oregon coasts are not really suited for oil and gas development. First of all, there are extreme sea states, treacherous storms, and the remote nature of our coastlines. As one of our maritime communities told me, it doesn't really have the resources for cleanup in the area. If a spill happened, who would be there to clean it up? In the meantime, our fishermen, if they have oil sheens behind their fishing boats, can be fined. If we are ready to fine fishermen for oil sheens behind their boats, why are we proposing a plan in the treacherous waters of the Pacific Northwest without having any idea who is going to clean up the mess?

Adding to the risk in the Pacific Northwest is the Cascadia Subduction Zone—one of the most dangerous faults in the United States. The Cascadia Subduction Zone is long overdue to create a significant earthquake. You hear from lots of people about this. In fact, after The New Yorker wrote a big story called "The Really Big One," many people from across the country emailed me to ask: Are we ready for this to happen? I can tell you, with what happened in Japan, people are very concerned about how we prepare for that in the Pacific Northwest. So it makes no sense to put an oil rig on one of the most high-risk, earthquake-prone zones in the United States.

In a 1991 spill, the dangerous and choppy seas prevented first responders

from being able to contain more of the spill. That is why I have fought to improve oilspill prevention and response in the State of Washington by deploying our Neah Bay tug, which is a full-time tug, to make sure we get boats safely through our waters; by increasing oilspill response equipment throughout the Strait of Juan de Fuca; and by pushing for the Coast Guard to invest in research on tar sands oil.

Those are some of the things we can do to protect ourselves, but we need to do much more.

We must weigh future decisions about where we should allow oil and gas exploration with the costs to our coastal economies.

We must incorporate the lessons we have learned from disasters such as Deepwater Horizon, which is part of this picture, or the Exxon Valdez in order to improve oilspill prevention, response, and safety. Herring fish from Prince William Sound are still very much impacted and have not fully recovered after the Exxon Valdez. So telling our fishermen that this is a great idea, that Washington fisheries, whether they be crab or other fisheries, should be susceptible to these kinds of spills—that is just not something our fishermen want to hear.

In addition to these efforts to drill off of our coasts—efforts that have been repeatedly blocked in the past—President Trump wants to roll back important safety regulations that were put in place after Deepwater Horizon, such as blowout preventer systems, well control, and production safety systems.

Now Secretary Zinke wants to open these coastal areas. Our State has been responding to his proposal for months and months. We gave very important data to say that this was not a good idea off the coast of Washington. It is interesting because Secretary Zinke made a last-minute decision with regard to Florida, which didn't turn in its information about its State on this issue. Then later, after a visit with the Governor, Secretary Zinke said that this was something he didn't want to see happen. The people of Washington don't want political games played. They want to have their say on this issue, and they want to make sure their voices are heard loud and clear. Our coastal economies are too important to us, from a jobs and cultural perspective, to go about even proposing the research on drilling in our coastal areas.

I am disappointed that yesterday there was a last-minute postponement of a public meeting that was supposed to take place in Tacoma, WA, to hear from our citizens about their opposition to expanding oil drilling off our coasts. I am not sure whether there will be a hearing rescheduled or exactly what was behind the cancellation, but it was one of the first opportunities Washingtonians could have had to express their views on this issue.

Based on the vocal opposition of our communities, I sent a letter to Secretary Zinke, with 15 of my House and Senate colleagues from the Pacific Northwest, calling on Washington and Oregon to not be part of a future lease program. I know that many people, including our Governor, have done the same. Members from the Pacific, Atlantic, gulf coast, and even Alaska are writing to Secretary Zinke, asking him to exclude their areas from future drilling activities.

I am very concerned that we are wasting taxpayer money in reanalyzing what we have analyzed before—that oil and gas development in the Pacific Northwest does not make sense for our coastal communities. We will fight to protect our fishing jobs, our tourism, our recreation, and all of the things that are part of the center of our culture on our coasts. We hope Secretary Zinke will follow science, protect our coastal economy, stop this foolish idea that drilling off of our coast is either necessary or prudent, and move about to protect our Federal lands.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, today I rise to address an issue that probably is not of great concern to the citizens of Arizona, but, certainly, it is of a lot of concern for people who happen to live on the east coast and the west coast of our Nation.

I join my colleagues on both coasts in opposition to the Trump administration's recent proposal to open up parts of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans and the Gulf of Mexico to more oil and gas drilling. For a long time, I have advocated for an "all of the above" strategy to meet our country's energy needs, as we move our country toward greater energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy and to energy independence. In my view, the administration's recent proposal to expand drilling off of our coasts into new areas is not necessary at this time. It is unnecessary at this time.

Just 8 years ago, we saw very clearly with the Deepwater Horizon disaster that oil spills do not respect State boundaries and that severe environmental and financial costs of oil spills last, in some cases, not just for years or decades but for generations. A spill anywhere along the east coast could easily affect the pristine beaches of Delaware and the vibrant coastal communities that rely on fishing, tourism, and recreational activities to drive their local economy.

Delaware's coast isn't all that long. It is about 25, 30 miles, from the Mary-

land line to just north of Lewes, DE. Each year, Delaware's coasts generate almost \$7 billion. Our beach communities in places like Rehoboth Beach, Dewey Beach, and surrounding areas support nearly 60,000 jobs in a little State with not quite 1 million people. It supports \$711 million in tax revenues. Again, the State budget is right around \$4 billion. Delaware may be a small State—I like to say we are the 49th largest State—but we have a lot of coast-related activities, and they are a big business for a little State, providing more than 10 percent of the First State's total employment, taxes, and business production. Jeopardizing the environmental and economic health of the entire Atlantic coast is the wrong move, and we simply think it is not worth the risk.

You don't just have to take my word for it. Experts, scientists, and residents living in communities along the coast that will be most impacted by this decision agree, especially since the threat of climate change continues to grow.

Delawareans are similarly concerned about the dangers posed by oil and gas exploration activities, including the use of seismic-testing air guns to search for offshore oil and gas deposits. In August 2016, roughly 18 months ago, over 40 State and local elected officials in Delaware sent a letter to the Department of Interior—this was in the last administration—expressing their opposition to proposed seismic surveys.

Their concerns, in my view, are well-founded. The negative impact of the oil and gas industry's seismic testing on ocean ecosystems and the life they support—from plankton at the base of the ocean food chain and all the way to whales at the top—is well documented. Despite the widespread opposition and proof of harmful consequences, proponents of increased drilling for oil would argue that oil and gas development could represent economic benefit in selected areas along our coast. But these areas are already the beneficiary of remarkable economic benefits derived from and contingent on a healthy, vital, and sustainable ocean environment off of our shores. As a result, these communities do not take the prospect of compromising these natural resources lightly, nor should we.

Do you know who also recognizes that coastal communities could be negatively impacted if their natural resources were compromised? The answer is our Interior Secretary, Mr. Ryan Zinke. In fact, that was the exact justification that Secretary Zinke used to carve Florida's gulf coast out of the Trump administration's proposal. Secretary Zinke pointed out that other States—like Louisiana, for example—are "working coasts" that are "very much different than a recreation-centric coast that's in Florida."

It seems to me that maybe, just maybe, the only real difference between Florida and every other coastal

State—including Delaware and up on north to Maine—that was not lucky enough to get an exemption from Secretary Zinke is that President Trump happens to have beach-front property in Florida. Believe me, I understand that a potential oilspill off of the Florida coast would be bad for business at Mar-a-Lago and that the President's guests probably don't want the view from the resort obstructed by offshore oil rigs. I understand that because an overwhelming majority of Delawareans feel the same way, and their voices deserve to be heard too.

It is not just the Delawareans or even Democrats who acknowledge that increased oil drilling off of our coasts is the wrong move. Republican Governors and lawmakers from States such as Georgia and South Carolina—and all the way up to Massachusetts and New Hampshire—have publicly stated their opposition to the Trump administration's plan because the risks are simply not worth the potential reward.

If the administration insists on proceeding with this proposal, then, it should carve out the cherished Delaware coast and similar areas along the Atlantic from any efforts to increase drilling. As we have heard said many times, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. In Florida, Secretary Zinke has clearly established the standard that should apply to any coastal area that would be part of an offshore leasing plan. If it is an area in which coastal activities and industries yield greater economic value and where local communities are solidly opposed, then those areas should get the same exemption that has been awarded to the Sunshine State of Florida.

This President is a businessman, and the numbers are clear. Increased drilling does not make economic sense. I urge President Trump to rethink this shortsighted proposal and to side with coastal residents from Maine to Miami.

Mr. President, I yield back.

We have been joined by my colleagues from Florida and Oregon, and I yield to one of them.

To whom shall I yield?

I am happy to yield to the ranking member of the Finance Committee.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I thank both of my colleagues, and I thank my colleague from Florida for his courtesy. I am going to be brief.

My views on this issue can be summed up in a tweet that I sent on Saturday. I was home having town meetings. I go to every county every year, and I had just wrapped up in Astoria, and I was on my way to Tillamook.

We stopped at Rockaway Beach, on the spectacular Oregon coast, and I decided that I would send a tweet and start it off with a question: Drilling on the Oregon coast? The answer was this: You have got to be kidding me. On my watch, that is going to be the policy we



are going to have for protecting the Oregon coast. That is what Oregonians are saying today, specifically. In fact, Oregonians are lining up to make their opposition known by protesting this proposal outside a meeting today, hosted by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management in Salem.

We have a picturesque coastline that looks as if it is right out of a storybook. It is 362 miles that supports 22,000 jobs and a \$2 billion economy. Tourism, fishing, and recreation are all dependent on a healthy Pacific Ocean.

Our coast is entirely publicly owned, and it has been protected from oil and gas drilling for decades. That is, in large part, because we have learned harsh lessons from the past. In 1999, the freighter *New Carissa* ran aground off the coast of Coos Bay. The ship split apart, spilling tens of thousands of gallons of oil and diesel that covered our beaches in oil and tar balls. Some of that toxic mess remained on our beaches for almost a decade, costing tens of millions of dollars to clean up.

The thousands of fishermen, recreation business owners, and guides shouldn't have to go to bed at night hoping there is not a spill or an explosion—or risk their livelihoods on the good will of oil and gas executives. To make matters even more ominous, just days before announcing his intention to open up our entire coastline to oil and gas drilling, Secretary Zinke reversed basic safety standards for workers that were adopted after the Deepwater Horizon disaster. So what you have here is a double whammy. First, gut safety standards for oil and gas workers on offshore rigs. That is right; gut the safety standards for oil and gas workers. Second, increase the probability that these workers are going to be put in danger in the first place.

As I said on Saturday on my way to those town meetings, the people of my State, Oregonians, overwhelmingly do not want to be a part of any of this. Secretary Zinke went ahead and made a wrong decision with respect to coastal drilling without any input from Oregon. Our commercial and recreational fisheries industry—hard-working families who depend on healthy fishing stocks—had no seat at the table. In fact, an entire west coast industry was left out of whatever discussions happened between the oil executives and the Trump officials in the back room of the Department of the Interior.

One day after his decision, Mr. Zinke met with the Republican Governor of Florida, and my colleague who will speak next has been eloquent on that point, describing the plan as a threat to the environment and economy of his home State. That was enough for Secretary Zinke to let Florida off the hook, but there has been an outcry of opposition from the Governors of 15 coastal States, including mine. We have raised the very same environmental and economic concerns, yet Secretary Zinke seems deaf to our voices. I guess the only voice that is

really relevant is that of a Republican Governor, and that is about as nakedly political as it gets around Washington—a big gift for the oil and gas companies but one that poses an enormous danger to the economies and environment of local communities along our coast.

Finally, the decision doesn't make sense in terms of energy policy. Our country is more energy-secure now than ever. The International Energy Agency reports that within 10 years the United States will move from being a net importer of oil to a net exporter. So Secretary Zinke's scheme to expand offshore drilling is going to benefit—let's acknowledge that—a handful of Big Oil interests and then leave hard-working fishing families and coastal business owners to pick up the bill. That is not how we do things on our west coast.

The lasting economic uncertainty and ultimate environmental degradation are not worth it, and today, on behalf of the people of Oregon, I urge Secretary Zinke to rescind his proposal.

I yield the floor and thank my colleague from Florida for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I make an announcement and then defer to Senator KING and then that it come back to me for my statement about offshore drilling.

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

Mr. NELSON. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### FALCON HEAVY ROCKET

Just a few minutes ago, the largest rocket since the Moon program, the Saturn V, launched from the Kennedy Space Center. People across the world saw it on TV, as well as over the internet. Thousands of people lined the beaches at the Kennedy Space Center.

Perhaps even more impressive is that this rocket, with three Falcon 9s strapped together—27 engines—took a payload for its first test flight. It was so successful that the two side Falcon 9s, with the center core of the Falcon 9—we watched in amazement as they returned to Earth, 100 yards apart on two landing zones at the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station.

At liftoff, the Falcon Heavy generates 500 million pounds of thrust and is twice as powerful as any other rocket currently flying. Especially with the ability to land and reuse the boosters, it promises to be a very affordable way to get to space.

The test launch of the Falcon Heavy is a spectacular demonstration of the comeback of Florida's Space Coast and of the U.S. commercial launch sector, which is succeeding in a big way. Last year, we tied the all-time record for the number of U.S. commercial launches. That is good news for the civil space program; it is good news for national security; it is good news for employment in the United States; and

it is great news for jobs and the economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, first, I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding and congratulate him on the success of this launch in Florida. As he said, it is a huge boost, if you will, for the space industry in his State and a huge advantage for our country. It is a really amazing technological feat that I think will be positive.

#### OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS DRILLING

Mr. President, I rise just for a few minutes to talk about the decision to allow drilling for oil and gas off of our coasts. This is a very consequential and serious decision involving important policy questions, and it has important implications for all of the coastal States and indeed for our country.

My concern, to echo some of the comments that have already been made, is that there was very little, if any, consultation with the interested parties along our coastal States. In Maine—which, by the way, according to geographers I have talked to, has the longest coast of any State in the country; I am sure I will get some debate about that from some of my colleagues—we depend upon our coast. Tourism and visitation to our beaches and coastal communities are a billion-dollar industry—the largest single employer in our State. So that is an enormous economic engine that is currently working and running and powering at least a portion of the economy of our State. Of course, on my tie, I have lobsters, which is a \$1.7 billion-a-year industry in Maine, and it promises to be even stronger as processing is developed. We also have an offshore fishing industry—shrimp, shellfish. It is enormously important. It is a part of who we are in the State of Maine.

In my view, this is a pretty straightforward decision. What are the benefits, and what are the costs? The benefits are speculative at best, limited at best, and the costs are immediate and an enormous challenge for us. The cost of a single incident along our coast, which would affect our lobster industry or our visitor industry in the summertime and in the spring and the fall, would be catastrophic for our State.

I hope that the Department of the Interior will back off and enter into a process by which they make this decision by talking to the people who are most directly involved. I think this is a very important issue for all of the coastal States, and some may say that this could be advantageous to us. But let's get the facts, let's get the data, and let's understand the upside and the downside.

The entire Maine congressional delegation, nonpartisan—that is, a Democrat, an Independent, and two Republicans—came out against this designation within hours of its having been made. This is one where I think the people of our State, through their

elected representatives, need to be heard.

I hope that the Department of the Interior will back away from this unilateral decision, make it in a much more considered way, listen to the residents, the industries, and the businesses that are affected by a decision like this, and let our States have the important role that they should play in a decision of this magnitude, affecting their citizens.

As I said, I think this is an important decision. It deserves much deeper consideration, and I believe the people of Maine will very promptly say that this isn't something we are willing to support.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I see my good friend the Senator from New Jersey here, and I just want to make a few comments, since I have been at the center of this firestorm.

I am here again to talk about the mess that has been created by the 5-year drilling plan. Some of the reasons I have talked about it so much go beyond the fact that it is disastrous and dangerous, not only for all the coastal States but for our State of Florida, which has more beaches than any other State and is surrounded by test range. Indeed, just today, the largest rocket since the Apollo program to the Moon has brought back two of its boosters that didn't have to fall into the ocean. But some may, and you simply cannot have oil rigs out there in the Atlantic where we are testing our military rockets, such as today—a commercial rocket, the Falcon Heavy, has dropped its initial stages. The same is true with the military on the west coast.

The largest testing and training area for the U.S. military in the world is the eastern Gulf of Mexico off of Florida. That is why it is off limits in law for another 5 years, until the year 2022, and we need to expand that.

Well, my colleagues have endured me so many times as I have talked about how disastrous it would be, but now we have a different wrinkle with the Department of the Interior. They first published a proposal that would open up nearly every inch of coastline of the entire United States. You are hearing all of these coastal Senators speak against it.

They pick up on the eastern gulf off of Florida; since it is off limits in law until year 2022, they pick up there and start wanting to drill out there. Can you imagine what that would do to the U.S. Air Force, which runs the eastern gulf test range?

Well, look what happened. They published this, and then the very next day—24 hours later—the Secretary of the Interior jetted off to Tallahassee for a 20-minute press conference at the Tallahassee airport and announced that Florida was off the table. It was an obvious, transparent, political

stunt, but it created enormous uncertainty about what was truly under consideration for drilling.

What did “off the table”—in order to try to satisfy Florida's incumbent Governor—mean? Does it apply to the Atlantic coast of Florida, as well, or just to the gulf coast? Is it the whole moratorium area of the eastern gulf? Does it include the Straits of Florida off the delicate Florida Keys, or will it be carved in half to appease the oil industry in the eastern Gulf of Mexico?

The administration—specifically Secretary Zinke—is playing fast and loose with a process that affects millions of people in the State of Florida, and Floridians deserve to know what is going on. That is why I sounded the alarm immediately, within 10 minutes after Secretary Zinke's announcement.

I have been through this process before—ever since I was a young Congressman representing the east coast of Florida—with a Secretary of the Interior, James Watt, who wanted to drill off the east coast of Florida. In fact, back then, in the mid-1980s, we were launching our military rockets, just as we do today, and the space shuttle was dropping its solid rocket boosters.

These 5-year plans are supposed to be developed over the course of 1 or 2 years with extensive input from the public, agency staff, the industries involved, and the environmental community. Five-year plans aren't supposed to be a goody bag of political favors, and they can't be undone by the Secretary's press conference or a tweet. That was confirmed by a career employee, Walter Cruickshank, the Acting Director of the Interior's Bureau of Ocean Energy Management. He said that at a House committee hearing. It is no wonder the attorneys general from 12 coastal States wrote to the Secretary to warn him that he should terminate the draft proposal—terminate it entirely—or else they were going to pursue their appropriate legal avenues.

The whole process has been fraught with confusion because it was a political stunt, and as a result, we have a bunch of Senators out here fighting to make known what is happening. At the same time, the Interior Department is trying to open up America's entire coastline to drilling. They are also working to undo all the commonsense safety standards that were put in place after the Deepwater Horizon oil spill that spilled 5 million barrels of oil into the gulf and killed 11 workers on the rig. Those safety standards include requirements like making sure an independent third party, such as a professional engineer, certifies the offshore drilling safety equipment, such as the blowout preventer. That malfunctioned 5 miles below the surface of the gulf when it did not cut off the oil at the wellhead on the floor of the ocean, and it allowed those 5 million barrels to be spilled. Now Secretary Zinke wants to go backward in time and reverse all of those safety standards. The American

people deserve better than this. Floridians certainly deserve better than this.

I want to thank my fellow Senators for getting out here and raising such a ruckus so that we can get the American people to focus on what is happening and the political stunts that are being done by the Secretary of the Interior.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, first of all, let me congratulate my colleague from Florida on the most recent historic launch. There is no one who has been a greater advocate for America's space program than Senator NELSON. I appreciate his leadership as well on this issue, which goes all the way from Florida, across the entire Atlantic and, of course, the Pacific as well.

I rise in strong opposition to the Trump administration's offshore drilling plan. I am here to speak on behalf of New Jersey's shore businesses—the restaurants, the bait-and-tackle shops, and the bed-and-breakfasts that depend on clean beaches to succeed. Their businesses are the lifeblood of the Jersey Shore. Their voices deserve to be heard. Their livelihoods are on the line. Yet this administration remains solely focused on what is good for Big Oil's bottom line, never mind the consequences for our economy, the health of the planet, or our vibrant coastal communities.

The Interior Department's offshore drilling plan reads like a wish list for oil industry executives. Clearly, the Trump administration didn't consult my constituents when drafting this plan. By the way, we had already gone through a 5-year plan, so there were supposed to be 5 years before we revisited this, and now we are back at it again. They didn't consult the shop owners in Asbury Park or the fishermen in Belford or the innkeepers in Cape May, because if they had, they would have learned that our shoreline is an economic powerhouse for our State.

Each year, New Jersey's tourism industry generates \$44 billion in economic activity, directly and indirectly supporting nearly 10 percent of the State's workforce. Likewise, our seafood industry supports over 31,000 jobs, and we are home to one of America's largest saltwater recreational fisheries, supporting over 16,000 jobs. Together, the homes and businesses along the Jersey Shore encompass almost \$800 billion in property values.

All of this adds up to a simple reality: Clean coasts are vital to the economic security of millions of New Jerseyans. The same holds true for towns up and down the Atlantic shoreline. Yet the Trump administration plans to ignore the concern of the communities that have the most to lose. They ignore the more than 120 municipalities, the 1,200 elected officials, the 41,000 businesses, and the 500,000 fishing families from up and down the east

coast who voiced their opposition the last time oil and gas drilling was being considered. They ignore concerns from the Pentagon and NASA about disruptions to their operations from drilling in the Atlantic. They ignore the opposition of my west coast colleagues to drilling in the Pacific. They ignore the Department of the Interior's own finding that the Arctic drilling comes with a 75-percent chance of an oilspill in a treacherous and challenging environment. Simply put, the Trump drilling plan ignores everyone except Big Oil.

What is happening here is a dream scenario for the oil industry, but it is a nightmare for our shore communities. It is a gift to corporate polluters at the expense of our coastal economies.

By the way, I love these commercials that I see that talk about American energy independence. As you have heard my colleague Senator WYDEN say before, we are now an exporter of oil. Well, how is it that you are exporting oil? You are drilling it here in the continental waters of the United States, but you are exporting it abroad for others to use. It seems to me that if you are drilling on Federal lands and waters, you should keep it here for domestic energy consumption to keep the price down and to keep energy security. That is real energy security, not having Big Oil drill here and then export it all over the world so that they can make a profit. I don't know how that makes us more energy secure here at home.

Make no mistake—this administration's massive expansion of offshore drilling is just the beginning. They are also working to dismantle minimal safety standards for offshore drilling. That is right. The Trump administration not only wants more offshore drilling, it also wants to permit more dangerous offshore drilling.

The Interior Department reportedly seeks to weaken the well control rule—the critical safety standards put in place after the Deepwater Horizon tragedy, which taught us something: If you drill, you will spill. If you drill, you will spill. At some point, that will happen. During Superstorm Sandy, which took place along the east coast of the Atlantic, imagine if we had oil rigs off the shore of New Jersey. We would have had spills. We would have had spills. So instead of saving lives and saving our environment and the economic consequences that flow from that, the Trump administration's actions aim to save the industry \$90 million.

During his Senate confirmation, Secretary Zinke promised to “work with rather than against local communities in the states.” Well, it sure feels as though he is working against New Jersey. The Secretary has shown no concern for the Jersey Shore communities that would be devastated by an oilspill—the shuttered businesses, the destroyed industries, the massive job losses, and the birthright of every New Jerseyan to go to the Jersey Shore and

enjoy its pristine beaches. That is why it is all the more baffling that Secretary Zinke recently said that after hearing from concerned Florida businesses and public officials, he would consider exempting the State from the disastrous Trump drilling plan. When asked about the decision, the Secretary said that “local voices count.”

Well, I am happy if that is what is going to happen for Florida, but guess what—if it is good enough for Mar-a-Lago, it certainly should be good enough for the Jersey Shore. That is why every Member of the New Jersey congressional delegation, Republicans and Democrats alike, recently joined me on a letter inviting Secretary Zinke to visit the Jersey Shore. We would be happy to have him meet with community leaders, business owners, and families who depend on clean coasts. If he wants to focus on the economics of oil drilling, I suggest he start with the thousands of people who would be out of a job if oil starts washing up on our beaches.

The Secretary needs to hear from constituents of mine like Charles from Tom's River, who recently wrote to say:

We already have some shoreline concerns, thanks to Super Storm Sandy. We definitely don't need another threat to our economy.

Jeanne from New Brunswick wrote:

Tourism is a major New Jersey business. Our beaches are pristine and must be protected.

He needs to hear from any of the thousands of New Jerseyans who have signed my COAST Anti-Drilling Act citizen petition to permanently ban drilling in the whole Atlantic Ocean.

The Jersey Shore is a national treasure, home to generations of family vacations, successful small businesses, and vibrant coastal communities that are visited by people from across the Atlantic coast, Canadians who come down and spend their money at our shore, and so many others. That may not mean anything to ExxonMobil or BP. It may not mean anything to President Trump or Secretary Zinke. But it means something to me. That is why we are here today to give voice to New Jerseyans who have gone unheard. We will not stand silent while this administration tries to auction the Jersey Shore off to the highest bidder—not without a fight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, one of Rhode Island's contributions to the cultural life of our Nation came from two brothers who grew up in Cumberland, RI, Bobby and Peter Farrelly. The Farrelly brothers did a number of movies. One of them was famously called “Dumb and Dumber.”

This is a good example of dumb and dumber. It was dumb when President Obama opened the south Atlantic coast to the prospect of oil drilling. When he did, the reaction was immediate and

profound. From Norfolk, VA, all the way down the red south Atlantic coast to St. Augustine, FL, city after city, county after county, coastal community after coastal community passed resolutions saying: Get that offshore drilling out of here. We don't want it. It was a sweep of that Republican shoreline. It was called the resolution revolution because so many resolutions were passed saying: Get your oil drilling the heck away from our coasts.

Ultimately, the Obama administration got smart, and in the final approval, there was no drilling in the Atlantic and no drilling in the Pacific. They gave some reasons for their choice: strong local opposition was one, conflicts with other ocean uses was another, market dynamics was a third, and comments received from Governors was a fourth.

So, in the wake of that, here comes the Trump administration, and they have seriously gone from dumb to dumber, to go right back into this fight, where it blew up in the Obama administration's face among the red State communities of the Atlantic coast. Good luck finding support for this up in New England.

In New England, our ocean economy was valued just a few years ago at over \$17 billion. It employs about a quarter of a million people. Who thinks we are going to walk away from that? Who thinks we are not going to defend that ocean economy against an idea as dumb as offshore drilling in the Atlantic? We are not going to permit it.

I have authored, with my House colleague DAVID CICILLINE, legislation that the whole New England Senate representation supports, to ban this as a matter of Federal law; to stop this. The attorneys general of States from Maine down to North Carolina, including Massachusetts, Delaware, Rhode Island, of course, New Jersey, New York, Maryland, and Virginia, all have spoken out against this and I expect will litigate against it. Our Governor, Gina Raimondo, has come out strongly against this incredibly dumb idea, and she has been joined by Republican Governors in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Maryland, and South Carolina because this is such a dumb idea.

Why would this administration pursue such a dumb idea, that Republican Governors oppose, that blew up in the face of the Obama administration along the south Atlantic coast when they tried it, that would infringe upon and damage critical coastal economies in States that are Republican and Democratic? Why would they do such a stupid thing?

Well, Attorney General Kilmartin of Rhode Island has one suggestion: “This decision by the administration is clearly driven by the oil and gas industry.”

Huh. No kidding. This administration is bought and paid for by the oil and gas industry. Throw in coal, and we have the complete lock, stock, and barrel sale. We have complete industry toadies in the responsible agencies of

government and climate denial of the most flagrant and obtuse variety coming out of the White House. I mean, it is nonsense land, except for the fact that it keeps the oil and gas and coal money coming to prop up the Trump administration and the Republican Party. We are not going to stand for it. It is crooked. It will not go.

Chris Brown is the head of the Commercial Fishermen's Association of Rhode Island. He is adamant that "oil drilling is something that is incredibly threatening and directly adverse to our well-being."

We are going to stand and fight for our fishing communities.

Our environmental community is wildly against this: "The last thing our coast needs is oil drilling and all of the risks that go with it," says our lead environmental organization, Save the Bay.

I will close with the Providence Business Journal, the voice of the Rhode Island business community, which just editorialized:

Fossil fuels, no matter where they are harvested, are putting coastal areas across the globe in danger as sea levels rise. In the name of national energy independence, public policy would hasten the devastating impacts of burning fossil fuels and make much of Rhode Island and other low-lying areas uninhabitable.

At a time when renewable energy in the United States and across the world is becoming less expensive, and the effects of climate change are becoming more pronounced, pulling more fossil fuels out of the ground is not a wise decision, and one that hopefully will be rescinded before any drilling rigs park themselves off Block Island.

That is the voice of Rhode Island's business community.

If you want to take a look at why this bothers us, take a look at the footprint of the BP oilspill laid on the map of the New England coast. There is Boston, there is Long Island, there is Narragansett Bay, and that is Rhode Island. That is the footprint of the mess the oil industry left when it blew up its facility in the middle of the gulf. That is what they did, and we don't need that up in New England.

We have offshore industries that are vibrant, that support our economy, that are welcome, that have long traditions and histories. We do not need oil industry invaders coming where they are not wanted because they have bought their way into the Trump administration with their political contributions and their dark money. That will not stand.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate that Senator CANTWELL organized this time for a group of us to come to the floor to speak about this disastrous, insane plan to drill throughout 90 percent of our coastal shelf. This, the Interior Secretary tells us, is part of President Trump's directive to rebuild the offshore oil and gas program, but he also conveyed it was

the President's directive to "take into consideration the local and State voices."

Well, certainly the draft plan—if you can call it a draft—didn't take into account local or State voices. Had the Interior Secretary bothered to actually consult, this is what he would have heard from people in Oregon. Our Governor, Kate Brown, denounced the plan, saying: "In what universe would this be okay?"

Noah Oppenheim, the executive director of the Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations, stated:

The Trump administration wants to put fish and fisheries at significant risk while lining the pockets of their oil industry co-conspirators. Meanwhile, more frequent oil spills and more intense ocean acidification and ocean warming are guaranteed to ensue.

Charlie Plybon, the Oregon policy manager at Surfrider Foundation, an organization made up of everyday people passionate about protecting our oceans and our beaches, shared this opinion:

We are united in an understanding of the threats which offshore oil drilling poses to our coastal economy, jobs and culture we have today. We will not gamble our ocean resources with dangerous oil exploration and polluting drilling activities that put our future and that of generations to come at risk.

Charlie went on to convey the enormous disparity between the economy that is driven by fishing and ocean recreation and by tourism as compared to the economy driven by oil drilling and how the former completely outweighs the latter.

The Association of Northwest Steelheaders is one of the oldest and most cherished conservation and sport fishing advocacy organizations in the Pacific Northwest. Their statement is the following:

This proposal stands to go against everything we believe in. Drilling for oil and gas off the coast of Oregon compromises our fisheries, our coastal economies, and our values.

These folks know what they are talking about.

The Tribes weighed in through the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission. Their resolution conveys opposition to "any proposal to open Pacific offshore waters from California to and including Alaska to offshore drilling."

Scott McMullen, the chairman of the Oregon Fishermen's Cable Committee—a group of troll fishermen who have been very involved in negotiations involving the fiber optic cable lines that are laid in the ocean—said:

The Oregon fishing industry has had a long history of good stewardship of the fishing grounds which are open for multiple uses. Oil platforms in our fishing grounds would deny access to the resources that fishermen, fish processors and thriving coastal communities depend on. To take away the right to use our historical shared fishing grounds by awarding drilling rights for this single industrial use would be wrong.

Dale Beasley had this opinion:

As president of the Columbia River Crab Fisherman's Association and Coalition of

Coastal Fisheries, our position on any fixed structures in the ocean and particularly oil platforms is simple—NO NO AND NO again.

Our members rely 100% on clean sustainable marine waters for 100% of our families income.

Terry Thompson, Lincoln County commissioner, stated:

The state of Oregon has been a leader in the nation in terms of protecting our environment while responsibly utilizing our natural resources.

We banned oil and gas development years ago because of the potential risk to our ocean, which is one of the most productive places in the world.

The President's proposal to allow oil and gas development is an attempt to override the will of the people and shows a complete disconnect between the Administration and the people of the West.

I think these voices—the voices of the crabbing industry and the salmon industry, the fishing industry and the tourism industry—these voices of the coastal economy, reverberate in absolute parallel and passionate opposition to drilling off our coast for oil.

Before the drilling takes place, there are massive amounts of explosions that are conducted in order to create the maps of what is under the surface for potential drilling. That alone—just the preparation for drilling—is deeply disturbing, but imagine what an oilspill looks like.

This is a map of the Washington and Oregon coast, with the outline overlaid with the gulf oilspill. It covers a section that is the entire length of the State of Oregon and the State of Washington. Imagine those hundreds of miles of soiled beaches, the oil's impact on the ecosystem of the fisheries. There is no way this risk is justified for pumping a few more barrels of oil—which, I might point out, should be left in the ground anyway because burning oil that we are extracting from the ground is steadily raising the temperature of the planet and the temperature of our oceans, which absorb the vast majority of the heat from burning fossil fuels, and that is creating changes, from ocean acidification to the bleaching of the coral reefs, and all kinds of impacts on the surface of the continents.

So I say to the Interior Secretary, you have been given a mission by the President of the United States, which, as you have stated, is to take into consideration local and State voices, so simply hear those voices, and then take Oregon out of the equation, take Washington out of the equation, take California out of the equation, take every State that objects out of this equation, and, by the way, it would be wise to take the rest out as well.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I wish to thank Senator CANTWELL for organizing the opportunity this afternoon to speak about this egregious decision that was made by the Trump administration that will allow for drilling for

oil off of the beaches of the United States of America. It is an absolute disgrace that this administration is doing something like this. What we have on our hands is a President who has a hard time listening to his own message.

Last week, he was bragging about how much new oil we are discovering in America. He is so proud of this. In fact, we export a million and a half barrels of oil a day. Listen to that again: We export a million and a half barrels of oil a day. Where do we send this oil? We send it to China. We send it to other countries.

Is the President happy with that? No, he says we need more oil; we need to drill off of our beaches—notwithstanding what that will do to our tourism industry, to our fishing industry, or to any industry that does business along the coastlines of our country. Ultimately, what would be the purpose to which this oil would be put? Export the oil.

So how does that formula really work? The oil companies come to the beaches of Massachusetts or any other State. They set up rigs and start to drill for oil. They find the oil. Then, they sell that oil somewhere else around the world. Meanwhile, people who live off of those beaches in Massachusetts or any other State run all the risk if there is an accident, as there was in the Gulf of Mexico in 2010 in the BP oilspill.

So the risks are run by the States that don't want the drilling, and the benefits all run to the oil companies that get to sell this oil around the world. It makes perfect sense because "GOP" really stands for "gas and oil party." That is what they have turned themselves into. It is whatever Big Oil wants, even if State after State after State says it does not want this to happen.

Every single State, from Maine down to Florida, was going to be giving permission to the oil companies to commence drilling, but the Governor of Florida—a Republican Governor—protested. He said he didn't want there to be drilling off the coast of Florida, after Florida had already been included in the plan.

So what happens? All of a sudden, the Trump administration decides that they are going to have a gator giveaway. All of a sudden, Florida gets to be exempt. Why would Florida be exempt? Maybe because it has a Republican Governor. Maybe because that Republican Governor is thinking about running for the U.S. Senate. So maybe, just maybe, this Governor, who once supported drilling off of the coast of Florida, all of a sudden says: The people don't want it. They don't want the beaches of Florida to be endangered.

So what happens? Governor Scott from Florida all of a sudden starts shedding crocodile tears about how much he cares about the beaches, even though he had always been supportive of offshore drilling. That leads to the

gator giveaway where, all of a sudden, Florida is not in.

I don't think it is incidental that Mar-a-Lago is actually in Florida, as well, and maybe Donald Trump hadn't been fully consulted by Secretary Zinke and the Department of the Interior on this inclusion of Florida. But before you knew it, all of a sudden, Florida was no longer on the map, but every other State that doesn't have a Republican Governor running for the Senate, that doesn't have a President of the United States with a summer resort, a winter resort, a spring and summer resort—Mar-a-Lago—is stuck with this decision.

The problem with what they did is this: It is obviously arbitrary and capricious. It is obviously a violation of the Administrative Procedures Act. It is obviously something that will never stand up in court—that after a decision is made to include every State, all of a sudden Florida comes up. It will never hold up. That will be the basis of the case made by the attorneys general and all of the business and environmental interests that will be suing on this issue.

So what part of this really works? It is oil that will be drilled for at the risk of despoiling the beaches and the fishing industry—the tens of billions of dollars in the fishing and tourism industry—with the benefits running to one single industry.

The American Petroleum Institute is trying to have it both ways. On the one hand, they are saying: We are at the boom time of all times in oil drilling in the United States. We are energy independent. This is the boom time.

Donald Trump is sounding the same exact way, boasting across the country about his energy policies, his fossil-fuel-first policies. He keeps saying that he has ended the war on energy. It is not true because just last week he imposed a 30-percent tariff on importation of solar panels. So he is talking about no war on his favorite energy technology. But if he doesn't like them, they get a 30-percent increase in tariffs on the very technologies that, in polling, 80 percent of all Americans want to see increased inside of our country.

We are going to be fighting this every single step of the way. It is immoral, it is unnecessary, and it violates the goals that individual States have in order to advance their own economies. I, personally, am going to exhaust all available legislative tools to fight this attempt by President Trump to allow drilling off of the coast of Massachusetts, the east coast, and nearly every other single mile of coastline in the United States, with the exception of Florida.

That includes using the Congressional Review Act, which allows for agency action to be undone by a simple majority in both Chambers. I plan to pursue such a Congressional Review Act resolution if the Trump administration moves forward with this reck-

less plan. We will not stop until this plan is blocked and dead and our coastlines are protected once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the Trump administration's latest move to override the will of Washington State's citizens—our fishing families, our small business owners, our environmentalists, and our outdoor enthusiasts—by opening our coastal waters to harmful oil and gas drilling.

The continental waters on the west coast are one of our State's richest and most cherished national resources, sustaining communities along the Pacific Northwest for centuries and helping to define our regional culture for generations. It would be hard to overstate just how important Washington's coastal waters are to our local way of life.

Many of us count on our coasts for our food or work. Washington State coasts are home to numerous seafood- and tourism-dependent communities, and they support a \$50 billion maritime economy and nearly 200,000 maritime-related jobs—not to mention countless families and travelers who are seeking outdoor recreation and flock to our shores throughout the year to experience the natural beauty and sport of our iconic shorelines.

To put it simply, Washingtonians don't take our healthy coasts for granted. We know that keeping our shores pristine isn't just about leisure and scenic views. Preserving our coastal waters is a critical factor in promoting a healthy regional ecosystem and an economy that support vital jobs and industries, fish and wildlife, and public health opportunities that many of us—our families, friends, and neighbors—rely on.

So I, too, was deeply disappointed but, ultimately, unsurprised when Interior Secretary Zinke announced the Department's plan to ignore the existing oil and gas leasing program that was just approved a few years ago and instead moved to draft and implement a new program that would allow offshore oil and gas drilling in nearly all of our Nation's continental waters, including our coastal waters off of Washington State.

Despite decades of factfinding and public input that already established the need to protect ecologically sensitive areas like our coasts, it appears, once again, that President Trump and his Cabinet have decided to prioritize Big Oil and the relentless pursuit of profit over the interests of Washington State families and with virtually no regard to what their one-sided policy proposals may mean for our environment, for our public health, or for our economy.

To add insult to injury, I was even more appalled when it was reported just a few days later that Secretary Zinke was planning to remove Florida's waters from consideration after

meeting with their Governor and hearing their concerns. I will leave it to others to wonder what exactly persuaded Secretary Zinke to remove Florida from that list, but I can't say I was stunned when that courtesy was not extended to Washington State, even after our Governor made the exact same request.

Later, while I was on my way back home from the other Washington and concerned about the potentially damaging impacts of Secretary Zinke's decision on our Washington State ecosystem, I decided to ask my followers on Twitter to join me in sending a message to the Interior Department and tweet photos of some of Washington State's many important and pristine coastal areas. I just have to say that the response was overwhelming.

Within hours, my timeline was filled with photos of beaches and coasts all along Washington State's shoreline, from Ruby Beach to Bellingham Bay to Olympic National Park to Orcas Island—photos of painted sunsets on the Puget Sound, the majestic calm of Cape Flattery, and of rainbows arching across the Bell Island shore, photos of children running across the beaches of Kalaloch, and photos of fishermen unloading their haul in Salmon Bay. I even received photos from other coastal areas in the Pacific Northwest. They were all from residents who want their pristine shorelines preserved, and they were eager to raise their voices to safeguard our coasts.

I was inspired as I scrolled through this growing and beautiful collection of photos that illustrated the significance of our coasts, not just to our State's economy and environment but to our shared culture and identity. Our shores are where we fish, swim, exercise, and work, but also where our wildlife roams, our children play, and where we make lasting memories with our loved ones.

It is not too late for the Interior Department to reverse its misguided decision to expand offshore oil and gas drilling and instead focus on maintaining and strengthening existing regulations protecting this country's continental waters.

I really hope Secretary Zinke and officials at the Interior Department finally hear loud and clear what Washingtonians have been saying for decades—that the extreme environmental and ecological dangers posed by offshore oil and gas drilling are too great a risk for Washington State families. I hope they move quickly to reschedule the public meeting they were supposed to hold yesterday in Tacoma, so people from Washington can share their concerns with the Department directly.

I want to remind my colleagues and everyone in our country who cares about our environment that this fight is far from over. As we have learned over the last year, it is important that we continue to make our voices heard again and again to ensure that this administration backs down from this

reckless proposal and puts the interest of Washington State families first.

As a voice for Washington State here in the Senate, I am going to continue fighting against the Trump administration's efforts to leverage our environment to boost Big Oil's bottom line, and I know I will never stop standing with our families, workers, and small businesses to protect our coasts today and for future generations.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, we have an opportunity before us today to fund key priorities that we all agree are important. The American people elected all of us to do a job, and that job is to provide for the most important functions of our government.

For far too long, politics has prevented us from committing the resources necessary to sustain the most critical part of our government—the military that keeps us safe. This is a chance to cast aside partisan differences and give the Department of Defense the stable and consistent funding it needs so it can rebuild readiness and execute its mission.

Just this morning, Secretary Mattis testified before Congress, saying: "I ask that you not let disagreements on domestic policy continue to hold our nation's defense hostage." He is right. We cannot let these basic issues distract us from the job that we have all, under the Constitution, taken to provide for the common defense.

I just came from a classified briefing with the Secretary, and he outlined the most important needs we must fund for our country's security. So why not come together on issues we can agree on? Six months ago, this Chamber passed the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2018 with an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 89 to 9. In the time since, however, our military remains hamstrung under short-term measures that are standing in the way of modernization and readiness.

That is why I say to my Democratic colleagues, here is a chance for you to prove that you are serious about funding the military. Many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have already spoken clearly about their desire to support the troops.

Last month, the senior Senator from Vermont remarked:

Our military leaders agree, we cannot govern by a continuing resolution. The military cannot function under sequestration.

The senior Senator from West Virginia said:

We want our military to be funded properly so they can defend us.

The senior Senator from Montana said:

The uncertainty we have without a longer budget that goes to the end of the fiscal year is unacceptable.

The senior Senator from Connecticut said:

I hope there is bipartisan consensus among us on the Armed Services Committee and in

the Chamber as a whole that we need a strong national defense.

Even today, the minority leader told this body that Democrats "support increasing funding for our military."

So why not act? There is a consensus that we desperately need to fix the readiness issues in our Armed Forces. Why not take that step today and vote to provide the stable, predictable funding the Department of Defense so seriously needs?

When I swore an oath to defend the Constitution, I did it knowing that every day I hold this office, countless numbers of my constituents would be wearing the uniform and be in harm's way. Around the globe, you find Nebraskans, you find Americans protecting and defending the United States. Each of us here represents people who sacrifice and serve American heroes. Today is a chance to show them we have their backs because they have proven, time and time again, that they have ours.

I urge my colleagues to put aside partisan differences and take the vote to support our military and the programs that are critical to the safety and the well-being of this Nation.

#### COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

Mr. President, we also have a unique opportunity today to address another program that has a deep, bipartisan well of support in the Senate. Today I visited with Nebraskans who made the trip to Washington to advocate for funding for community health centers. Across our Nation, community health centers are vital to keeping our children and our families healthy.

Last year, nearly 85,000 Nebraskans received care at centers across our State during approximately 296,000 visits. These centers provide high-quality care, compassionate care, and patient-focused care. Community health centers in my State rank second in quality measures nationally and first in four other measures involving individual care. Their focus and their impact on the communities they serve is very impressive.

We all recognize the importance of these health centers, and I was proud to recently join my colleagues in the Senate in urging that funding be reauthorized so these centers can continue to provide the quality care all Nebraskans and all Americans deserve.

Our military and community health centers are too important to be caught up in politics. As we find ourselves once again facing the prospect of yet another impasse, I urge my colleagues to join me in showing your support for these critical areas. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution makes clear what our job is: provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States. Let's fulfill that duty today.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, a number of my colleagues will be coming to the floor this afternoon to discuss the predicament we face as the Mueller investigation—the special counsel investigation, the Department of Justice—closes in on the Trump White House and the Trump campaign, creating two problems. One is an unprecedented attack on the law enforcement institutions that are involved in that investigation, an effort to discredit our Federal Bureau of Investigation and our Department of Justice, including the suggestion that this whole thing is a witch hunt, even though every single witness, including Trump appointees who have come before our committees, has been asked “Hey, this investigation, is it a witch hunt?” and, to a person, has said no.

Russian interference was real, they are coming back in 2018, and it is no witch hunt to look into what took place.

You have this whole smear effort going on of individuals and institutions involved in the institution. You could call that the crime of omission, if you would. The crime of omission that accompanies that is, while the majority in both Houses is busy trying to smear the FBI, the Department of Justice, and various individuals in this investigation, they are not taking the steps necessary to protect the 2018 elections. We have done virtually nothing.

The one thing we have done—led by Ranking Member BEN CARDIN, the Senator from Maryland—was to get really strong sanctions put through. We all agreed on that. I think the vote was 98 to 2 in the Senate—98 to 2, powerful sanctions.

You messed in our elections. Pop. Here is one in the nose for you. Don't do it again.

That was the lesson. We are going after you, Mr. Putin, where it hurts, which is with all your dirty, corrupt oligarchs who support you and whom you pay to stay in power. That is the shot we took back. You messed in our elections; we are going after your crooked oligarchs.

Except guess where that effort stopped dead—in the Oval Office, at the President's desk, where President Trump will not let the Russia sanctions go forward. We have this whole smear campaign, discrediting honorable American institutions just to protect the President from the investigation. We have nothing being done legislatively to protect the 2018 elections, and you have the one thing we did do to send the message to the Russians that we are tired of this nonsense and to give them a little bit of a pop in the nose to get them to knock it off, a little deterrent, and the President will not act on it.

I am going to be here for the duration of this and have more to say, but I want to yield to the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who was so important in getting these sanctions through and understands very well, from his work on the Magnitsky issue, what these Russian oligarchs are up to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, first, I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for bringing this issue to the attention of our colleagues and the American people. As Senator WHITEHOUSE points out, we have seen from the White House, from the President, an effort to try to undermine the credibility of the independent investigation being done by the Department of Justice under Mr. Mueller. These are very serious issues, and I hope every Member of this Chamber will support the independence of that investigation and speak loudly against any interference, wherever it may come from.

Then, Senator WHITEHOUSE has brought up the second issue; that is, Mr. Putin has been extremely active in regard to activities against U.S. interests. I appreciate Senator WHITEHOUSE referencing a report that was released on January 10 of this year. It was as a result of a full year's operation by the staff of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to document Mr. Putin's reckless assault against democratic institutions, universal values, and the rule of law—the asymmetric arsenal he uses to accomplish that attack against democratic institutions, which includes cyber attacks, disinformation, support for fringe political groups, weaponization of energy resources, organized crime, corruption, and, yes, military aggression. He has used every one of those tools to compromise democratic institutions in Europe and, yes, in the United States.

Mr. Putin was extremely active in the 2016 election. That has now been verified without any question. A report I authored goes through 19 European countries in which Mr. Putin has been active against democratic institutions.

I share with my colleagues that the President of the OSCE Parliamentary Assembly was in town today. He is meeting with government officials. He knows firsthand Mr. Putin's aggression because there are Russian troops in Georgia today affecting its sovereignty, as there are Russian troops in Moldova, as there are Russian troops in Ukraine. The people of Montenegro saw the hand of Mr. Putin when he held a coup against their authority. The people of the United Kingdom saw Mr. Putin's efforts as he got involved in the Brexit referendum. The people of France and Germany saw Mr. Putin's aggression as he tried to interfere with their free elections.

Countries have stepped up. They said: Enough is enough. We have seen, with strong leadership, that you can counter the activities successfully of what Rus-

sia is trying to do. The right mixture of political will, of defense and deterrence can work, and, yes, as Senator WHITEHOUSE pointed out, we in Congress acted. We recognized the threat of Russia. We passed the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act, the CAATS Act. It was a bipartisan effort that tightened some of the sanctions under the Obama-era Executive order on Ukraine and passed new mandatory sanctions against Russia because of its activities.

There were sanctions imposed in regard to the Russian Federation's undermining cybersecurity. There were sanctions related to Russia's crude oil products. There were sanctions authorized with respect to Russian and other foreign financial institutions. There were sanctions imposed against Russia for significant corruption in the Russian Federation. There were sanctions with respect to certain transactions with foreign sanctions evaders and serious human rights abusers in the Russian Federation. There were mandatory sanctions with respect to persons who engaged in transactions with the intelligence and defense sectors of the Government of the Russian Federation.

Why? Because they were interfering in our elections.

There were sanctions with respect to investment in or in the facilitation of the privatization of state-owned assets by the Russian Federation.

Why? Because that helped finance Mr. Putin's activities.

There were sanctions with respect to the transfer of arms and related materiel to Syria.

Each one of those sanctions gave new authority to the President of the United States to impose sanctions against Russia for its activities.

I said earlier that, where countries have shown leadership, it has been effective in countering Mr. Putin's activities. With President Trump, there have been no sanctions. Not one has been brought forward under the law passed by the Congress of the United States. By 98, 99 percent, the House and Senate approved the sanctions. The Trump administration has imposed zero.

Mr. Trump has failed to acknowledge that Mr. Putin has even been engaged in our 2016 elections. He said: I talked to Mr. Putin. He seemed like he was telling me the truth when he said he wasn't involved—even though it was the unanimous view of our intelligence community and the facts had very clearly been laid out to the American people that Mr. Putin had been actively engaged in the 2016 elections.

Yes, we have seen, very recently, Russia's engagement in the Czech election. We have seen this movie before where the candidate, in his advocating for stronger ties to European institutions, is targeted by a barrage of fake news stories that spreads across online platforms, which he alleges have been directed by Russian security services

and entities tied to them—a direct assault against the Czech Republic’s democratic institutions.

As Senator WHITEHOUSE pointed out, when asked in an interview if Russia would try to influence the midterm elections of the United States, our CIA Director, Michael Pompeo, replied: “Of course. I have every expectation that they will continue to try and do that.”

So where is the Trump administration in its taking action to protect our democratic institutions?

This is not a partisan issue. There is a long tradition of Republicans and Democrats working together in Congress to counter Russian Government aggression abroad and abuse against its own citizens, our allies, and democratic institutions. The sanctions bill that passed in 2017 had near-unanimous support. It was crafted and developed by Democrats and Republicans who worked together.

The strength and durability of our political system relies on such bipartisan solutions to our national security challenges. There is a series of recommendations that were in the report I referred to earlier, those of working with our allies to develop cybersecurity issues, to working with NATO to understand what the article V response should be to cyber attacks, to finding alternative ways to stop Russia from using energy as a weapon. It starts with Presidential leadership.

We must take care to point out that there is a distinction between Mr. Putin’s corrupt regime and the people of Russia, who have been some of his most frequent and long-suffering victims. Many Russian citizens, like Sergei Magnitsky, strive for a transparent, accountable government that operates under the democratic rule of law, and we hope for better relations in the future with a Russian Government that reflects these imperatives.

In the meantime, the United States must work with our allies to build defenses against Mr. Putin’s asymmetric arsenal and strengthen our international norms and values to deter such behavior by Russia or any other country. It starts with leadership from the White House, and it starts with imposing the sanctions that were approved by Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have been involved in a number of elections over the years. I love campaigns, and I love campaigning. I have always campaigned in a situation in which you have your opponent, and the people have a chance to make a judgment between you and your opponent as to who can best serve the people. Little did I ever think that I was going to have to fight against the Russians in a campaign. Yet that is what I fully expect, and that is what I expect a number of us who are up in November of this year will be having to do because, in the midst of all of the disinformation that we have seen that the Russians are

very good at—all of the fake accounts on Twitter and Facebook, the internet trolls, the botnets—it is critically important that the American people understand this is a fundamental attempt by Russia to influence our very democratic institutions and our critical infrastructure; and our elections, indeed, are a part of that critical infrastructure.

Last year, the intelligence community assessed that when Putin sees his attempt to influence the last election as a success, he is going to do it again. That is what the intelligence community’s conclusion was. Then, just last week, the Director of the CIA said that he had every expectation that Russia will meddle in the 2018 midterm elections.

As the Senator from Maryland just said and as the Senator from Rhode Island has already said, this is not a partisan issue. It could happen to both sides. Attempts to influence our elections are attacks on the very foundation of the democracy that we so cherish. That is really what the Russians are trying to do. They are trying to divide us, and they are trying to undermine faith in our democratic institutions. Ultimately, they are trying to undermine American leadership in the world community of nations. The bottom line is we have to do more to protect ourselves, and we have to make Mr. Putin feel enough pain to deter future attacks or else he is going to keep doing it.

Now, this Senator has the privilege of being the ranking member of the Cybersecurity Subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. I must say that this Senator has sat through hearings with people who ought to know, and I have been appalled at how little we have or will have the capability of responding. It is going to take some resolve not only in this Senate, in this Congress, but in this administration, as well, to let Mr. Putin know that he is going to have pain if he continues the attacks that he has already made.

Of course, there is another aspect to this threat, which is that Russia didn’t just attack our democracy in America, as has been stated so effectively by previous speakers, but he is in Europe and in Latin America too. Look at what the Russians have done with the Spanish language propaganda television, RT. There is an RT en Espanol that has already targeted upcoming elections in Mexico and Colombia—two of our important partners in the hemisphere. The President’s National Security Adviser, General McMaster, said recently that there was already evidence of Russian meddling in Mexico.

Of course, this points to the Russian effort to destabilize the region. It has sought to gain influence through propaganda, arms sales, trade, and other means to challenge the United States in the Western Hemisphere and to undermine our partnerships, which are critical to our national security. Look at Russia’s friends Cuba and Nicaragua.

How about Venezuela?

The reality is that Russia is propping up the Maduro dictatorship in Venezuela. For years, the Maduro crowd has stolen and used the state-owned oil company Pe De Vesa to launder money, and Russia has bailed them out. Russian money has helped Maduro to avoid defaulting on debts and payments to bondholders. Meanwhile, look what is happening to the poor people of Venezuela. They are hungry, and they don’t have basic supplies. Their children are malnourished, and inflation is rampant. Maduro has undermined any remnants of Venezuela’s democracy. He jails opponents and has a corrupt Congress and cracks down on protesters. It is all part of the Russian influence campaign.

As you can see, countering Russian influence is critical for the United States and for the world. It is also important to remember that Putin can’t beat us on the ground, that he can’t beat us on the sea, and that he can’t beat us under the sea. He can’t beat us in the air, and he can’t beat us in space, but he can beat us in cyber in his propaganda campaign.

Yet Putin—that Russian bear—is not 10-feet tall. As a former Secretary of State just testified last week to our Armed Services Committee, Putin is playing a weak hand, but he is playing it very aggressively. It is time for us, the USA, to push back.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I am here with Senator NELSON, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and Senator CARDIN because I share their concerns about the rising chorus of partisan attacks, not only on Special Counsel Robert Mueller but also on the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Justice.

These attacks are part of a broader campaign that has been orchestrated by the White House to undermine the investigations into Russia’s interference in the 2016 campaign, including possible collusion by the Trump campaign. Unfortunately, if continued, it will have a lasting impact on our security structures, on our democratic institutions, and on our people. Ultimately, it will help the Kremlin achieve its goal of breaking down our country and our democratic way of life.

In a report issued in January 2017, the U.S. intelligence community found that Russia interfered in our elections. This was the unanimous conclusion of all 17 U.S. intelligence agencies. Indeed, that Russian interference continues to this day, not only in the domestic affairs of the United States but in the affairs of our Western allies. We have seen the Kremlin’s hand in Great Britain, in Spain, in France, and in Mexico—all in an effort to determine the outcome and to disrupt elections in those countries.

Just last week, in an interview with the BBC, CIA Director Mike Pompeo



confirmed Russia's ongoing interference. As Senator CARDIN said, when Director Pompeo was asked if Russia would try to influence our midterm elections this year, he replied: "Of course. I have every expectation that they will continue to try and do that."

In fact, in recent weeks, Russian internet trolls and bots have used Facebook and Twitter to aggressively promote the release of the House Republicans' memo, by DEVIN NUNES, that attacks the integrity of the FBI. Let's think about that. Russia gave a powerful assist to the successful campaign to release a misleading document, undermining an ongoing FBI investigation.

Despite these disturbing facts, President Trump continues to be dismissive of claims of any Russian interference. For 6 months, Congress has expected the administration to impose the penalties in the bipartisan Russia sanctions bill that passed 98 to 2, but the administration has not even issued one sanction through that law. Despite ongoing brazen Russian interference, the White House claims that sanctions are not needed because the threat of sanctions is already "serving as a deterrent." The mere threat of sanctions clearly is not serving as a deterrent. Our national security agencies, NATO systems, and even the Senate have experienced countless cyber attacks since the 2016 elections. Yet Vladimir Putin continues to deny that Russia interferes in anything at all, and for support, Putin can point to President Trump's own denials of Russian interference.

President Trump has a penchant for labeling factual reports as "fake news." Again and again, he says things that are obviously false or misleading. He calls responsible mainstream journalists "the enemy of the people." He attacks the rule of law, the judiciary, and our law enforcement agencies. These are all classic hallmarks of the slippery slope toward authoritarianism. Indeed, it is striking how attacks by some Republicans on law enforcement and democratic institutions echo similar attacks by the Kremlin and its mouthpieces.

Consider these side-by-side comparisons of statements by Russian officials and statements by Republicans.

As we see in this tweet, which is dated January 2, 2018, President Trump has described U.S. Government employees and the Justice Department as the "Deep State." At the same time Russia's propaganda network, RT, has repeated this terminology. So we see this: "Deep State takedown." Just yesterday, RT aired a discussion on how to root out the "Deep State" now that its biases supposedly have been exposed by the "Nunes memo."

Again, we see these mirrored messages between Republicans, the White House, and Putin. As we see in this panel, allegations that Special Counsel Mueller and the FBI are conducting a "witch hunt" are coming from the highest levels of both the American

and Russian Governments. We see that Reuters has repeated a line from RIA, which is Russia's state television, saying: "U.S. scandal over Russian contacts is 'a witch hunt.'" That sentiment was repeated by ANDY BIGGS, a Republican who is calling on Mr. Mueller to "end the witch hunt," and, of course, it was tweeted by Donald Trump, who called all of the illegal leaks of classified and other information a "total witch hunt."

In panel 3, we see that both Putin and President Trump claim that there is no way to know for sure who meddled in the U.S. election. You can see the two of them. They blame Democrats for allegations of Russian meddling. Putin said that "maybe someone lying in bed" was responsible. Looking at similar language, President Trump famously said: "It could be someone sitting on their bed that weighs 400 pounds."

It is unfortunate that some Republicans, as well as voices in the conservative media, appear to believe that, in order to support the President, they must attack and discredit not only Special Counsel Mueller but also the Department of Justice and the FBI. These partisan attacks are baseless and reckless.

They will not succeed in deflecting law enforcement from its duties and mission. What they may do is that they may well succeed in undermining the American people's faith and confidence in these institutions so vital to a healthy democracy. That is not only unfortunate, but it is shameful.

Last summer Members of Congress came together on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis to impose sanctions on Russia because people here believed they were interfering in our elections. Republicans and Democrats spoke with one voice. We said: Our country has been attacked by a hostile power. We will not tolerate it, and we will stand together to stop it. Today, it is critical that we continue to speak with one voice in condemning Russia's interference.

This is a really remarkable moment in our country's history. A hostile foreign power has interfered in our Presidential election, and it continues to interfere. CIA Director Pompeo said, in no uncertain terms, that Russia will interfere in this year's midterm elections. Our law enforcement agencies and a special counsel are working diligently to undercover the scope and methods of Russia's interference so we can put a stop to it. Supporting these efforts is not about party and not about partisanship. It is about patriotism. It is about defending America's democracy, which has been attacked and continues to be vulnerable to attack.

Make no mistake. Our democracy is being tested, our law enforcement agencies are being tested, and we, as Senators, are being tested. We have a responsibility to come together—Senators of both parties—to defend the

independence of the Justice Department and the FBI. We must insist that Special Counsel Mueller be allowed to conduct and complete his investigation without further political interference. We must stand together in opposing Russia's outrageous continuing interference in America's elections and domestic affairs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to commend my colleagues who are sounding the alarm about Russia's interference in U.S. elections and who have worked tirelessly for months on their respective committees to get the answers that Americans deserve and give the confidence Americans need to know that their government is committed to preventing such interference from ever happening again.

This work is incredibly important to people around the country and in my home State of Washington. I have heard from countless people who deeply love this country but fear for its institutions, and they are concerned about the integrity of elections.

Here are the facts. More than a year ago, U.S. intelligence agencies concluded that Russia interfered in the last Presidential election, calling Russia's meddling a "significant escalation in directness, level of activity, and scope of effort" compared to previous attempts.

That is not my opinion. It is not a partisan statement. It is a fact. Even more troubling, they are already back at it. We know this because our President's own handpicked CIA Director said last week that, "of course," Russia is trying to meddle in this year's midterm elections.

That is exactly why this Congress approved sanctions months ago in order to punish Russia and show them the steep price of doing this again. If there is one issue that we should all be able to agree on, it is that no one should get away with such a devious attack on our democracy. But, somehow, while the public is demanding action, the White House has gone silent, refusing to implement sanctions for reasons President Trump can't or will not explain.

This same President, who has no problems speaking or tweeting on any other topic under the sun, clams up when it comes to Russia or he tries to change the subject or he launches a political attack. This same President, who promised to put "America first," has failed to live up to the most basic duty of defending our elections and enforcing congressional actions to punish Russian meddling.

The same President who promised law and order has been lashing out against a special counsel investigation, with a campaign to discredit our agencies of law and order by criticizing the men and women of our Nation's top law enforcement agencies, firing or threatening to fire those who stand up to him, and sowing doubt about the media that dares to report the facts.

Let's remember that the Putin regime that President Trump is so fond of is one that has invaded and annexed part of Ukraine and continues to incite war in Ukraine, is propping up the murderous Assad regime and is every bit as responsible for those heinous acts as Assad himself, and constantly tries to instigate conflict by threatening our troops around the world.

Perhaps the most disappointing piece of this is that President Trump is now not acting alone. He gets help from Members of Congress who join in partisan attacks on the FBI and Department of Justice. Just think about that. We have a President and Members of the Republican Party who are more interested in helping a foreign power get away with interfering in our elections than allowing an investigation to run its course.

It is simply stunning how far some of my Republican colleagues would go to undermine the special counsel and congressional investigations in order to score political points. This doesn't just put them at odds with the public in the short term. This has long-term consequences for the men and women who protect our country from harm. A few days ago, a former supervisory special agent with the FBI who served as a counterterrorism investigator and special assistant to the Bureau's Director explained why he was now resigning from the FBI in order to speak publicly.

He said his resignation was painful but "the alternative of remaining quiet while the bureau is tarnished for political gain is impossible." He said he worries that the damage from attacks on the integrity of the FBI could last generations.

There are a number of things this Congress must commit to. First of all, we must ensure that Special Counsel Robert Mueller stays on the job and continues to follow the facts wherever they may lead, without threat or intimidation and with the resources he needs. We already know the President talked about firing Mr. Mueller last year. Well, the President should be on notice: Firing Mueller is not an option, and the same goes for trying to fire Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein.

I also want to be clear. Doling out a Presidential pardon to try to cover up any collusion or obstruction of justice is unacceptable and will be met with furious resistance across the country.

This is about our elections, our national security, and it is about our standing in the world. No one—no one—should stand in the way of a thorough investigation. In the coming days, weeks, and months, Congress must work to fulfill its duty to the American people by ensuring the integrity of our elections and safeguarding investigations by allowing them to run their course free from political pressure.

The question is whether the Trump administration and all Members of

Congress will choose to act in the best interests of our country and our democracy or whether they will continue to act out of self-preservation and shortsighted political gain. The world is watching.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to denounce—this is a strong word but an appropriate word—the Republican effort to undermine America's faith in important institutions—all to protect Donald Trump from the Russia investigation.

This effort is self-evident to any neutral observer watching "Fox and Friends," reading the "Drudge Report," or following the President on Twitter, and it has profound consequences for our country.

Defending our critical institutions, such as the FBI and an independent Department of Justice, should not be a partisan issue, and those who care about these institutions have to speak up. This, of course, includes Members of Congress.

Many congressional Republicans, however, appear determined to transform legitimate congressional oversight into an arm of the President's defense. For example, the Teapot Dome hearings uncovered government corruption for personal gain. The Kefauver committee uncovered organized crime and corruption nationwide. The Watergate committee uncovered Nixon's conspiracy. The Church committee led to landmark reforms of the intelligence community, some of the very reforms that are currently being warped for Trump's benefit. These were bipartisan, fact-based, public inquiries into issues of national consequence.

The investigation into Russia's acknowledged interference in our election should be no different. Unfortunately, many of the Republicans in Congress investigating the Trump-Russia matter appear more concerned about protecting the President than getting at the truth. This is particularly so in the House of Representatives, where almost nothing happens on the Intelligence Committee without the assent of the White House. But it is also true in the Senate, where even the Judiciary Committee has been stymied in its efforts to get to the truth.

Certainly, it is not from a lack of trying. Democrats serving on relevant committees have demonstrated determination in fulfilling our constitutional oversight obligations, but this is nearly impossible without cooperation from the Republican majority. Without cooperation from Republicans, letters requesting information are not bipartisan, and interviews of key witnesses are delayed or are canceled, just to give two examples.

Conducting oversight behind closed doors and out of the public view lacks transparency, of course, and creates a situation ripe for exploitation. It allows Republicans to weaponize incom-

plete or inaccurate information for the President's benefit.

We have seen the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, DEVIN NUNES, use this tactic last week, in spite of concerns raised by the FBI and the Department of Justice. Congressman NUNES, determined to support the President's paranoid conclusion that the entire national security apparatus is out to get him, created a memo that misconstrued critical intelligence to engineer an outcome that pleased the White House. Armed with a misleading and inaccurate memo, Congressman NUNES and Republicans across the country, with the assistance of Russia bots on social media, launched a concerted attack on the FBI, the intelligence community, and the Justice Department. Why? To prove a conspiracy against the President that does not exist.

NUNES and other Republicans knew the facts did not support their conspiracy theory, but the incitement continued anyway, even singling out for attack the President's own handpicked Director of the FBI after his agency opposed releasing the memo. By the time the committee released it and the public learned just how false and misleading it was, Congressman NUNES and his memo had already sowed the seeds of doubt about the FBI and its investigation.

The President rewarded Congressman NUNES yesterday by tweeting:

DEVIN NUNES, a man of tremendous courage and grit, may someday be recognized as a Great American Hero for what he has exposed and what he has had to endure!

I think history will conclude otherwise.

Just as the President has praised the NUNES attacks on the FBI and the Justice Department, he has certainly been doing his part to undermine these institutions. He has done his part by demeaning and humiliating the very people he appointed to run these institutions. We can all recall the very personal attacks on Attorney General Jeff Sessions in the Oval Office, demands for personal loyalty from Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein, and assertions that the FBI was "in tatters" under the leadership of his handpicked Director, Christopher Wray. We can all appreciate the irony of Donald Trump's personal attacks against Special Counsel Robert Mueller, whom the President interviewed and seriously considered for a return to his old job as Director of the FBI.

The self-serving and personal attacks against people who refuse to do his bidding reflect the narcissism of a man who has little regard for his responsibilities as President. Sadly, for President Trump, it is all about him every time, all the time.

By attacking the Justice Department and the FBI, the President is attempting to discredit the Russia investigation and protect himself and his family. His words and actions are intended to undermine public confidence in the

FBI and the Justice Department for his benefit in the here and now. He does not seem to care about the long-term consequences of eroding public confidence in two critical institutions charged with keeping us safe and protecting our rights.

Through all the obfuscation and negative personal attacks, a clear pattern has emerged. The President and his Republican allies will do whatever they can to discredit the Mueller Russia investigation without regard or respect for the collateral damage caused. Then they will turn to FOX News and other outlets to get their message or propaganda out to their base and dismiss the mainstream media as fake news. Sadly, for our country, it is a strategy that can win and that can work.

According to a new poll from Reuters, 73 percent of Republicans believe that the Justice Department and the FBI are trying to undermine the President. This state of affairs may serve the President's short-term interests, but it will have real and lasting negative consequences for our country in the years and decades to come.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oregon.

**Mr. WYDEN.** Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Hawaii for a very eloquent statement. I so appreciate her leadership and miss her on the Intelligence Committee. I also want to express my appreciation to the organizers of this effort—Senator **WHITEHOUSE** and Senator **BLUMENTHAL**—who have been tenacious in pursuing these issues. Both of them serve on the Judiciary Committee, and I serve on the Intelligence Committee.

It is quite obvious what has been going on in the last few weeks. The President, the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, and others are working hard to get the American people just to forget that our country is in the middle of an ongoing national security crisis. Russia has attacked our democracy; Russia has intervened in our election; and there is every reason to believe that they are just going to keep doing it.

In the year since the assessment I mentioned was conducted by the intelligence community, virtually everyone has come to see it this way. Donald Trump obviously disagrees. The only change has been the extent to which Donald Trump's protectors are willing to go out and throw dust in the air to prevent America from focusing on this direct threat to the people of this country and our very system of government.

Congress has to get to the bottom of what has been done to our democracy, but the fact is, the Senate has been stonewalled, particularly when it comes to the crucial issues of following the money. It began when Donald Trump refused to do what every other Presidential candidate has done now for four decades; that is, release his tax returns. It continues on other fronts. I

have repeatedly asked the Secretary of the Treasury to provide the Senate Finance Committee with Treasury Department documents that would allow investigators to follow the money between Russia, Donald Trump, and his associates. The committee has been given nothing. Secretary Mnuchin has simply refused to cooperate with congressional oversight conducted by members of the committee that has direct jurisdiction over his agency.

So the question is, Mr. President, what are you hiding? What is in those tax returns and those financial documents that you don't want revealed? What would be so damaging?

It seems to me that if you are to understand Russia's ability to undermine our democracy, it is essential to follow the money. Donald Trump's family has acknowledged its financial ties to Russia. In fact, in 2008 and 2009, when it was pretty hard to get money for investment, the Trump family said—their words, not mine: Much of our portfolio comes from the Russians.

The special counsel included extensive information on money laundering and tax evasion in his recent indictment of Paul Manafort. There have been dozens and dozens of press stories—it seems there are several every week—about the finances of the President and his associates that warrant real congressional oversight.

Americans are alarmed by the administration's stonewalling, and millions have been appalled by the idea that this would somehow be treated like just another political game. Those who abuse the classification system to put out a laughable partisan memo that doesn't stand up to scrutiny apparently are willing to do it just to protect the President at any cost.

The cost is our national security. The cost is our democracy. No matter how much the President and his protectors in Congress try to change the subject, we are not, on the floor of this Senate, going to lose sight of what is really at stake.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Connecticut.

**Mr. BLUMENTHAL.** Mr. President, I am honored to follow my colleagues here today and to be followed by my great friend and colleague, Senator **WHITEHOUSE**, who has been a wonderful partner in this effort and has helped organize today's colloquy. I will yield to him shortly.

I think the American people are asking a commonsense question: What is the President trying to hide? What do the Russians have on Donald Trump?

The intelligence community unanimously says that the Russians attacked our democracy by interfering in the 2016 election. The only one who has any doubt about it—in fact, the only public official who has the temerity to deny it—is the President of the United States. So the question is, Why?

That is the elephant in this Chamber. That is the question that the American

people demand that we answer in our investigation into obstruction of justice through the Judiciary Committee and that the special counsel will be answering in his investigation into collusion between the Russians and the Trump campaign, as well as subsequent obstruction of justice.

Some of this investigation involves past events and actions by the President and others. But, in fact, what is happening daily in real time is evidence of obstruction of justice. It is as though we were watching a case in court unfolding before our eyes. All we lack is the marshalling of the evidence and the closing argument. In a subsequent speech, I intend to go into great detail on that obstruction case.

From what we know now through the public record, there is a lot more that the special counsel knows from his investigation, and he will be making use of it from classified and unclassified sources.

We now know, irrefutably and undeniably, that there is a credible case of obstruction of justice against the President of the United States. It is credible and, in many ways, powerful and compelling.

In fact, President Trump has endeavored mightily to stop all of these investigations into the Russian meddling in the 2016 election and his connections to it.

Obstruction of justice is a serious crime, essentially consisting of two elements: No. 1, to interfere with a lawful investigation and, No. 2, that interference has to be done with corrupt intent. Corrupt intent means any improper purpose.

It doesn't matter that the President, for example, had the right to fire Jim Comey or to say one thing or another. The question is why he did it. There can be circumstantial evidence of that corrupt intent in what he says and does, as well as direct quotations.

If it was to stop or influence an investigation, that is corrupt intent, and that is enough for obstruction of justice.

My colleagues and I are here today to raise the alarm because where we are now is that part of the President's corrupt intent, as well as his interference with the investigation, consists of an all-out assault on law enforcement and the intelligence community.

In some ways, it is a standard means of defense at trial: When all else fails, attack the prosecution. I have seen it and experienced it as a U.S. attorney myself in court. So I know it is a last resort, but it has lasting implications for the defendant, or whoever is raising this defense—in this case, the President of the United States. It has huge, sweeping, enduring, horrific, and reprehensible ramifications. It is irresponsible in a profound constitutional sense for the Commander in Chief to be undermining our national security by attacking the FBI and our intelligence community as institutions.

I wish to remind my colleagues of what our colleague **JOHN MCCAIN** said.

My colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE prepared this poster board and will be using it shortly. He said: "The latest attacks against the FBI and Department of Justice serve no American interests—no party's, no President's, only Putin's." These attacks serve the Russians. They do not serve America's national security because they are done with the purpose to obstruct justice.

They are the latest in a series of irresponsible and reprehensible actions that began in the first days of this administration. In January 2017, Acting Attorney General Sally Yates went to the White House to inform White House Counsel Don McGahn that Michael Flynn had lied to the Vice President about his relationship with the Russians and he could, therefore, be subject to blackmail. Don McGahn immediately briefed President Trump, but the White House failed to react in the way that a responsible President would. Soon after it was revealed that the FBI was doing an investigation into Russian meddling, Trump asked FBI Director James Comey for his loyalty. In effect, he asked for a loyalty pledge from the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigations. He cornered Comey privately and said that he hoped Comey would let Flynn go, referring to the FBI's investigation into Michael Flynn.

Trump called Comey and told him he wanted him to lift the cloud of the Russian investigation over his Presidency. He then called for the firing of Andrew McCabe, a potential corroborating witness for Comey's conversations with Trump.

He asked Director of National Intelligence Dan Coats and CIA Director Mike Pompeo and Mike Rogers to publicly state that he was not under investigation. When Comey refused to bend to this pressure, he fired Comey and misstated the reason for that firing. He lied about it, claiming it was because of Comey's supposed handling of the Clinton email investigation, although he later admitted in an interview with NBC News anchor Lester Holt that the firing was "because of this Russia thing," and he bragged to Russian officials at the White House that Comey's firing had "taken off" the "great pressure" of the Russia investigation.

But that did not make the Russia investigation go away, because of the appointment of Special Counsel Robert Mueller. He berated his Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, for recusing himself from the special counsel's investigation because he knew Sessions could have stopped it. He berated Jeff Sessions and privately ranted about it.

Those private rants, along with other private conversations—many of them now known to the special counsel, no doubt—are evidence that will be produced by the special counsel.

We know that President Trump wrote a deliberately deceptive statement for his son Donald Trump, Jr., to cover up the Trump Tower meeting and

to misstate what the purpose of that meeting was—supposedly Russian adoptions, when, in fact, it was to obtain dirt on Hillary Clinton. He did it when he knew he was under investigation. That is the key point.

He ordered the firing of Robert Mueller and backed down only when his White House Counsel said he would resign. Again, the reasons that he provided, much like the Comey letter that was a lie, the reasons for his firing the FBI Director were pretextual. He lied about why he wanted Mueller gone, just as he had lied about why he fired Jim Comey.

In some ways, others are tasked now, in a switch of tactics. He has no longer threatened to fire the special counsel—at least publicly—but he has tasked his surrogates and sycophants in Congress to attack institutions like the FBI, the Department of Justice, and the intelligence community, along with him. That was the purpose of the Nunes memo—to discredit the FBI and distract from the investigation.

But if he orchestrated the writing of that memo, if he participated in drafting it, if anyone in the White House, with his imprimatur or direction, was involved in crafting that memo, that is evidence also of obstruction of justice, and it will come home to haunt DEVIN NUNES and the White House staff who participated and others in the Congress who may have been involved, including the staff—all of it because he wants to stop the investigation, all of it because he is afraid of something that the special counsel has and that the Russians may have on him.

The fact of the matter is that no one is above the law. If the President refuses to talk to the special counsel, he should be subpoenaed to appear before the grand jury. If he fails to voluntarily appear for that interview with Robert Mueller or his staff, he should be subpoenaed before the grand jury, and he should be forced to testify under threat of contempt. And if he invokes Executive privilege, the outcome will be the same when it is tested in court, as it was in *United States v. Nixon*.

We have seen this movie before. We know how it ends because a broad claim of Executive privilege fails in the face of a lawful need for evidence in an ongoing criminal investigation.

If he claims a Fifth Amendment privilege—the right against self-incrimination—it will be a powerful testimony to what he fears the special counsel and the Russians have on him.

We are careening toward a constitutional crisis, and that is why my colleagues in this Chamber can no longer remain silent. It is why Paul Ryan can no longer tolerate DEVIN NUNES to continue with these frantic antics to protect the President and his ongoing acts of obstruction. It is why I hope we will adopt legislation to protect the special counsel, sending a message to the President of the United States that he cannot obstruct justice by firing the special counsel and precipitate a con-

frontation that would match the Saturday Night Massacre during the era of Watergate. That would throw this country into another constitutional conflagration that would be profoundly damaging and enduringly harmful.

This investigation is no hoax or witch hunt. It is real. It is not about any of us or any of the President's tweets. It is about evidence and law. It is about facts and statutes. It is about the elements of a crime that is under investigation. The American people deserve to know the truth, which is why we must have public hearings in the Judiciary Committee, and we must have subpoenas for documents and witnesses. It is why we need to move in the Judiciary Committee with special counsel legislation that will offer protections that guarantee the American people that they will know the truth and that the rule of law will be protected. No one is above the rule of law.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank my friend and colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, on January 6, 2017, the U.S. intelligence community released a shocking report.

It stated: "We assess with high confidence that Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016, aimed at the U.S. presidential election, the consistent goals of which were to undermine public faith in the U.S. democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency."

This wasn't just one intelligence agency, it was a unanimous conclusion of the entire intelligence community.

It sent shockwaves throughout our entire government. This isn't about Republicans versus Democrats, it is about a foreign President ordering an attack on our democracy.

President Putin's goal was clear: to sow division and discord and to undermine public faith in our democratic processes and the rule of law.

Almost immediately we saw concerns and calls for action from both sides of the aisle.

Bipartisan congressional investigations were initiated to figure out exactly what happened and how to prevent it from happening again.

However, despite this promising beginning, the commitment to uncover the facts and protect our country from outside attacks has devolved into an inside attack on our own democratic institutions.

Sadly, rather than serving as a unifying force, President Trump has done all he can to undermine the intelligence community's assessment.

What is worse, he has utterly failed to take strong actions against Russia—and in some cases has rewarded Russia by changing U.S. policy.

Instead of supporting a robust and independent investigation into what Russia did and who was involved, the President instead is working to halt the investigations altogether.

Unfortunately, the President hasn't been alone in these efforts.

Last week, Congressman DEVIN NUNES, chairman of the House Intelligence Committee, pushed for the declassification of a transparently political memo written by his staff.

Here are some things we know about the memo and the process to release it: We know that the memo confirms the FBI's Russia investigation was not triggered by the dossier or by Carter Page.

In fact, the investigation started because another Trump campaign foreign policy adviser, George Papadopolous, was told in April that Russia had "dirt" on Clinton in the form of thousands of emails.

We also know that, while Carter Page was not the reason the Russia investigation started, the government had a reasonable belief that Page was acting as an agent of a foreign power.

We know that Congressman NUNES did not review the underlying classified documents himself.

These documents include the FISA warrant renewal applications, which must show what the government was learning about Carter Page.

Instead of reviewing these documents himself, the chairman relied solely on his staff, who may or may not have been coordinating this campaign with the White House. We don't know because Congressman NUNES refuses to answer that question.

We know that Chairman NUNES refused to allow the Department of Justice and FBI to brief all Members on the underlying documents before and after the memo's release.

We know that Congressman NUNES refused to allow Democrats to issue their own analysis of the classified documents along with his memo.

And we know that Russian social media bots assisted in the efforts to influence American public opinion concerning the memo.

The drafting and release of this partisan, misleading memo was particularly disturbing to me.

As Senator McCAIN stated last week, "If we continue to undermine our own rule of law, we are doing Putin's job for him."

Intelligence and law enforcement oversight should never be used as a political weapon.

I have served on the Senate Intelligence Committee for 17 years, and I can't recall a single instance when an intelligence report was handled in this manner or a situation where additional views were actively blocked from being released.

This has been true even with the most controversial issues like the Intelligence Committee's investigation of the Benghazi attacks or the report on the CIA's use of torture.

In both of these instances, the committee held bipartisan meetings and shared drafts of report language between the majority and minority.

For the torture report, the CIA was offered and accepted opportunities to

respond and request changes. The committee revised its report where appropriate and even cited disagreements in footnotes.

Once public, the committee included additional views from Republicans on the committee. The CIA's response was made public. There was a very thorough declassification process to ensure the summary was safe to release.

In fact, even though the final report was completed in 2012, the executive summary wasn't made public until December 2014 in order to ensure the process was properly followed.

There were disagreements, but the minority party was not cut out of the process.

That is not how the Senate works, that is not how democracy works, and it is not how any congressional committee or investigation should operate.

What I have described so far was the process and political implications of the Nunes memo, but it is just one part of an extensive pattern of abuse of power.

What we are seeing is a sustained, coordinated effort to diminish, weaken, and destabilize our top law enforcement officials, and we all should take exception to that.

Both the rushed manner and the disputed contents of the Nunes memo are a case in point.

After the memo was released on Friday, House Intelligence Committee Ranking Member ADAM SCHIFF hit the nail on the head.

He called the public release of misleading allegations against the FBI and the Justice Department "a shameful effort to discredit these institutions, undermine the Special Counsel's ongoing investigation, and undercut congressional probes."

He is absolutely right.

And this is just the latest in a long pattern of attempts to undercut the FBI and Justice Department.

Some of the efforts were blatant.

After FBI Director Comey refused to pledge his loyalty to the President, the President fired him, an action the President himself admitted was tied to the Russia investigation.

The President has engaged in a series of tweets attacking the Attorney General, Deputy Attorney General and Deputy Director of the FBI, among others.

There have also been media reports that the President has considered firing both Robert Mueller and Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, but many of the efforts by the President and his team weren't quite as obvious.

We have seen multiple reports that the President demanded personal loyalty from top law enforcement officials including Comey and Rosenstein.

In fact, President Trump frequently calls the Attorney General "his" Attorney General and refers to "my FBI" and "my Department of Justice." In fact, they aren't his, they are American people's.

Media reports also say that President instructed White House Counsel Don

McGahn to keep the Attorney General from recusing himself from the Russia investigation.

Two heads of intelligence agencies, DNI Director Dan Coats and NSC Director Michael Rogers, said they felt pressure from the President to say there was no collusion with Russia.

And it has become apparent that many of the actions taken by the White House, Congressman NUNES, and others have been coordinated with conservative media like FOX News.

Objectivity and nonpartisanship are core components of the FBI and the Justice Department. To either attempt to co-opt them or punish them for not kowtowing to the President's political whims is egregious.

Our Founding Fathers placed enormous trust in the legislative branch to serve as an effective check on the President, and it is time to do our job.

Congress needs to work alongside Special Counsel Mueller to get answers for the American people.

The Nation deserves to understand exactly what happened and who was involved, and all of us need to believe the President isn't above the law and will not be allowed to abuse his position for personal gain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, indisputably, Vladimir Putin conducted a broadly based attack on American democracy and its most important institutions. Tragically, Putin's broadly based attack on American democracy and our institutions is echoed by President Trump's attack on American democracy and our most important institutions. And tragically or pathetically—I don't know which to say—that attack is echoed by a broad Republican attack on American democracy and institutions.

We can and should take steps to defend our American democracy. They are not terribly complicated.

No. 1, stop attacking our own institutions. We can start there. We are doing Putin's work when we attack our own institutions.

No. 2, step up to protect our own elections. All of our national security witnesses have warned that they are coming after us in 2018 with more election interference. Yet what have we done?

No. 3, stop sheltering Putin and his oligarchs from consequences. We passed sanctions against Russian oligarchs and Putin and Russia for this very thing—messing around in our elections—through the Senate 98 to 2. The effective date of them has run. Yet the President won't enforce them. Stop sheltering Putin and his oligarchs.

No. 4, clean up the dark channels of foreign influence and corruption. We know what they are because we have seen this play out in European countries and former Soviet Union countries. We know how it works. We have similar vulnerabilities. Fix them.

Those are four things that are not hard to do.

A fifth would be serious investigations by Congress—not tiptoe investigations but ones where we take hard looks, ask hard questions, and demand hard evidence.

No one in the Senate has tangled more with Vladimir Putin than our friend JOHN MCCAIN. Senator MCCAIN has tangled with him so often that he has actually been blacklisted from travel to Russia. What Senator MCCAIN said last week is something we should take to heart: “The latest attacks against the FBI and Department of Justice serve no American interests—no party’s, no President’s, only Vladimir Putin’s.”

He also said this: “Our Nation’s elected officials, including the President, must stop looking at this investigation through the lens of politics and manufacturing political sideshows.” Instead, we need to be looking at the situation through the lens of our national security.

Here is what America’s national security professionals tell us. First, they concluded: “Russian President Vladimir Putin ordered an influence campaign in 2016 aimed at the U.S. presidential election.”

I will continue. “Russia’s goals were to undermine public faith in the U.S. Democratic process, denigrate Secretary Clinton, and harm her electability and potential presidency.”

They concluded: “We further assess Putin and the Russian government developed a clear preference for President-elect Trump.”

We went on with this important conclusion in the January 2017 intelligence community assessment: “We assess Moscow will apply lessons learned from its Putin-ordered campaign aimed at the U.S. presidential election to future influence efforts worldwide, including against U.S. allies and their election processes.”

We know they are coming. We have been warned by Trump’s own appointees that they are coming. Yet we do nothing. Nada. As Putin would say, “*nichego*.”

Well, right now that leaves Congress complicit, but it doesn’t have to be this way, and it ought not be this way. It is not too late to defend our democracy and to teach Russia and the world some different lessons about who we are. What are the things we could do? Well, we could defend our democracy from Russian political influence.

Let’s take legislative action to secure election infrastructure, improve our cyber security, counter and blunt Russian propaganda, and keep foreign money out of our politics. That ought not to be too hard to ask.

Let’s defend our democracy from future Russian and foreign meddling. Let’s insist on the implementation and enforcement of the sanctions against Russia. We passed them 98 to 2 for a reason. Why is President Trump sheltering Putin and the oligarchs from that punch? Let’s insist on the message being delivered that we don’t tolerate

this behavior and that we will deter it with serious sanctions.

Let’s insist on transparency. Let’s insist on transparency about foreign financial interference in our country, through shell corporations in particular, and let’s insist on transparency about the President’s foreign financial dealings and conflicts of interest.

Finally, let’s pass legislation to protect the special counsel from interference and obstruction. I have been a U.S. attorney. I understand the role of an independent and honorable Department of Justice. I understand, as we all should, that no man—not even the President—is above the law. And like many colleagues who have served in the Department of Justice, I expect, as they all expect, that even under the pressure, the threats, and the intimidation brought by the President against this Department of Justice, it will do its job. As FBI Director Christopher Wray recently said, “We expect them to keep calm and tackle hard.”

I see the majority leader is on the floor.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The majority leader.

#### 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.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent due to a family medical emergency for rollcall vote No. 28. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on the confirmation of Andrei Iancu, of California, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

#### CONFIRMATION OF DAVID RYAN STRAS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I wish to express my disappointment that David Stras was confirmed to serve on the Eight Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Stras’s nomination should not have made it to the Senate floor. For over a century, the Senate Judiciary Committee has used the blue slip process to ensure that the White House fulfills its constitutional duty to seek the Senate’s advice and consent for judicial nominations. Traditionally, a nominee received a committee hearing only if both of their home State Senators returned their blue slips to the committee. Despite receiving only one blue slip, Mr. Stras was granted a hearing, and his nomination was sent to the

Senate floor for a vote. I am extremely disappointed that my colleagues are abandoning long-standing practices in order to fill the judiciary with conservative ideologues.

Moreover, Mr. Stras is yet another judicial nominee selected for this administration by the Heritage Foundation and the Federalist Society. His name was on President Trump’s Supreme Court shortlist, and although he was not selected to fill the Supreme Court vacancy, outside dark money PACS spent millions of dollars running ads in support of his nomination to this seat. These facts should alarm every American. Our judiciary system, under the Trump administration, is being outsourced to outside organizations with unlimited financial resources that are not accountable to voters.

I urge my colleagues to return to regular order.

#### OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS DRILLING

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I wish to speak in opposition to President Trump’s proposal to open all offshore waters in the country to oil drilling.

This proposal has been met with outrage from every corner, as my colleagues are making clear here on the Senate floor today.

I would like to take a minute to remind everyone of what is at stake.

Before the Deepwater Horizon and Exxon Valdez spills, Santa Barbara, CA, experienced the worst oil spill in U.S. history.

In 1969, an offshore oil rig in Federal waters spilled more than 3 million gallons of crude oil into the Pacific Ocean.

The environmental disaster killed thousands of marine mammals and birds. Our local beaches were coated by a thick layer of oil. Tourists were turned away, and commercial fishing operations were shut down, hurting the local economy.

After that spill, California decided that enough was enough. State agencies blocked all new offshore oil drilling in State waters up to 3 miles from the shore. The State reinforced this ban with the California Coastal Sanctuary Act in 1994.

Through a combination of local ordinances, congressional opposition, and moratoria imposed by Presidents from both parties, our State has also fought off any new drilling in Federal waters beyond 3 miles from the shore since 1984.

The Trump administration has now proposed undoing our progress by opening all Federal waters, including the waters off California’s coast, to new gas and oil drilling.

If his proposal is allowed to go through, it would lead to the first new offshore oil drilling leases sold in the Pacific Ocean in more than 30 years.

So far, an exception has been made for Florida, hastily announced by Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke in response

to concerns from Florida's Republican Governor.

That is completely arbitrary and not acceptable.

It is clear California also staunchly opposes this plan. According to the latest polling, nearly 70 percent of Californians oppose new drilling off our coast.

Senator HARRIS and I, together with our colleagues in the House of Representatives, have repeatedly shared our concerns with Secretary Zinke.

The Secretary has even received statements of opposition from California's Governor, senate, assembly, attorney general, coastal commission, fish and game commission, State lands commission, and more than two dozen counties and cities.

So why are we not being given the same deference as Florida?

Unlike this administration, California understands that offshore oil drilling belongs in the past. We are making smarter investments in clean energy and renewable sources. Our State is on target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 80 percent below 1990 levels by the year 2050.

The President's proposal would undermine that progress.

The Trump administration's proposed six new lease sales off the California coast would lead to new oil rigs that would continue to produce oil for decades to come.

That is well past the time we will need to have moved away from fossil fuels altogether.

Even though California has fought off new Federal drilling for three decades, there are still 43 leases that remain active from Federal lease sales prior to 1984.

In State waters, there are still nine active rigs that were built before the Santa Barbara oil spill.

We are still dealing with the legacy of last century's drilling, but it is our responsibility to leave a better legacy for the next century.

California won't allow new offshore oil rigs to create another generation of dirty carbon emissions and disastrous oil spills.

California, along with our coastal State friends, has rejected President Trump's offshore drilling proposal.

It is time to respect our local opposition and completely scrap this plan.

#### KARI'S LAW ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Senate passage of Kari's Law Act of 2017.

In December 2013, Kari Hunt Dunn was attacked by her estranged husband in a hotel room. In an attempt to help her mother, Kari's 9-year-old daughter tried to contact the police by dialing 9-1-1. Tragically, the call failed to go through because Kari's daughter did not dial "9" to reach an outside line before entering 9-1-1. Kari did not survive the attack.

Kari's murder brought a serious public safety problem to light. Whether

you are a worker at a big office building or a family staying in a hotel, dialing 9-1-1 should always connect you with people who can help.

By passing Kari's Law, we will enact a national standard to ensure that multiline telephone equipment must be capable of supporting the ability to directly reach emergency services by dialing 9-1-1 and that those responsible for installing, maintaining, and operating the system are required to ensure that simply dialing 9-1-1, a critically important capability, is available for use in emergency situations.

Ensuring multiline telephones are installed with the capability to contact emergency responders by dialing 9-1-1 will help prevent tragedies like the one that Kari Hunt Dunn endured.

#### RECOGNIZING THE COMMISSIONING OF THE USCGC "JOSEPH GERCZAK"

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the commissioning of the Coast Guard's 26th Sentinel-class Fast Response Cutter, FRC, the USCGC *Joseph Gerczak*. The commissioning ceremony for this impressive ship will take place in Honolulu, HI, on March 9. Although I regret not being able to attend the ceremony in person, I am deeply honored for the chance to speak about this cutter and the remarkable man for which it is named.

Joseph Gerczak, a son of Pennsylvania, valiantly died fighting for his country during World War II. He was born on February 10, 1922, in Philadelphia, PA. Soon after enlisting in the Coast Guard on September 26, 1942, he was assigned to a tank landing ship whose job it was to carry tanks, vehicles, cargo, and troops directly onto enemy shores. Gerczak was quickly promoted to signalman third class on this ship, which was called the USS *LST-66*.

On December 26, 1943, Gerczak and his crewmates participated in the initial Allied assault on the Japanese-held island of New Britain. During this operation, the USS *LST-66* came under sudden attack by seven Japanese dive bombers. Acting without hesitation, Gerczak was the first crewmember to man his battle station; he heroically shot down two Japanese planes before being mortally wounded from the shrapnel of a bomb blast. He was 21 years old.

For his valor in battle, Gerczak was posthumously awarded both the Silver Star and Purple Heart. The USS *LST-66*'s entire crew was also given the Presidential Unit Commendation. It is exceptionally fitting that Gerczak be honored for the sacrifice he gave during World War II by having his name live on in the service of the U.S. Coast Guard.

The USCGC *Joseph Gerczak* will be the second FRC based in Honolulu, HI, replacing the legacy Island-class patrol boats. As a Sentinel-class cutter, it will feature advanced command, con-

trol, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance—C4ISR—equipment. Furthermore, this ship will be fully interoperable with existing and future Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of Defense assets. These state-of-the-art capabilities will better enable the USCGC *Joseph Gerczak* to conduct missions that include port, waterways, and the coasts; fishery patrols; search and rescue; and national defense.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognition of the commissioning of the USCGC *Joseph Gerczak* into military service as a Coast Guard ship.

#### TRIBUTE TO KERRY SUTTEN

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the dedicated career and service to the Congress and the intelligence community of Kerry Suttten, who is retiring at the end of this month after more than 20 years of service in both the executive and legislative branches of our government. Kerry dedicated his professional career to help keep our Nation safe and to improve our government and intelligence community. We thank him for his dedication.

Kerry is leaving the Senate as the deputy minority staff director of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, a post he has held for the last 2½ years. He first joined the committee as the head of the committee's collection review, a study looking at the intelligence activities of all the IC. During his time on the committee, Kerry has worked tirelessly to help the committee rigorously oversee the 17 intelligence agencies that make up our national intelligence community and has especially dedicated himself to improving the oversight of the IC's inspectors general and to the protection of IC whistleblowers. His efforts in these subjects have been invaluable.

Prior to joining the committee, Kerry served in a variety of roles in the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), including spending almost 5 years as the lead for intelligence community strategic planning in the Office of Systems and Resource Analysis, (SRA). In that capacity, Kerry was responsible for helping provide resource direction for the entirety of the IC, developing integrated planning guidance for the various intelligence programs, and managing the development of strategic priorities.

In addition to his time in SRA, Kerry held important roles in the Business Transformation Office at ODNI and the Office of the Chief Financial Officer. Kerry was also instrumental in helping to create the national counterterrorism budget, a key accomplishment in his time at the National Counterterrorism Center, (NCTC), where he served for almost 2 years as a Senior Program and Resource Officer. Prior to joining the IC, Mr. Suttten spent almost 5 years supporting the Director of the Bureau

of Economic Analysis at the U.S. Department of Commerce, was the Director for Congressional and Intragovernmental Affairs at the Economics and Statistics Administration, and worked for 2 years at the Bureau of the Census. Kerry began his governmental career as a Senior Economist at the Joint Economic Committee in July 1997.

During his time in the government, Kerry won a wide variety of performance awards for his work. However, I am sure that he feels his most important award is his forthcoming and well-deserved retirement. Kerry plans to relocate full-time to the Sperryville, VA, area, where he owns and runs a popular coffee shop. Kerry's plans include expanding the services offered by his shop to include a wine bar, and he has expressed an interest in raising chickens and miniature goats. While these subjects are far from the expertise he has shown in his time in and around the intelligence community, I am sure he will excel at them just as he has in his time with SSCI.

Kerry Suttan, we wish you great success and great happiness in your retirement. Thank you for your years of service.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### STATE OF THE UNION ESSAY FINALISTS

● Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate more finalists in this year's State of the Union Essay Contest and, as I did with the finalists I recognized yesterday, I ask that their essays be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

MAISIE NEWBURY, MIDDLEBURY UNION HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

"Whenever you feel like criticizing anyone, just remember that all the people in this world haven't had the advantages that you've had." The Great Gatsby, page 1. This was one of my father's favorite quotes when I was growing up. He always cautioned me to think before I spoke or better yet, "think before you think." While some might call this inauthentic, my father called it sensible.

I am not blind to the privilege I possess. Though, living in the big house atop the hill with my two healthy, living parents in the sheltered town of Weybridge, Vermont, it would be an easy thing to forget—if it weren't for my brother, Robbie.

Robbie does not talk much. He cannot read. He cannot write. He has "Severe, Regressive Autism," a developmental disorder that inhibits his literacy and communication skills. When I was younger, my parents explained to me that the world looked different to Robbie. It was louder, brighter and so much bigger. Living with Robbie, I am constantly reminded of my privilege. Every time I speak, run, ski, read, write . . . I'm doing something that he cannot. All the things I do on a daily basis are insurmountable obstacles to him. Yet, even without these luxuries, my brother smiles and laughs—he enjoys his life and his experience because he owns it. No one should be allowed to take that from him.

Yet, my brother's access to the care he needs has decreased immensely in the last year. His weekly appointments with his occupational therapist, which used to be covered by insurance, are now unaffordable as my parents must continue supporting him in their retirement. Learning this, I was upset. How could something so fundamental be removed from our insurance policy without a second thought?

In our society, mental health challenges are often dismissed as illegitimate and fixable. Words like psycho, idiot and lunatic, are thrown around as diminutive insults rather than seen as impactful and potentially harmful. Because of this, mental healthcare is considered a luxury rather than a necessity, and therefore not something that should be covered by insurance.

The union we live in does not value mental healthcare simply because society does not. This issue starts with us. I cannot stay silent and watch my parents sacrifice my brother's future stability and independence in order to be able to support him in the long run; nor can I do this alone. I know that until society begins placing value on the lives of people like Robbie, no one will—especially not large-scale insurance providers. However, I believe that there are other people like me who, if we band together, can create a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens ready to take on the world. For, unlike my brother, my privilege has given me a voice, and it is my duty to use it to fight for him. I owe him that much.

JACKSON NOEL, MILTON HIGH SCHOOL, SENIOR

With a nation as large as the United States there is a constant stream of issues and problems that require addressing. This means that the most important issues are those that involve the largest portion of the United States population. In that way, the biggest issue that the United States should currently focus on is making sure that every American can afford and has access to health care.

Every American should have the right to health care, as wealth should not determine quality of life. Health care is an incredibly important aspect of everyone's lives as it allows them to live without worrying about not having access to critical care and treatment to thrive. In this way, the solution to this problem is the maintaining and constant adjusting of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, "ACA", to best suit and assist the American people. The benefit of the Affordable Care Act is deceptively simple in that more Americans would be able to afford and hold onto healthcare. This means that they would be able to live a better life and be better functioning members of society. The Affordable Care Act has proven to be a legitimate solution since it has been enacted under the Obama administration. According to the New York Times, the number of Americans without healthcare is "down by 25 percent." This shows that the Affordable Care Act is effective at achieving its goals.

There are many people who believe that the United States government should play no role in health care; this is a flawed perspective. The goal is insure as many American citizens as possible it makes the most sense to have defined government regulation. One belief is that there should be a free market for health insurance, allowing companies to compete to provide the best system to benefit the people. There are many problems with a free market health care system that stops it from being helpful and most useful for the American people. A free market is not designed to allow for everyone to have insurance, but rather people who can afford it having better access. This is not

beneficial on the national scale and leads to a large imbalance of power. There are also numerous flaws in the current American approach to health care. For one, even when someone is insured there are upfront fees and payments before insurance kicks in. This means that someone who is insured might not be able to pay these fees causing them to be financially burdened by bills even with insurance.

Universal government health care has proven to be a sufficient solution to the problem of health care. For example, Switzerland has universal health care and a per capita health expenditures of \$1,879, compared to America's \$4,160. Meaning that the United States is spending more money on less.

Making sure that this is available and maintained under the Trump administration is important in the path towards accessible health insurance. No one should ever die because they cannot afford treatment.

HOPE PETRARO, MONTEPELIER HIGH SCHOOL,  
SOPHOMORE

Commitment to democracy is the founding principal of the United States of America—embedded in the fabric of our Nation, the crown jewel of our proverbial crown. A constitutional federal republic, with a system of checks and balances, is an assurance to constituents that they each have a seat at the table. Yet in practice, this has proven to be nothing but a promising facade. Gerrymandering, voter suppression, and "money in politics" are not a threat to our democracy—they define American democracy. The disproportionate influence of wealthy individuals and corporations in elections and in the legislative process has muddled an honest definition of democracy in our Nation while simultaneously becoming it. However, America's commitment to tried-and-true methods does not necessitate lack of receptivity to positive change.

Campaigns will always include campaign financing, as the distribution of information to voters is dependent upon systems that require funding. In addition, campaign contributions, whether by individuals or corporations, can rightfully be considered an exercise of the First Amendment right to free speech. However, refusal to set donation limits violates the grounds of equality upon which such freedom of speech is conducted, and can arguably censor and repress the speech of the less wealthy as it greatly diminishes their relative influence. Unfortunately, Citizens United and the subsequent SpeechNow allow donors to make unlimited donations to super PACS. This includes money donated by foreign entities, possibly anonymously as "dark money". Moreover, these expenditures aren't verifiably independent from candidates. Collusion between super PACs, often created by associates of candidates and candidates themselves, is rarely, if ever, regulated. In addition, it is hypocritical to argue, in the name of free speech, that donors can contribute an unlimited amount to expenditures but that those expenditures must remain independent. Citizens United, SpeechNow, and the additional McCutcheon rulings have nearly neutralized the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, adding a somewhat plutocratic influence upon the electoral process and American democracy as a whole.

This issue is multi-partisan. According to Gallup Poll, the greatest majority of Americans cite dissatisfaction with the government and poor leadership as our Nation's most important issue. A September 2015 Bloomberg poll found that about 80 percent of Republicans and Democrats alike oppose Citizens United. This overarching dissatisfaction can be ameliorated by working



to keep elections in the hands of the American people. Political groups, such as the Swift Boat Veterans for Truth and ALEC, were able to influence elections before Citizens United, SpeechNow, and McCutcheon, and are able to influence the legislative process, respectively. However, it's important for Americans to avoid demoralization, understanding that the first step to achieving a republic free of corruption rests in truly democratic elections. A true democracy can be achieved by restoring the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, strengthening campaign-finance regulations, and supporting public campaign-financing initiatives. We, the American people, must decide our destiny, and our elections should remind each American that their voices prevail.

ZOE PRUE, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

The United States is distinguished by the values that are deeply embedded in our culture and economy. Americans place emphasis on individual initiative and self-created success. These ideas are evident in the Constitution, its amendments, and various institutions. Their derivation is best seen in a famous phrase written in the Declaration of Independence, "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Captured in these seven words are the ubiquitous values of our Nation.

Our focus on individually created prosperity is manifested by capitalism and the free market. However, these are not conducive to always guaranteeing protections like health care for our most vulnerable citizens. In America, there are families stymied in an unrelenting cycle of poverty, and they are incapable of rising out of the cycle for a myriad of factors. For example, access to education and vocational training, discrimination—especially for marginalized communities—higher incarceration rates, low salaries/wages, and lack of jobs. Impoverished people have difficulties paying for the bare minimums like housing, food, and heat. Consequently, families rarely find any spare money to spend on healthcare.

This is an issue because, according to the National Center for Children in Poverty, 15 million children in the United States live below the federal poverty line. There are millions of children who do not receive regular physical check-ups, necessary optometry appointments, or dental care. Children and adolescents are suffering from health problems that impact their quality of life. Many treatable ailments require simple fixes such as glasses to see the board, fillings for painful cavities, medicine for illnesses, or inhalers for asthma. It is within our capacity to fix these problems, so why are we not? We should be concerned about the health of our Nation's citizens as it is one of the most important issues facing the U.S. today.

There is an inescapable need for affordable and accessible health care for the American public. The lasting impacts of affordable healthcare would be monumental. When we invest in the health and livelihoods of the next generation of Americans, we are investing in the next generation of our workforce. Healthier people results in more able workers, who by extension, are able to support their own families. It is one of the best methods to combatting the poverty cycle.

We characterize our Nation by our belief in individualism and independence. However, when we see a system that is relentlessly unforgiving towards people in poverty, the most productive conclusion to come to is that we have to start taking care of our neighbors. The cycle disempowers them; it strips them of the ability to pay for necessities like healthcare. This is why affordable healthcare needs to be obtainable for all Americans.

Instead of repealing and replacing the Affordable Care Act, it should be expanded upon. The government should fund programs to offer reasonably priced healthcare to Americans. Doing so would create a lasting solution to poor citizens being unable to access health care. The quality of life for millions of Americans would be improved.

ETHAN SCHMITT, RUTLAND HIGH SCHOOL, SOPHOMORE

I am the grandson of a card-carrying member of the National Rifle Association. I support the United States Constitution and all of its amendments. Despite this, I believe that the way our country's officials have interpreted the Second Amendment has created the foundation for many mass shootings, which have claimed the lives of countless innocent civilians.

A price cannot be assigned for the lives lost due to this awfully dangerous policy of our country; every time another person dies due to homicide, another family is torn apart. Many children have been killed, particularly in church and school shootings. And even in cases where there are children who haven't been physically impacted by the mass shootings, they may have lost a loved one which will take a toll on them mentally and emotionally for the rest of their lives.

The universal definition of the term mass shooting is when four or more people are injured or killed in a single event at the same time and location. According to The Guardian, there have been 1,516 mass shootings in the past 1,735 days before October 1, 2017, the date of the mass shooting that took place at the Mandalay Bay Hotel in Las Vegas. A total of 1,719 people have died as a result of these mass shootings, while an additional 6,510 were injured. The gun at the forefront of these mass shootings was the semi-automatic rifle, which has the ability to shoot a round, and automatically reload with another round that is fired with an additional pull of the trigger. Despite the National Rifle Association's attempts to defend such a weapon as a gun mostly used for hunting purposes, there is no need for this hazardous assault weapon in order to successfully hunt.

In addition, devices known as bump stocks are used to simulate the speed of fire similar to that of an automatic weapon for a semi-automatic weapon. An automatic weapon has the ability to fire multiple rounds of ammunition by only pulling the trigger of a gun once, and are more commonly known as machine guns. The American people have been prohibited from the use of these weapons with the passing of the National Firearms Act in 1934. However, bump stocks have not been banned, and the result of this have been conflicts such as the mass shooting in Las Vegas where the gunman successfully attached these devices to 23 of his semi-automatic rifles, and used them to kill 58 people, which resulted in the most devastating shooting in U.S. history.

The solution to this mass shooting epidemic is clear. Congress must use rationality and act as a bipartisan group to pass a bill which regulates the use of semi-automatic weapons and bump stocks which have both been used with frequency in a multitude of mass shootings across the United States. American citizens have the right to bear arms, but not with weapons that have no purpose in hunting, target practice, or even self-defense.

ELIZABETH TOENSING, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

On a summer Saturday morning, I was driving into Burlington. At a stop light, I looked over at a church to my right. A man, in his early twenties was sitting on the steps. He was shivering ferociously, yelling at God, and begging for help. His tremors

were not from cold. He was shaking from withdrawal. Beads of sweat trickled down his forehead and soaked his shirt. His body was unable to handle the side effects of withdrawal. He was a heroin addict. This homeless man with torn clothing, could not access a treatment center. His last-ditch effort was to sit on the steps of a church and pray, scream, for a miracle.

A miracle is "a highly improbable or extraordinary event, development, or accomplishment that brings very welcome consequences." Miracles are meant for things we cannot control, not things we can control like making help available for drug addicts.

By funding public drug rehabilitation centers, we can help drug addicts to recover from their addictions. No addicts can do it alone and adequate support is the only way to help with these problems.

An analysis from Blue Cross Blue Shield found that from 2010 to 2016, the number of people diagnosed with an addiction to opioids climbed 493 percent. Yet, at the same time, there was only a 65 percent increase in the number of people getting medication-assisted treatment to manage their addiction.

Why do we allow the drug abuse problem to skyrocket well beyond treatment resources? Perhaps it is because drug treatment centers come at a cost. They can range from \$20,000–\$60,000 for a 30–90 day inpatient stay. No wonder 77.7 percent of addicts cannot afford it. But for society, the costs go well beyond treatment.

The opioid crisis in America is increasing by the day and with it comes increased deaths and suffering. Some suggest creating injection sites to supervise heroin users to help with the growing death toll. But this is a short term fix. Rehab is a long-term fix and gives opioid abusers a chance to reclaim normal lives.

Making rehabilitation centers more accessible to financially strapped addicts will help the opioid epidemic. Reducing or eliminating the financial blockades to treatment that exist for nearly 80 percent of addicts will answer the prayers of an increasing number of victims of this plague. Affordable rehabilitation centers will eliminate the need for miracles.

ELLA WHITMAN, CHAMPLAIN VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL, JUNIOR

When my high school principal told us that there were only three rules we had to follow I was shocked. How can you sum up every expectation that must be demanded of a young adult into three things? He went on to inform us that we must take care of ourselves, take care of each other, and the place. While thinking about these three guidelines it became apparent that achieving them can be challenging at times but the step to do it is simple; you must respect all things. Looking at our Nation today it is clear that lack of respect creates the most conflict in our Nation. Our negligence to respect each other's bodies, opinions, ethnicities, races, backgrounds and beliefs leads us to discrimination, hatred and prejudice. We see endless examples in our lives today.

The lack of respect for one another's opinion is vividly apparent in politics today. The Pew Research Center recently reported how the partisan divide on our Nation's politics is increasing. A study concluded, "The shares of Republicans and Democrats who express very unfavorable opinions of the opposing party have increased dramatically since the 1990's, but have changed little in recent years." This is alarming because if we as people cannot see others perspective, we will not be able to collaborate or work with one another to collectively strengthen our Nation. By respecting others' opinions we can gain insight and also learn their specific needs.

Not only is respect lacking towards each other's opinions, but to others wellbeing as we have recently seen millions of women come forward with stories of sexual abuse. Not only in our Nation's history but in present day, women are treated as objects. Just within the last twenty four hours, additional notable people have come forward with their previous stories of harassment such as Reese Witherspoon, Jennifer Lawrence and Molly Ringwald, not to mention the 12 million others who have also shared their own stories on Facebook.

Looking back, maybe our principal had a point. To function not only as a school, but as a community or even a nation we must have respect. To advance our Nation from its biggest struggles and alleviate the consequences that come with it, each person must learn how to see out of another's eyes. Each person must treat one another with dignity. Respect is important to our country because it allows us to adjoin together as one. Our Nation was created upon respect and embracing one another for their differences. Each person's difference allows us to be the unique nation we are today. We must embrace and respect every opinion that each one of us has, every talent each one of us possesses and every person each one of us is.

NAME WITHHELD UPON REQUEST, BURLINGTON SCHOOL DISTRICT, SENIOR

The biggest issue we face in America today is that we neglect our incarcerated population. I'm part of the juvenile incarcerated population, and as a resident I don't feel like I'm getting the appropriate treatment I need. I was already here once and the skills I learned were not enough to keep me from coming back.

Incarcerated people need to be given the opportunity and resources to identify what gets them in trouble and to work on their problems. If a person has a history of violent behaviors and is incarcerated because of his behaviors, he shouldn't be doing groups on drugs and alcohol. Instead he should be focusing his time and attention on working to better his violent behaviors so he can be successful when he gets out.

Another issue is that there are many young people in the system who do not need to be. There are almost 7,000 youth behind bars for "technical violations" of their probation. Also, about 600 youth are behind bars for "status offense," which are behaviors that are not law violations for adults, such as running away, truancy, and incorrigibility.

There are another 840,000 people on parole and about 3.7 million people on probation. I would like to see better support for these people who come out of jail. If previously incarcerated people relapse for certain types of offenses like drug and alcohol offenses, breaking curfew, or violating probation, they should be given opportunities to fix that before it becomes a pattern, rather than being thrown back in jail.

I also think they should have more adult programs like juveniles have such as short or longterm programs away from their environment. A placement that juveniles go to after being released from a locked facility is called a step down. Laraway is an example of this, where a juvenile can go and be allowed back in the community. They are given the opportunity and supports to help them find a job and enroll back in school.

I hope that policymakers and the public carefully consider better treatment within locked facilities and alternatives to incarceration for people who are not a threat to public safety. We should ask whether legitimate social goals are served by maintaining the status quo.●

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

H.R. 4708. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to issue Department of Homeland Security-wide guidance and develop training programs as part of the Department of Homeland Security Blue Campaign, and for other purposes.

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

At 10:43 a.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. 2504. An act to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms.

H.R. 2646. An act to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2888. An act to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4547. An act to amend titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the representative payment program.

The message also announced that pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1024(a), and the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Speaker appoints the following Member on the part of the House of Representatives to the Joint Economic Committee: Mrs. HANDEL of Georgia.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:59 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 534. An act to prevent the sexual abuse of minors and amateur athletes by requiring the prompt reporting of sexual abuse to law enforcement authorities, 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. 2504. An act to ensure fair treatment in licensing requirements for the export of certain echinoderms; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 2646. An act to reauthorize the United States-Jordan Defense Cooperation Act of 2015, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2888. An act to establish the Ste. Genevieve National Historic Site in the State of Missouri, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4547. An act to amend titles II, VIII, and XVI of the Social Security Act to improve and strengthen the representative payment program; to the Committee on Finance.

## MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1551. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the credit for production from advanced nuclear power facilities.

H.R. 2372. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the rules relating to veteran health insurance and eligibility for the premium tax credit.

H.R. 2579. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the premium tax credit with respect to unsubsidized COBRA continuation coverage.

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

H.R. 1809. An act to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3445. An act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, 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-4237. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Isoxaben; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9972-75) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 1, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4238. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fomesafen; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9972-66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 1, 2018; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4239. A communication from the First Vice President and Vice Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bank's 2017 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4240. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13441 with respect to Lebanon; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4241. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4242. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's Strategic Plan for fiscal years 2018 - 2022; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4243. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Montana Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Maintenance Plan for Missoula" (FRL No. 9973-17-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 1, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4244. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Definitions of 'Waters of the United States'—Addition of an Applicability Date to 2015 Clean Water Rule" (FRL No. 9974-20-OW) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 1, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4245. 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 Plan Revisions; Regional Haze and Interstate Visibility Transport Federal Implementation Plan Revisions; Withdrawal of Federal Implementation Plan for NOx for Electric Generating Units in Arkansas" (FRL No. 9973-61-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 1, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4246. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Additions to List of Section 241.4 Categorical Non-Waste Fuels: Other Treated Railroad Ties" (FRL No. 9969-80-OLEM) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 1, 2018; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4247. 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 "Guidance on Withholding Rules" (Notice 2018-14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 2, 2018; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4248. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision to Children's Gasoline Burn Prevention Act Regulation" (16 CFR Part 1460) (Docket No. CPSC-2015-0006) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2018; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4249. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to extending and amending the Agreement Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Mali Concerning the Imposition of Import Restrictions on Categories of Archaeological and Ethnological Material of the Republic of Mali; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4250. A communication from the Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, transmitting, a report relative to international trade; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4251. A communication from the Secretary General of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, transmitting, a report relative to international trade; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4252. A communication from the Acting Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau's fiscal year 2016 Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act submission of its commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4253. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Freedom of Information Act Implementation" (RIN2590-AA86) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 2, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4254. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States" for the September 2017 session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-4255. A communication from the Secretary of the Board of Governors, U.S. Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4256. 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 "Removal of Certain Time of Inspection and Duties of Inspector Regulations for Biological Products" ((RIN0910-AH49) (Docket No. FDA-2017-N-7007)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4257. 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; Calcium Carbonate; Confirmation of Effective Date" ((21 CFR Part 73) (Docket No. FDA-2016-C-2767)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on February 5, 2018; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4258. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Community Relations Service for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2377. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 200 West 2nd Street in Dayton, Ohio, as the "Walter H. Rice Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 2378. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an exclusion from gross income for interest on certain small business loans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 2379. A bill to improve and expand authorities, programs, services, and benefits for military spouses and military families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:

S. 2380. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GARDNER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2381. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Transportation to require that broadband conduits be installed as a part of certain highway construction projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 2382. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for requirements relating to the reassignment of Department of Veterans Affairs senior executive employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2383. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve law enforcement access to data stored across borders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2384. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to make funding available to 1890 institutions without fiscal year limitation; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 2385. A bill to establish best practices for State, tribal, and local governments participating in the Integrated Public Alert and Warning System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 2386. A bill to provide additional protections for our veterans; 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 Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. THUNE):

S. Res. 392. A resolution commemorating the success of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams in the past 23 Olympic Winter Games and 11 Paralympic Winter Games and supporting the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams in the 2018 Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Winter Games; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. Res. 393. A resolution making minority appointments for the 115th Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN,

Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 394. A resolution recognizing January 2018 as National Mentoring Month; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 351

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 351, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for comprehensive student achievement information.

S. 545

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 545, a bill to preserve and protect the free choice of individual employees to form, join, or assist labor organizations, or to refrain from such activities.

S. 698

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 698, a bill to establish a national program to identify and reduce losses from landslide hazards, to establish a national 3D Elevation Program, and for other purposes.

S. 732

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 732, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 813

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 813, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to make it unlawful for a packer to own, feed, or control livestock intended for slaughter.

S. 951

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 951, a bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents, and for other purposes.

S. 974

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 974, a bill to promote competition in the market for drugs and biological products by facilitating the timely entry of lower-cost generic and biosimilar versions of those drugs and biological products.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S.

1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1353

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) 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. 1746

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1746, a bill to require the Congressional Budget Office to make publicly available the fiscal and mathematical models, data, and other details of computations used in cost analysis and scoring.

S. 1899

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1899, a bill to reauthorize and extend funding for community health centers and the National Health Service Corps.

S. 1917

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1917, a bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2076, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the expansion of activities related to Alzheimer's disease, cognitive decline, and brain health under the Alzheimer's Disease and Healthy Aging Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2101

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2101, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the crew of the USS *Indianapolis*, in recognition of their perseverance, bravery, and service to the United States.

S. 2138

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2138, a bill to authorize the creation of a commission to develop voluntary accessibility guidelines for electronic instructional materials and related technologies used in postsecondary education, and for other purposes.

S. 2156

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2156, a bill to amend title XVIII of the

Social Security Act to provide fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 2173

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2173, a bill to amend subpart 2 of part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to extend State court funding for child welfare, and for other purposes.

S. 2194

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2194, a bill to remove a limitation on a prohibition relating to permits for discharges incidental to normal operation of vessels.

S. 2235

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to establish a tiered hiring preference for members of the reserve components of the Armed Forces.

S. 2244

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2244, a bill to create opportunities for women in the aviation industry.

S. 2296

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2296, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 2304

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2304, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to protect veterans from predatory lending, and for other purposes.

S. 2310

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2310, a bill to require the United States Trade Representative to permit the public to submit comments on trade agreement negotiations through the Internet.

S. 2324

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2324, a bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 to change certain requirements relating to the capital structure of business development companies, to direct the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise certain rules relating to business development companies, and for other purposes.

S. 2340

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2340, a bill to establish

the Federal Labor-Management Partnership Council.

S. 2345

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2345, a bill to amend the DNA Analysis Backlog Elimination Act of 2000 to provide additional resources to State and local prosecutors, and for other purposes.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2372, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 168

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 168, a resolution supporting respect for human rights and encouraging inclusive governance in Ethiopia.

S. RES. 361

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 361, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Government shall, both unilaterally and alongside the international community, consider all options for exerting maximum pressure on the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK), in order to denuclearize the DPRK, protect the lives of United States citizens and allies, and prevent further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BROWN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2384. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to make funding available to 1890 institutions without fiscal year limitation; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Carryover Equity Act of 2018 to eliminate the 20 percent carryover limitation which is an impediment to flexibility and effective financial planning of the 1890s Extension Program. The 1890s Extension Program is administered by the USDA's National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) and is a capacity funding program supporting extension activities at 1890 Land-Grant Universities. Its intent is to increase and strengthen agricultural sciences at the 1890s through the effective integration of education, research and extension programs.

My State is the home of the University of Maryland Eastern Shore (UMES), Maryland's only 1890 Land-Grant University and one of the State's four Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs). UMES, along with the University of Maryland College Park, form the University of Maryland Extension—a statewide educational organization funded by Federal, State, and local governments that brings research-based knowledge directly to communities throughout the “Old Line” State. The mission of University of Maryland Extension is to educate citizens to apply practical, research-based knowledge to critical issues facing individuals, families, communities, the State of Maryland, and its global partners.

In Maryland, the 1890 Extension Program is headquartered at UMES in Princess Anne, MD and extension programming at the University focuses on 4-H STEM; nutrition and health; seafood technology; small farm outreach; and small ruminant research. The UMES program is targeted to diverse audiences on the agriculturally important Eastern Shore with special emphasis on those with limited resources to help them improve their quality of life and to successfully pursue a career in agriculture.

Mr. President, current law limits the funding amount an 1890 institution may carry over in any fiscal year to 20 percent of the 1890s Extension Program funding received. This prohibition creates significant impediments for 1890 institutions to carry out their mission to deliver programs to customers and clientele and restricts the ability of 1890 institutions to efficiently and effectively manage their funding. No other USDA/NIFA capacity program has a similar 20 percent carryover limitation. By eliminating this 20 percent limitation, via the Carryover Equity Act, the 1890s Extension Program will have the same funding flexibility found in the other major capacity programs administered by NIFA. This bill has the strong support of 1890 institution Presidents as well as the Association of Public & Land-Grant Universities.

I am pleased to be joined in introducing this bill by Senators PERDUE, BROWN, TILLIS, CARDIN, COONS, GRAHAM, MANCHIN and KAINE who, like me, recognize the value 1890 land grant institutions bring to the rural communities of our States and the research and technical support these institutions provide to our socially disadvantaged, and veteran farmer, and rancher constituents with limited resources. I look forward to working together with Senate and House colleagues to see that this important legislation is included in the next Farm Bill.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mrs. ERNST):

S. 2386. A bill to provide additional protections for our veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to raise a very important

issue that is impacting our veterans population. That issue is the systematic denial of these veterans' Second Amendment rights. This comes up in discussions with Iowa veterans, and I have candidly discussed this issue before on the Senate floor.

Today, I am introducing bipartisan legislation, cosponsored by Senator MANCHIN, called the Veterans' Second Amendment Rights Restoration Act of 2018. This bill is being introduced to solve the problem of denying these rights to veterans.

The legislation is about the fidelity of the Constitution and about the fidelity of the Bill of Rights. It is also about due process and fairness for veterans. What this is not about, I want to make clear, is allowing anyone to purchase a firearm who is prohibited to do so under current law or regulations. I want it to be very clear right off the bat so that no one misinterprets this as some effort to let people own firearms who would normally be prohibited.

This legislation is needed because a very disturbing trend has occurred in the past decade. The Veterans Health Administration has been reporting veterans to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System—the national gun ban list—just because these veterans have been determined by the VA to be veterans who require a fiduciary to administer benefit payments. This is a pretty simple proposition that denies veterans their Second Amendment rights. It is that simple, as I just said. A fiduciary's administering benefit payments to a veteran could and does lead to that veteran's being denied Second Amendment rights. Once on the gun list, a veteran is outlawed from owning or possessing firearms.

It is crucial to note that the regulations that the Veterans Health Administration is relying on are from way back in the 1970s. It predates even the National Instant Criminal Background Check System and is long before the Supreme Court held the Second Amendment to be a fundamental, constitutional right. These regulations grant limited authority to determine incompetence only in the context of financial matters.

The regulation reads like this: “Rating agencies have sole authority to make official determinations of competency or incompetency for purposes of: insurance and . . . disbursement of benefits.”

There is nothing wrong with that language, but it is that language that leads to the problems that veterans have with their Second Amendment rights. From this language, it is clear that the core regulatory authority applies to matters of competency for financial purposes. It has nothing to do with regulating who can purchase firearms, but that is exactly what is happening. Veterans are losing their Second Amendment rights because they have people managing their checkbooks. It is that simple. If you cannot handle your finances, you lose your Second Amendment rights.

Everybody wants to know how this is happening. Federal law requires that before a person is reported to a gun ban list, he be determined to be a “mental defective.” The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives created a regulation to define what “mental defective” means. It includes, among other requirements, that a person is a danger to self or others. The VA has taken the position that this Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives regulation can then be made to fit within its own preexisting regulatory structure for assigning a fiduciary, thus requiring that name be put on the gun ban list.

The intent and purpose between these two regulations is entirely different. On the one hand, the VA regulation is designed to appoint a fiduciary. On the other hand, the ATF regulation is designed to regulate firearms. That is a great big, huge distinction. The level of mental impairment that justifies taking away the right to possess and own firearms must rest at a severe and substantial level—a level at which the mere possession of a firearm would constitute a danger to self or others. That decision is never made by the VA before submitting names to this gun ban list. As such, imposing a gun ban is a harsh result that could sweep up veterans who are fully capable of appropriately operating a firearm.

It gets worse.

When veterans are then placed on that gun ban list, they must prove that they are not dangerous to the public in order to get their names removed from that list. That dangerousness standard is much higher than the mere assignment of a fiduciary. Thus, veterans are subjected to a more rigorous and more demanding evidentiary standard to get their names off the gun ban list than the Federal Government must prove to put their names on that list. We ought to all agree that is patently unfair. I also believe that it is unconstitutional. When dealing with a fundamental, constitutional right like the one protected by the Second Amendment, at the very minimum, the government ought to be held to the same standard as we the people.

We owe it to our veterans to fix this problem. As of December 31, 2016, the Veterans Health Administration reported 167,815 veterans to the gun ban list for having been assigned a fiduciary. That is 167,815 out of 171,083 or another way of saying it is 98 percent of all names reported.

It is important to note that since the VA reports names to the gun ban list merely when a fiduciary is assigned to that veteran, not one of those names has been reported because a veteran has been deemed to be a public danger. Accordingly, not all veterans reported to the gun ban list should be on it.

On May 18, 2016, I debated this very issue on the Senate floor with Senator DURBIN. He said, “I do not dispute what the Senator from Iowa suggested, that some of these veterans may be suf-

fering from a mental illness not serious enough to disqualify them from owning a firearm, but certainly many of them do.”

Then Senator DURBIN said, “Let me just concede at the outset that reporting 174,000 names goes too far, but eliminating 174,000 names goes too far.”

I am pleased that Senator DURBIN acknowledged that many of the names supplied by the VA on the gun ban list do not pose a danger and should be removed.

I thank his staff for working with my staff during this process.

The essential question then is, How do we go about fixing it the right way?

I believe my legislation does just that. This legislation adds a new step before the VA can report names to a gun ban list. The step requires that once a fiduciary is assigned, the VA must first find the veteran to be a danger to self or to the public before taking away his firearm. That is the same standard that the veteran must satisfy currently in order to get his name off the gun ban list.

My legislation also provides constitutional due process. Specifically, it shifts the burden of proof to the government to prove a veteran is dangerous before taking away firearms. Currently, the entire burden of proof is on the veteran to prove that he or she is not dangerous. When a constitutional right is involved, the burden must always be on the government.

My bill also creates an option for the veteran to seek legal redress via an administrative board or the Federal court system. The veteran is in control. It provides an avenue for every veteran already on that gun ban list to get his name removed. That last point is important to note.

My bill does not automatically remove every veteran from the list, which was a concern Senator DURBIN raised previously when we debated this issue. It does require the VA to provide notice to every veteran on the list of his right to go through the new process to have his name removed. Should a veteran choose to do that, the protections, the process, the procedure, and the standards set forth in my bill would then apply to him. Every veteran is free to apply for relief, and every veteran will be treated equally under my bill. Of course, that is the fair thing to do. That is the constitutionally sound way to manage this process.

The bill does provide authority for the government to seek an emergency order if it believes a veteran is a serious and imminent risk to self or to others. That was a suggestion by Senator DURBIN—to provide for a short-term safety mechanism when the situation is too urgent to wait for a judge to evaluate all of the facts.

The bill also retains a mechanism for the VA to systematically refer veterans to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System. This was

another of Senator DURBIN’s main concerns. A simpler bill passed the House of Representatives last year that is similar to the amendment I tried to offer and that Senator DURBIN objected to in the year 2016. It would, simply, stop the VA from referring veterans to the gun ban list without first finding them a danger to self and others. However, it did not set up any system to make that happen. The argument is that this puts veterans using the VA in the same boat as everybody else. Of course, I am sympathetic to that argument, but the legislation I am introducing today is a good faith effort to overcome objections that have prevented action on this important issue in the past.

My bill solves a problem that has existed for many years: denying veterans their Second Amendment rights. Veterans should not be subject to a harsher standard than what the government is subject to. Veterans deserve full due process protections when their constitutional rights are at stake. That is the core of this legislation.

The regulatory process at the back end to remove a veteran from the gun ban list is simply moved to the front end; that is, the Federal Government must first prove that a veteran is dangerous before taking away firearms. This is the same standard applied to nonveterans.

This fix will not change existing firearms laws. Felons are still prohibited from owning firearms. Persons with domestic violence convictions are still prohibited. Persons adjudicated as mentally defective are still prohibited. Persons involuntarily committed are still prohibited. If my bill were to become law, every Federal firearm prohibition would still exist.

Again, the core of my bill simply requires the Federal Government to prove that a veteran is dangerous before taking away his or her firearms. That is the same standard our veterans must live by currently in order to remove their name from the gun ban list and get their guns back.

If we, the people, have to live under that standard, then, so should our Federal Government.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 392—COMMEMORATING THE SUCCESS OF THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC TEAMS IN THE PAST 23 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES AND 11 PARALYMPIC WINTER GAMES AND SUPPORTING THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC AND PARALYMPIC TEAMS IN THE 2018 OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES AND PARALYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. THUNE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 392

Whereas, for more than 100 years, the Olympic and Paralympic movements have built a more peaceful and better world by—

(1) educating young people through amateur athletics;

(2) bringing together athletes from many countries in friendly competition; and

(3) forging new relationships among athletes bound by friendship, solidarity, and fair play;

Whereas the 2018 Olympic Winter Games will take place in PyeongChang, South Korea, from February 9 to February 25, 2018;

Whereas the 2018 Paralympic Winter Games will take place in PyeongChang, South Korea, from March 9 to March 18, 2018;

Whereas at the 2018 Olympic Winter Games, 90 nations will compete in 7 sports, and the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams (referred to in this preamble as “Team USA”) will compete in all 7 sports;

Whereas at the 2018 Paralympic Winter Games, approximately 45 nations will compete in 5 sports, and Team USA will compete in all 5 sports;

Whereas Team USA has won 96 gold medals, 102 silver medals, and 84 bronze medals, totaling 282 medals, during the past 23 Olympic Winter Games;

Whereas Team USA has won 98 gold medals, 104 silver medals, and 77 bronze medals, totaling 279 medals, during the past 11 Paralympic Winter Games;

Whereas the people of the United States stand united in respect and admiration for the members of Team USA and the athletic accomplishments, sportsmanship, and dedication to excellence of Team USA;

Whereas the many accomplishments of Team USA would not have been possible without the hard work and dedication of many individuals, including—

(1) individuals on the United States Olympic Committee; and

(2) the many administrators, coaches, and family members who provide critical support to the athletes of Team USA;

Whereas the United States takes great pride in the athletes of Team USA exhibiting a commitment to excellence, grace under pressure, and good will toward other competitors; and

Whereas the Olympic and Paralympic Movements celebrate competition, fair play, and the pursuit of dreams: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) applauds the athletes and coaches of the United States Olympic and Paralympic Teams (referred to in this resolving clause as “Team USA”) and the families who support them;

(2) supports the athletes of Team USA in competing at the 2018 Olympic Winter Games and Paralympic Winter Games in PyeongChang, South Korea; and

(3) supports the goals and ideals of the Olympic Games and the Paralympic Games.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 393—MAKING MINORITY APPOINTMENTS FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

Mr. SCHUMER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 393

*Resolved*, That the following be the minority membership on the following committees for the remainder of the 115th Congress, or until their successors are appointed:

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Menendez, Mr. Cardin, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Coons, Mr. Udall, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Markey, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Booker.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP: Mr. Cardin, Ms. Cantwell, Mrs. Shaheen, Ms. Heitkamp, Mr. Markey, Mr. Booker, Mr. Coons, Ms. Hirono, Ms. Duckworth.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 394—RECOGNIZING JANUARY 2018 AS NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 394

Whereas the goals of National Mentoring Month are—

(1) to raise awareness of mentoring;

(2) to recruit individuals to mentor;

(3) to celebrate the powerful impact of caring adults who volunteer time for the benefit of young people; and

(4) to encourage organizations to engage and integrate quality in mentoring into the efforts of the organizations;

Whereas young people across the United States make everyday choices that lead to the big decisions in life without the guidance and support on which many other people rely;

Whereas a mentor is a caring, consistent presence who devotes time to a young person to help that young person—

(1) discover personal strength; and

(2) achieve the potential of that young person through a structured and trusting relationship;

Whereas quality mentoring—

(1) encourages positive choices;

(2) promotes self-esteem;

(3) supports academic achievement; and

(4) introduces young people to new ideas;

Whereas mentoring programs have shown to be effective in helping young people make positive choices;

Whereas young people who meet regularly with mentors are 46 percent less likely than peers to start using illegal drugs;

Whereas research shows that young people who were at risk for not completing high school but who had a mentor were, as compared with similarly situated young people without a mentor—

(1) 55 percent more likely to be enrolled in college;

(2) 81 percent more likely to report participating regularly in sports or extracurricular activities;

(3) more than twice as likely to say they held a leadership position in a club or sports team; and

(4) 78 percent more likely to pay it forward by volunteering regularly in the communities of young people;

Whereas 90 percent of young people who were at risk for not completing high school but who had a mentor said they are now interested in becoming mentors themselves;

Whereas mentoring can play a role in helping young people attend school regularly, as research shows that students who meet regularly with a mentor are, as compared with the peers of those students—

(1) 52 percent less likely to skip a full day of school; and

(2) 37 percent less likely to skip a class;

Whereas youth development experts agree that mentoring—

(1) encourages positive youth development and smart daily behaviors such as finishing homework and having healthy social interactions; and

(2) has a positive impact on the growth and success of a young person;

Whereas mentors help young people set career goals and use the personal contacts of the mentors to help young people meet industry professionals and train for and find jobs;

Whereas each of the benefits of mentors described in this preamble serve to link youth to economic and social opportunity while also strengthening communities in the United States; and

Whereas, despite those described benefits, 9,000,000 young people in the United States feel isolated from meaningful connections with adults outside the home, constituting a “mentoring gap” that demonstrates a need for collaboration and resources: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes January 2018 as National Mentoring Month;

(2) recognizes the caring adults who—

(A) serve as staff and volunteers at quality mentoring programs; and

(B) help the young people of the United States find inner strength and reach their full potential;

(3) acknowledges that mentoring is beneficial because mentoring supports educational achievement and self-confidence, reduces juvenile delinquency, improves life outcomes, and strengthens communities;

(4) promotes the establishment and expansion of quality mentoring programs across the United States to equip young people with the tools needed to lead healthy and productive lives; and

(5) supports initiatives to close the “mentoring gap” that exists for the many young people in the United States who do not have meaningful connections with adults outside the home.

#### AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1922. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 695, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes.

SA 1923. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1922 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 695, supra.

SA 1924. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1923 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 1922 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the bill H.R. 695, supra.

SA 1925. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 695, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1922. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 695, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; as follows:

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

**SA 1923.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1922 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 695, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

**SA 1924.** Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 1923 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the bill H.R. 695, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike “2” and insert “3”

**SA 1925.** Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 695, to amend the National Child Protection Act of 1993 to establish a voluntary national criminal history background check system and criminal history review program for certain individuals who, related to their employment, have access to children, the elderly, or individuals with disabilities, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**TITLE —NO BUDGET, NO PAY**

**SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “No Budget, No Pay Act”.

**SEC. 02. DEFINITION.**

In this title, the term “Member of Congress”—

(1) has the meaning given the term under section 2106 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) does not include the Vice President.

**SEC. 03. TIMELY APPROVAL OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.**

If both Houses of Congress have not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget as described under section 301 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632) for a fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year and have not passed all the regular appropriations bills for the next fiscal year before October 1 of that fiscal year, the pay of each Member of Congress may not be paid for each day following that October 1 until the date on which both Houses of Congress approve a concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year and all the regular appropriations bills.

**SEC. 04. NO PAY WITHOUT CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET AND THE APPROPRIATIONS BILLS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds may be ap-

propriated or otherwise made available from the United States Treasury for the pay of any Member of Congress during any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section

05.

(b) NO RETROACTIVE PAY.—A Member of Congress may not receive pay for any period determined by the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section

05, at any time after the end of that period.

**SEC. 05. DETERMINATIONS.**

(a) SENATE.—

(1) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Secretary of the Senate shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall—

(A) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with section 03 and whether Senators may not be paid under that section;

(B) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Senators may not be paid under section 03; and

(C) provide timely certification of the determinations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) upon the request of the Secretary of the Senate.

(b) HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATIONS.—On October 1 of each year, the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives shall submit a request to the Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives for certification of determinations made under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (2).

(2) DETERMINATIONS.—The Chairpersons of the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives shall—

(A) on October 1 of each year, make a determination of whether Congress is in compliance with section 03 and whether Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under that section;

(B) determine the period of days following each October 1 that Members of the House of Representatives may not be paid under section 03; and

(C) provide timely certification of the determinations under subparagraphs (A) and (B) upon the request of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 06. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

This title shall take effect on February 1, 2019.

**AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Sen-

ate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

**COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Virtual Currencies: The Oversight Role of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and the U.S. Commodity and Futures Trading Commission.”

**COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES**

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on bills S. 2182, Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act and S. 2325, Northern Mariana Island and U.S. Workforce Act.

**COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS**

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Administration’s South Asia Strategy on Afghanistan.”

**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 on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Access and Innovation.”

**COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY**

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Beneficial Ownership: Fighting Illicit International Financial Networks Through Transparency.”

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE**

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

**COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION**

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “One Year Later: The American Innovation and Competitiveness Act.”

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PROTECTION, PRODUCT SAFETY, INSURANCE, AND DATA SECURITY**

The Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the



session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Data Security and Bug Bounty Programs: Lessons Learned from the Uber Breach and Security Researchers.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIMARY HEALTH AND RETIREMENT SECURITY

The Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Exploring the ‘Gig Economy’ and the Future of Retirement Savings.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL SPENDING OVERSIGHT AND EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT

The Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, February 6, 2018, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Terrible, No Good, Very Bad Ways of Funding Government: Exploring the Cost to Taxpayers of Spending Uncertainty Cause by Governing through Continuing Resolutions, Giant Omnibus Spending Bills, and Shutdown Crises.”

MAKING MINORITY PARTY APPOINTMENTS FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 393, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 393) making minority party appointments for the 115th Congress.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 393) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

NATIONAL MENTORING MONTH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 394, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 394) recognizing January 2018 as National Mentoring Month.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 394) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2018

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, February 7; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the House message to accompany H.R. 695.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:55 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 7, 2018, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate on February 5, 2018:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN E. WHITLEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE ROBERT M. SPEER.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SETH DANIEL APPLETON, OF MISSOURI, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE KATHERINE M. O’REGAN.

METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY

ALAN E. COBB, OF KANSAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON AIRPORTS AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING NOVEMBER 22, 2023, VICE WILLIAM SHAW MCDERMOTT, TERM EXPIRED.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

JOSEPH RYAN GRUTERS, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE ALBERT DICLEMENTE, TERM EXPIRED.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

JOHN L. RYDER, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2021, VICE MICHAEL MCWHERTER, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KIRSTEN DAWN MADISON, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (INTERNATIONAL NAR-

COTICS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AFFAIRS), VICE WILLIAM R. BROWNFIELD, RETIRED.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

ELIOT PEDROSA, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, VICE JAN E. BOYER, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

CHARLES E. COOK III, OF MARYLAND, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, VICE CHARLES H. FULGHUM.

THE JUDICIARY

KELLY HIGASHI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE THOMAS J. MOTLEY, RETIRED.

SHANA FROST MATINI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE ZOE BUSH, RETIRED.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

WILLIAM R. EVANINA, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY CENTER. (NEW POSITION)

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

PATRICK HOVAKIMIAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 30, 2020, VICE ANUJ CHANG DESAI, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS 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. JOHN J. DEGOES  
BRIG. GEN. ROBERT I. MILLER  
BRIG. GEN. LEE E. PAYNE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS 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. VINCENT K. BECKLUND  
BRIG. GEN. CHARLES S. CORCORAN  
BRIG. GEN. BARRY R. CORNISH  
BRIG. GEN. CHRISTOPHER E. CRAIG  
BRIG. GEN. ANDREW A. CROFT  
BRIG. GEN. ALLAN E. DAY  
BRIG. GEN. ERIC T. PICK  
BRIG. GEN. CHAD P. FRANKS  
BRIG. GEN. JOHN R. GORDY II  
BRIG. GEN. GREGORY M. GUILLOT  
BRIG. GEN. STACEY T. HAWKINS  
BRIG. GEN. CAMERON G. HOLT  
BRIG. GEN. KEVIN A. HUYCK  
BRIG. GEN. DAVID J. JULAZADEH  
BRIG. GEN. KEVIN B. KENNEDY  
BRIG. GEN. KYLE J. KREMER  
BRIG. GEN. PETER J. LAMBERT  
BRIG. GEN. WILLIAM J. LIQUORI, JR.  
BRIG. GEN. RANDALL REED  
BRIG. GEN. LENNY J. RICHOUX  
BRIG. GEN. CARL E. SCHAEFER  
BRIG. GEN. JOHN E. SHAW  
BRIG. GEN. BRAD M. SULLIVAN  
BRIG. GEN. STEPHEN C. WILLIAMS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JEFFREY P. KRAMER

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) GORDON D. PETERS

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. BRIAN B. BROWN

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. RICHARD P. SNYDER

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major general*

BRIG. GEN. JAMES W. BIERMAN, JR.  
BRIG. GEN. NORMAN L. COOLING  
BRIG. GEN. DAVID J. FURNESS  
BRIG. GEN. JOHN M. JANSEN  
BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL E. LANGLEY  
BRIG. GEN. DAVID A. OTTIGNON  
BRIG. GEN. THOMAS D. WEIDLEY

## IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE AND AS PERMANENT PROFESSOR AT THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 9333(B) AND 9396(A):

*To be colonel*

DAVID J. CASWELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be colonel*

BRUCE P. HESELTINE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

MICHAEL T. CAIN

*To be major*

ILDA Y. ISAZA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADES INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

KERRY L. HIRZEL

*To be major*

JASON R. BARKER  
JOSHUA S. TRICE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be major*

MIGUEL J. MORALES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

*To be major*

JULIE A. BOWMAN  
SEAN M. SUNDEY  
LARRIN S. WAMPLER

## IN THE ARMY

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 major*

RACHEL L. ADAIR  
BRIAN A. ALBERTS  
MICHAEL W. ALBERTSON  
ANDRE A. ALEXANDER  
MARK A. ALFERS  
GREGORY W. ALLEN  
SAIDAT ALLHASSAN  
MICHAEL D. ANDERSEN  
ALLISON M. ANDERSON  
CHRISTOPHER J. ANDERSON  
LEONARD L. ANDREWS, JR.  
JULLIANNE P. AFODACA  
CHARLIE ARELLANO  
BASIRU ASIGIRI  
CHINYERE ASOBI  
BRANDON L. AUSTIN  
JACOB E. AUSTIN  
VINCENT P. AUSTIN  
LAWRENCE B. AVILA  
NIVIA AYALA  
JACQUELINE M. AYALAVALE  
JACOB A. BAGWELL  
CORY G. BAKER  
MASTIE A. BAKER  
RONALD C. BAKER  
R. Q. BANIS  
ERWIN O. BARRERA  
SARAH A. BARRON  
LAURA K. BEACH  
MICHAEL D. BEAGLE  
JUSTIN R. BECKER  
THOMAS C. BEECROFT  
MORGAN L. BELAK  
MARK A. BELLE  
QUENTIN F. BENJAMIN  
TRAVIS M. BETTINGER  
THOMAS A. BEUSCHEL, JR.  
NATHELYN S. BLAKE  
THOMAS H. BLOOMER  
THOMAS J. BOEHM  
MATTHEW D. BOERSEMA  
GERALD P. BOLDEN, JR.  
ADAM M. BOLLIGER  
EDWARD W. BONCEK  
JUSTIN T. BOND  
LAKIA S. BOOKER

JOSEPH T. BOOS  
JOHN R. BORMAN  
RYAN D. BOWEN  
SEAN J. BOWEN  
JOSEPH M. BOWER  
MARIO J. BOWERS  
BRIAN J. BOYD  
CORNELIA BOYD  
BRANDON N. BRADFORD  
RYAN J. BREAUX  
VIVIA M. BROWNCORMIER  
JENNETTE D. BROWN  
JONATHAN E. BROWN  
MELISSA J. BROWN  
ROLONA D. BROWN  
CHRISTOPHER E. BRUNNER  
TOMMIE C. BRYANT  
VINH Q. BUI  
JAMES R. BURDS  
SHARJUAN P. BURGOS  
PETER K. BURKHART  
DONYELLE V. BURNEY  
JACKQUELINE Y. BURNS  
RONNIE L. BUSH  
RICHARD S. BUTTON II  
PABLO CABANILLAS III  
ETHAN B. CALDWELL  
JANICE M. CAMARILLO  
SAMUEL D. CAMPBELL  
CLAYTON J. CANNON, JR.  
ANGEL L. CARABALLO, JR.  
JERRIE CARDENAS  
GRANT L. CARTER  
THOMAS CARTER, JR.  
WILLIAM R. CASTILLA  
CHARLES A. CASTILLO  
PHILIP L. CERAMI  
JAMES L. CHANEY  
DAVID E. CHAPMAN  
KURT A. CHAPMAN  
ALAN R. CHARTIER  
ALEXANDER CHIANG  
NICHOLAS W. CIMLER  
BENJAMIN L. CLAPP  
JENNIFER A. CLARKE  
SAMUEL P. CLARKE  
MARIO D. CLAYTOR  
LOUELLA CLEVELAND  
TAMARROW CLIMES  
JOHN M. CLOSI  
CHRISTINE R. COGGIANO  
ERIC C. COLLIER  
DEVON C. COLLINS  
MARK E. COLLINS  
NATHAN P. COLLINS  
EDUARDO COLON  
ALDEBERT A. CONCEPCION  
RAMON L. CORTESNEGRON  
ALEXANDRA T. GROMIE  
GARY A. CROSTON  
JOY D. CROWDER  
ADENIRAN O. DAIRO  
SCOTT R. DANIELS  
RENATO DAPAT  
JAMES D. DARDEN  
KENNETH C. DAVIS, JR.  
MICHAEL T. DAVIS  
SARAH N. DAVIS  
BRIDGET L. DAY  
JASON M. DAY  
WILLIAM J. DAY  
DEXTER J. DEAN  
EARL C. DEAN, JR.  
WILLIAM E. DEAN  
RACHEL L. DEATON  
SHANNON M. DELAHOY  
RYLIE J. DELONG  
LILLIANE DELVA  
JASON W. DENCE  
JONATHAN M. DENTON  
CRAIG A. DEVITO  
MURIEL A. DIAZ  
RION A. DILLARD  
JEREMY R. DIXON  
NICHOLAS G. DOMS  
RYAN T. DONALDSON  
LEUTH DOUANGPRACHANH  
KEITH A. DOUGLAS  
STEPHEN R. DRAHEIM  
AARON J. DRAPER  
CHARLES D. DUNLEVY  
RICHARD D. DWYER  
JOHN P. DZWONCZYK  
WAI W. ELLISON  
MATTHEW J. EVON  
DANIEL P. FERENCZY  
BRIAN G. FERUSON  
CHRISTOPHER L. FIELDS  
JEROME A. FIGGS  
THEODORE J. FLESTADO  
JAMES A. FOLWELL  
JANELLE M. FORDE  
AMANDA L. FOSTER  
CHRISTOPHER P. FOWLER  
WILLIAM L. FRIEDLINE  
SUSAN D. FUCHS  
RYAN J. FUESTING  
WILLIAM C. FURNISS  
JOSEPH W. FYFE  
TOMMY GAITHER III  
SABRINA L. GAMMAGE  
TERRILL GANT  
MIRACLE GARCIA  
CHERELLE F. GARNER  
JERRY J. GARNER  
ANDREW G. GEBERT  
HILARY GENEVISH

ANTHONY D. GEORGE  
TONJESIA N. GILCHRIST  
STANLEY J. GILLEN, JR.  
ROSHONDA F. GILMORE  
BRIAN M. GIROUX  
LANAKIA S. GLOVER  
WILLIAM G. GOETZ  
RAMON L. GOMEZDAVILA  
WESTON B. GOODRICH  
BRIAN L. GRADY, JR.  
ERIC A. GRAVES  
MICHELE GREENE  
SHANE P. GREGORY  
WILSON L. GRIFFIN  
GEOFFREY R. GUINNUP  
EDWARD R. HALINSKI III  
LATOYA C. HALL  
LUKE J. HALLSTEN  
DAVID G. HAMILTON  
WAYNE D. HANCOCK  
DAVID J. HANNA  
MICHAEL F. HANNA  
BENJAMIN F. HARDY  
ALEXYS M. HARE  
RICHELLE A. HARE  
JONATHAN D. HARMELING  
BRANDON D. HARRIS  
JOHN A. HARRISON  
DANIEL P. HARTLESS  
CARL P. HARTMAN  
KRISTAN J. HAVARD  
SHAYNE D. HEAP  
JAMES C. HEIGHT  
BRENT M. HELLER  
JONATHAN A. HENRY  
ASHTON P. HERBERT  
DAVID HERNANDEZ  
FREDERICK D. HERSEY  
JAMIE L. HICKMAN  
SINDIE L. HICKS  
WILLIAM J. HOFFER  
JAMES C. HOLMAN  
FARIS C. HOLMAN  
JUSTIN E. HOSKINS  
BENJAMIN D. HOWARD  
MATTHEW L. HOWARD  
KYLE G. HUDALL  
STEPHEN W. HUGHES  
TIMOTHY S. HUGHES  
JEFFREY D. HUNT  
JEREMY M. HUNTER  
BONNIE M. HUNTER  
HWAN S. HWANG  
PATRICE L. INGRAM  
MARY V. ISKANDAROV  
ASHLEY E. JACKSON  
TANIA E. JACKSON  
DANA A. JACOBS  
JONATHAN JAGATNARAIN  
ROBERT J. JAMES  
ANTHONY J. JANESE  
HEATHER L. JANTSCH  
JOHNNIE T. JEFFERSON  
KATHRYN R. JENSEN  
JOSE A. JIMENEZ  
FRANK F. JOAQUIN  
ALBERT JOHNSON, JR.  
BRIAN M. JOHNSON  
JEFFREY C. JOHNSON  
JOHANNA M. JOHNSON  
MATTHEW J. JOHNSON  
SCOTT G. JOHNSON  
RYAN A. JOKERST  
AMBER R. JONES  
GERONIA L. JONES  
JASON W. JONES  
KIANA L. JONES  
SARAH E. JONES  
EVERETT A. JOYNER II  
ANDREA K. KAMAN  
ADRIANA M. KARMANN  
CHRISTOPHER C. KARR  
CHRISTOPHER Q. KARNNEY  
STEVEN T. KEISTER  
WALTER W. KIELBUS  
KANE K. KIM  
YO H. KIM  
YOUNG K. KIM  
JON M. KING  
MARGAREE A. KING  
TRENIESE L. KIRKLEN  
NATHAN A. KLEIN  
TERRANCE D. KNIGHT  
BRIAN K. KNOTTS  
ANNA H. KO  
JAMES KO  
TIFFANY P. KOCH  
CHASE N. KOCHKODIN  
SHANE A. KOHTZ  
JACOB S. KONKOL  
JOSHUA M. KREYV  
JEFFREY A. KROMM, JR.  
PAUL E. KUNNAS  
LELAND C. LABBE  
DUSTIN F. LADUKE  
JOHN E. LAIRD  
KEVIN M. LANDRETH  
CHRISTINA J. LAWSON  
ASHLEY S. LEACH  
LUKE W. LEININGER  
THOMAS S. LEITER  
ANDRES LEON  
STEPHEN J. LESTER  
GREGORY K. LEWIS  
REGINA A. LEWIS  
SAMUEL X. LEWIS  
VINCENT L. LEWIS

EDUARDO LIBEDAVILES  
 JERRY J. LINDSEY  
 JACK LINGLE, JR.  
 PAMISHA S. LITTLE  
 LANEA J. LIVINGSTON  
 RICHARD M. LOFTHOUSE  
 CORAL R. LORE  
 LARRY Q. LOWRANCE  
 JUSTIN D. LUCAS  
 JASON J. LYNCH  
 MATTHEW B. MACE  
 BRIAN E. MACKLIN  
 ROBERT B. MAKUCH  
 SAMUEL W. MALONE  
 DEREK D. MAPP  
 ROBERT M. MARTIN  
 MICHAEL V. MASON  
 ANTHONY L. MATHIS  
 ANDREA D. MATTHIEW  
 FREDERICK C. MAYFIELD II  
 MICHAEL A. MCCRORY, JR.  
 REUBEN B. MCCURDY  
 MATTHEW K. MCDANIEL  
 ERIC V. MCDONALD  
 WILLIAM S. MCGILL  
 PONNICATERRAL MCKENZIE  
 SHAWN T. MCMICKLE  
 DANIEL C. MEADOWS  
 ARIEL MEDINA  
 EDWIN B. MELENDEZMARTINEZ  
 BRYAN J. METCALF  
 TRAVIS J. MICHELENA  
 MARK D. MILLIGAN  
 MICHAEL A. MILLS  
 JODIE W. MINOR, JR.  
 AMY A. MIRANDA  
 RYAN A. MOLINA  
 MICHAEL J. MONFREDA  
 CHRISTOPHER G. MONTES  
 ANTHONY J. MOORE  
 RANDALL F. MORAN  
 MICHAEL P. MORGANA  
 PATRICK M. MORIARITY  
 TERRY JAMES R. MORRIS  
 ALEXANDER H. MORSE  
 SHAMEKA L. MOSS  
 BYRON W. MULDER, JR.  
 GRAHAM L. MULLINS  
 EUGENE A. MUNIZ  
 NELSON J. MUNIZ  
 ERIC B. MUNN  
 MICHAEL D. MURPHY  
 RYAN Y. MURPHY  
 MICHELLE R. NAPIER  
 BRIDGETTE M. NAVEJAR  
 ANDREW M. NESOM  
 BOYCE J. NEWTON  
 BURKE D. NORRIS  
 SAMUEL O. OHWOVORIOLE  
 FELIX R. OLIVAREZ  
 NICOLE L. OLIVER  
 BRIAN W. OLIVER  
 JOHNNY J. ORRRA  
 KERRY T. OSBURN  
 KOREY R. OUTERBRIDGE  
 JARED L. OWEN  
 ISHAK I. OWUSU  
 TRAVIS R. PAGAN  
 STEVEN A. PARENTHIEN  
 JOHNATHON D. PARKER  
 MONICA M. PATTONNEAL  
 WESLEY W. PAULSEN  
 TINA L. PENICK  
 JOY L. PENNEY  
 GEOVANNIE PEREZROSADO  
 SYLVIO R. PERSONNA  
 GWEN M. PETERS  
 RICARDO F. PHILLIPS  
 DAVID G. PIETRASZ  
 JOSE A. PIZARRO  
 JOSEPH D. PLOTINO  
 ANDREW C. POLER  
 NATASHA N. POLLOCK  
 THOMAS L. POWERS  
 LAURA C. PREKO  
 RYAN A. PRETE  
 JASON D. PULSIFER  
 MATTHEW J. PURDY  
 TYWAN D. PURNELL  
 ADAM C. PUTMAN  
 CHRISTOPHER S. QUANTOCK  
 JOSEPH A. QUENGA  
 PETER D. QUILLES  
 NATHAN L. RAY  
 SOPHIA A. RECLUSADO  
 EVA L. REED  
 DANIEL K. REEP  
 RYAN T. REILLY  
 GUY E. REYNOLDS  
 HAROLD K. RICHARDSON  
 JOSHUA A. RISHER  
 GUNO C. RIFFELD  
 WILLIAM J. RIVERS  
 LUKE P. RIZZO  
 MATTHEW W. ROBEY  
 ERIC G. ROBLES  
 CLAUDIO J. RODRIGUEZ  
 CLAVIER RODRIGUEZ  
 MARK A. RODRIGUEZ  
 JOSHUA S. ROGERS  
 STEVEN L. ROGERS  
 BRIAN K. ROHN  
 LAURA C. ROLLINS  
 JONATHAN S. ROMERO  
 JADE C. ROOT  
 DAVID B. ROSS  
 CHRISTINE ROUMO

AMBER J. RUCKER  
 JEFFREY M. RUDDERFORTH  
 KAREN V. RUFFNORTHEY  
 AMY A. RUPERT  
 CHRISTOPHER J. SAAGER  
 JUSTINE A. SACCO  
 JEFFREY S. SALEM  
 MITCHELL L. SALTER  
 FERDINAND G. SANCHEZ  
 BRYAN R. SAND  
 CHRISTOPHER W. SANDERS  
 CARLOS M. SANFORD  
 RICHARD M. SANTANA  
 MEGAN E. SCAVEZZE  
 ROBERT A. SCHNABEL  
 JUNG Y. SCHORR  
 ALICIA D. SCOTT  
 CHAD P. SCOTT  
 NALEYA K. SCOTT  
 JESSE SCRIVENS II  
 JASON M. SCUDAMORE  
 MATTHEW SEBASTIAN  
 NATHANIEL K. SEBREN  
 PATRICK R. SERNETT  
 ENJOY U. SHAMSHIDOV  
 THOMAS N. SHANAHAN  
 STEFANIE D. SHEFCHECK  
 VICTOR SHEN  
 JONATHAN P. SHEPHERD  
 MARK C. SHOAF  
 STEVEN J. SICKLES  
 GREGORY T. SIEVERS  
 SAMUEL J. SINGLETON  
 BRYANT B. SKINNER  
 KENNETH A. SLATON  
 WILLIAM W. SMATHERS  
 SAMANTHA L. SMAY  
 DETRICK L. SMILEY  
 JERRY SMITH  
 LAWRENCE B. SMITH  
 QUINTON L. SMITH  
 STEPHEN F. SMITH  
 ROGER A. SNEAD  
 BRENT A. SOBY  
 KYLANDRA C. SOMERVILLE  
 MADONNA A. SORIANO  
 MAHAMADOU SOUMAORO  
 JASON M. SPALDING  
 WESLEY R. SPARKS  
 MUEL SPENCERPITTMAN  
 BRIAN J. SPURGEON  
 BRADLEY C. STADDON  
 TYSHINA D. STARKS  
 KATIE L. STEELE  
 STAR L. STEWART  
 MATTHEW R. STOLTZ  
 MATTHEW J. STROHMAN  
 FELICIA E. STURGEON  
 JEFFREY C. SULLIVAN  
 JONATHAN A. SWARTZ  
 BENJAMIN J. SYLVESTER  
 PUNATOTO V. TAARU  
 LUCIA TARTT  
 KEVIN M. TATE  
 COREY D. TAYLOR  
 GARY N. TAYLOR  
 NYISHA S. TAYLOR  
 FREDRICK D. TEETTER  
 MATTHEW W. TETER  
 GUYCHEON THEOBAL  
 GINA R. THOMAS  
 REBEKAH K. THOMAS  
 STEPHANIE K. THOMAS  
 MARCIA L. THOMPSON  
 ROBERT A. THOMPSON  
 TIFANY THROWER  
 MICHAEL J. TILLSON  
 NATALIE TITERENCE  
 KRIS P. TOMAN  
 PATRICK A. TOUCHARD, JR.  
 MICHELLE Y. TUCKER  
 ADAM L. TUDOR  
 JAMES W. TURNER  
 KATRINA E. TWIGG  
 BRANDON C. TYNER  
 ANGELO VALDEBENITO  
 ELIA G. VALDESPINO  
 AURELIO J. VARELA  
 WILLIAM D. VAUGHN  
 GREGG E. VERHOEF  
 CHRISTOPHER J. VESCE  
 OTTO J. VINDEKILDE  
 DANIEL C. VOSS  
 JOSHUA H. WADE  
 BRANDON C. WAGNER  
 MAC A. WALKER  
 TAVIS WALLNER  
 NICOLE E. WALLS  
 JONATHAN M. WARD  
 TANESHIA L. WARREN  
 LOVETTA L. WASHINGTON  
 REBECCA D. WATERMAN  
 MATTHEW J. WEBB  
 TYLER C. WEIGHTMAN  
 RONALD G. WELTER  
 ETTA S. WHEELER  
 ERIC M. WHITSTONE  
 FLOYD WHITE, JR.  
 JI Y. WHITE  
 BRADFORD S. J. WHITING  
 DOUGLAS E. WILLIAMS  
 HANNAH K. WILLIAMS  
 JAMES R. WILLIAMS  
 SEAN C. WILLIAMS  
 VERNON A. WILLIAMS  
 WILLIAM G. WILLIS  
 JOSHUA H. WILSON

THADDEUS WILSON  
 CHRISTOPHER J. WIMSATT  
 RICHARD A. WINKELS  
 SAMBRIDDI WINKLER  
 PAUL L. WOLFE III  
 JOSHUA A. WOODKE  
 GWYNN M. WORKMASTER  
 ROBERT R. YAUGER  
 ZACHARY P. YOKLIC  
 JUDY M. YOO  
 ALEXI ZAYAS  
 BLAKE C. ZENTENO  
 CHRISTOPHER J. ZIMMER  
 SEAN C. ZION  
 BRIAN W. ZORGER  
 D012719  
 D013066  
 D013545  
 D014124

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 major*

ROSE ABIDO  
 JARVIS D. ADAMS  
 KIMBERLY J. BATSMILLAUDON  
 NORMAN W. BLACK  
 DONNIE R. BRADFORD  
 JONATHAN A. BRAECKEL  
 JOHN H. CHAMBERLIN  
 DANIEL J. JINDRICH  
 JESSE A. JOHNSON  
 MICHAEL J. KRANCH  
 MICHAEL B. KROGH  
 THOMAS A. KROGH  
 KEITH D. LIGMAN  
 LUKE G. MAFFEY  
 KEITH E. MAJOR  
 JONATHAN C. MALABRE  
 ANTHONY J. MATAZZARO  
 CLIFTON T. MCLUNG  
 AUSTIN R. MINTER  
 GEN N. MUI  
 CHRISTOPHER M. MULCH  
 BRENT C. NOLAN  
 JUNG W. OH  
 LUKE T. PLANTE  
 WILLIAM W. POLLARD  
 MAXWELL I. POTASZNIK  
 TAD E. PUGH  
 EVAN F. SALBEGO  
 WILLIAM S. SANZ  
 CHARLES E. SUSLOWICZ  
 JASON E. TAYLOR  
 STEVEN A. VIALI  
 FREDERICK R. WAAGE  
 DARITH J. WALSH  
 JOSEPH P. WZOREK II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

THOMAS A. SUMMERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

CHRISTINA M. BUCHNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be colonel*

MARCIA L. LEWIS

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*

JACK E. SHIELDS III

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*

JERZY M. MATYSZCZUK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be colonel*

ALECIA D. BIDDISON  
 RAYMOND S. CHICOSKI  
 GERALD E. DEZSOFI  
 SCOTT B. HILDEBRANDT  
 ADAM M. IWASZUK  
 JAMES C. PACKWOOD  
 MIGUEL A. TORRES  
 ROGER R. WOLD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

*To be colonel*

JOSEPH W. BISHOP

BLAIR L. DAVIS  
 ROMEO J. DELFIN  
 ROGER M. DILLARD  
 MICHAEL A. FRANK  
 DAVID A. PARKER  
 PAUL S. PETERS  
 KENT M. PORTER  
 RAYMOND K. SCOTT  
 ROBERT T. UTLAUT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be major*

JENNIFER L. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

*To be major*

PATRICK E. MATHER

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 colonel*

LUIS G. FUCHU  
 HARRY D. HUNG  
 JOHN C. MOORE  
 DEXTER C. NUNNALLY

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 colonel*

JOHN P. KILBRIDE  
 JOHN J. NEAL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

*To be major*

OLIVIA H. IVEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY DENTAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

*To be major*

HAN S. KIM

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*

JOHN E. RICHARDSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

PAUL A. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

*To be colonel*

ROBERT T. CARTER, JR.  
 RANDALL M. FANNIN  
 JEFFREY L. OLIVER  
 CHARLES A. PHILLIPS

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 major*

GREGORY J. ABIDE  
 BRIAN M. ADAMS  
 BRYAN E. ADAMS  
 ERIC D. ADAMS  
 DANIEL AGOSTO  
 ARIEL A. ALCAIDE  
 CASEY L. ALEXANDER  
 JEROME M. ALTHOFF  
 KARL K. ANDERSON  
 PAUL A. ANDERSON  
 PETER D. ANDERSON  
 CESAR A. ARISGUTIERREZ  
 JEREMY D. ARNOLD  
 JOHN E. ARTHUR  
 JUSTIN L. ASTROTH  
 ANTHONY W. ATMORE, JR.  
 ARTURO AVILA  
 CHRISTINA S. BAHR  
 BRANDON P. BAILA  
 ADRIAN BAJENARU  
 AUSTIN C. BAKER  
 MICHAEL A. BALAZINSKI  
 ALEXANDER S. BALK  
 DANIEL F. BALLER  
 NATHANIEL D. BALOUGH  
 KWASI V. BANKS  
 CATHLEEN B. BARKER  
 JAVIER F. BARRERA  
 GREGORY A. BASSETT  
 CLINTON E. BEAUCHAMP  
 JOEL B. BECKNER

SCOTT D. BEEERENS  
 DANIEL L. BELANGER  
 MICHAEL A. BENNER  
 ANDREW P. BENTON  
 ROBERT C. BERGDORF  
 DAVID C. BERMINGHAM  
 GRANT A. BETHURUM  
 KEVIN T. BEYER  
 TIMOTHY O. BLACK  
 DREW A. BLACKLIDGE  
 PETER H. BLADES  
 ZACERY C. BOATMAN  
 CHRISTOPHER A. BOLES  
 DOMINIC J. BONO  
 LISA A. BORER  
 STEVEN R. BOTA  
 DAVID L. BOYD, JR.  
 KALA M. BRADY  
 AAKAR C. BRAHMBHATT  
 RYAN J. BRIDLEY  
 BRANDON C. BRIM  
 SAMUEL R. BROADDUS  
 JOSHUA A. BROOKS  
 BRIEN P. BROWN  
 CASEY J. BROWN  
 LOUIS J. BROWN  
 LUCAS E. BROWN

BENJAMIN A. BRUHN  
 ADAM K. BRYANT  
 ALEXANDER E. BULLOCK  
 HEBBA N. BULLOCK  
 BENJAMIN K. BURCH  
 MICHAEL D. BURKE  
 HAROLD G. BUTTERFIELD  
 MICHAEL J. CABIC  
 JOHN D. CADDELL  
 ANDREW T. CAHAN  
 SONNY J. CAIN  
 FRANK J. CAMARA  
 JONATHAN T. CAMIRE  
 STEVEN A. CARBONE  
 RYCE K. CARLSON  
 THOMAS S. CARNES  
 BRUCE R. CARSON  
 VERONICA P. CARTER  
 JOHN J. CASE  
 JERRY W. CHAMPION  
 ADAM Y. H. CHANG  
 CARLOS CHAVEZ, JR.  
 DARIEN A. CHERY  
 MICHAEL A. CHEZUM  
 RUBEN E. CHIRINOS  
 DAEKWANG CHOI  
 KEITH R. CHRISTIANSEN, JR.  
 ALEXANDER H. CHUNG  
 NATHAN R. CLASON  
 CAIN S. CLAXTON  
 NORMAN R. COLE IV  
 BRAD J. COLEMAN  
 ANDREW T. COLLINS  
 CHAD E. COOPER  
 DANIEL F. COOPER  
 JACK H. COOPERMAN  
 ROBERT W. CORLESS  
 TREVOR J. CORRIGAN  
 JEREMY P. COVIELLO  
 DANIELLE COVINGTON  
 CANDIS L. CROSSLEY  
 LANCE R. CROW  
 RAFAEL CRUCETA, JR.  
 CHRISTIE P. CUNNINGHAM

ROBERT J. CZAJAK  
 ROGER A. DALLMAN  
 JOSEPH J. DANYEUR  
 JAMES A. DAVIS  
 ALEXANDRA K. DEANGELIS  
 NICHOLAS J. DEDOMINICI  
 JOSH D. DEEHR  
 DANIEL I. DENN  
 DAVID A. DENN  
 KAREN C. DEKRICKSON  
 STEVEN E. DEWHITT  
 MARISSA M. DEY  
 JOHN J. DIBBLE III  
 CHARLIE DIGLORIA  
 REECE K. DOTY  
 LAWTON E. DRAKE  
 LUBREY R. DUSTIN  
 JUSTIN P. EASTMAN  
 JONATHAN C. EDWARDS  
 BENJAMIN J. EISENHUT  
 CAMERON D. EK  
 JOHN C. ELLERBE IV  
 MATTHEW J. ERCOLANI  
 MARC A. ESKEW  
 ELIZABETH L. EVANS  
 DAVID L. EYRE  
 AMIR H. EZZEDDINE  
 STEPHEN E. FANCEY  
 ALEKSANDR FARBEROV  
 KENT T. FEDA  
 ROBERT D. FELLINGHAM  
 TREMAIN L. FERGERSON  
 KYLE C. FERGUSON  
 CHRISTOPHER P. FIGUEROA  
 DANIEL B. FISHER  
 DAVID I. FISHER  
 TALENA FLETCHER  
 THOMAS M. FLOOD  
 ERIC M. FLYNN  
 CHRISTOPHER S. FOGT  
 NATHAN M. FOLGERT  
 CHELSEY N. FORTNER  
 SEAN T. FRANKUM  
 JOHN B. FRENCH  
 SOPHIA V. FRENCH  
 JAMES R. FULKERSON

JONATHAN D. FULLER  
 GEORGE J. FUST III  
 JONATHON H. GAMBRELL  
 DHONCHEER S. GARCIA  
 EDWARD C. GARCIA, JR.  
 DEVRON M. GARDNER  
 BRYCE J. GATRELL  
 ROBERT J. GENTRY  
 JOHN W. GERACITANO  
 BRETT M. GILBERT  
 PHILLIP R. GILCHRIST  
 DALLAS J. GILMORE  
 BRADLEY W. GLOSSER  
 STEVE L. GLUCK  
 MATTHEW D. GORDON  
 DANIEL W. GOSSMAN  
 JOSEPH J. GOURYEB  
 WILLIAM A. GREEN  
 ROBERT W. GREY  
 JACOB T. GRIER  
 JOSHUA B. GROEN  
 TAIB GROZDANIC  
 MOEZ GUENAIEN  
 JAMES W. GUGLIELMI  
 GEORGE L. GURROLA  
 DEMITRIUS D. HAEFFNER  
 ROGER J. HAPFORD  
 JASON P. HAGGARD  
 NICHOLAS R. HAINES  
 BENJIE S. HALL  
 JESSE N. HALL  
 BENJAMIN J. HALLE  
 ROBERT A. HALLIDAY  
 BLAKE E. HALLOWELL  
 CHRISTOPHER R. HALTOM  
 TERESA M. HALTOM  
 MARK T. HARDEE  
 ANDREW I. HARRIS  
 JASON R. HARRIS  
 RUSSELL G. HARTLEY  
 ANDREW M. HASCHER  
 THOMAS L. HATTFIELD II  
 MICHAEL R. HAWKS  
 JOCELYN R. HAYES  
 MICHAEL E. HEATH  
 JOSEPH A. HENDERSON  
 MICAH G. HENNINGSEN  
 DREW C. HENSLEY  
 ALEJANDRO HERRERA  
 RAYANNE M. HERRERA  
 NATHAN I. HESS  
 MICHAEL P. HOPKINS  
 MATTHEW W. HOUSE  
 JUSTIN S. HOWARD  
 MICHAEL J. V. HOWARD  
 JULIE R. HOXHA  
 JOSHUA E. HUDSON  
 ALESIA L. HUGHES  
 PATRICK L. HUNT  
 JOHN E. HUTTON  
 JASON D. IMBODEN  
 MARK A. IRVIN  
 MICHAEL J. JACKSON  
 SANDRA Y. JACKSON  
 ROBERT K. JAHN  
 JUSTIN E. JAMES  
 DAVID R. JAQUITH  
 DANIEL R. JARVIS  
 DARLIN JEANFRANCOIS  
 JAMES P. JOHNSON  
 TYLER H. JOHNSON  
 BRYAN P. JONAS  
 MARGO L. JONES  
 DELBERT S. L. JOO  
 MORGAN S. JORDAN  
 JOSHUA J. KANDYBOWICZ  
 JARED D. KASSULKE  
 MICHAEL S. KEELS  
 JASON S. KELLER  
 JEFFREY P. KELLY  
 WILLIAM C. KEOGH  
 GEORGE A. KILGORE  
 DANIELLE L. KILLIAN  
 JASON Y. KIM  
 BRIAN A. KING  
 DANIEL T. KING  
 WILLIAM B. KING  
 DOUGLAS W. KINKENNON  
 AIMEE N. L. KIRK  
 ERIK T. KISER  
 CHARLES R. KISSLING, JR.  
 ANDREW P. KLEY  
 ALEXANDER G. KLINE  
 TODD M. KLINZINGDONALDSON  
 ERIK B. KORN  
 ELLAS S. KORTABANI  
 KYLE A. KREBS  
 DISHANTH KRISHNAGIRI  
 CHRISTINE C. KRUEGER  
 KYLE E. KRUG  
 BRENT E. KURUTZ  
 JUSTIN K. KWON  
 WALLIE G. LACKS  
 NELSON A. LAMB  
 ZACHARY P. LANDIS  
 MATTHEW A. LARSON  
 JOHN B. LARUE  
 AHREN P. LAVALLEE  
 BAO D. LE  
 THEODORE E. LEAKAS  
 MATTHEW A. LEBO  
 YUJU LEE  
 WILLIAM A. LEHMANN  
 THOMAS A. LENZ  
 MARC S. LEVITT  
 NICHOLAS S. LEWIS  
 ZACHARY K. LEWIS

DAVID J. LEYDET  
 JOSHUA S. LILEY  
 LILY M. LINGLE  
 DANIEL W. LOEFFLER  
 ANGEL LOPEZ  
 JUAN C. LOPEZ  
 NICHOLAS J. LOPEZ  
 DAVID B. LORA  
 GARY D. LOTENBECKFORD  
 ROSS F. LOW  
 SCOTT A. LYNCH  
 JOSEPH MACCHIARELLA  
 JAMES J. MADIGAN, JR.  
 BRANDON MAGUIRE  
 MICHAEL E. MAGUIRE II  
 ANDREW L. MALON  
 ADAM J. MANEEN  
 MARTIN P. MANGUM  
 FREDDY P. MANJARRES  
 JANISE N. MAPLE  
 KYLE T. MARKLE  
 JUDITH A. MARLOWE  
 CHRISTIAN F. MARTIE  
 CASEY A. MARTIN  
 CHRISTA E. MARTIN  
 ZACHARY I. MARTIN  
 JENNIFER E. MARTINDILL  
 FRANCISCO D. MARTINEZ  
 VICTORIA C. MAYNARD  
 JONATHAN T. MCANALLY  
 JASON A. MCCANN  
 JOSEPH E. MCCARTHY  
 JAMES S. MCCRAY  
 NEAL J. MCDONALD  
 JOSEPH MCDONOUGH  
 MICHAEL P. MCGRAW  
 GLEN W. MCINNIS II  
 JACK L. MCLAIN, JR.  
 DAVID G. MCLEAN  
 JEFFREY S. METZ  
 JAY Y. MEYER  
 MARIE C. MIKASA  
 CASEY L. MILLER  
 DANIEL T. MILLER  
 MELISSA S. MILLER  
 RYAN E. MILLER  
 SAMUEL J. MILLER  
 AARON P. MILLIGAN  
 CURTIS K. MILLION  
 KEITH J. MINAJI  
 CHRISTOPHER G. MITREWSKI  
 JOHN P. MONES  
 JARED M. MOON  
 MARTIN ZABEL MORCELO  
 BLAISE B. MORGAN  
 JAMES T. MORGAN  
 JAMES M. MORRIS, JR.  
 RICARDO A. MUNOZ  
 EVAN L. MUNSON  
 DANIEL R. MURDOUGH  
 MICHAEL K. MURRELL  
 MOURTNEY E. NEEL  
 JOEL W. NEWBURN  
 MICHAEL S. NEWMAN  
 JUSTIN R. NICHOLSON  
 ERIC J. NOLAN  
 TERRENCE R. NOLAN  
 BRYAN W. NORRELL  
 DOUGLAS W. NORTH  
 BRENT P. NOWAK  
 JUSTIN D. OAKLEY  
 CHRISTOPHER J. OGDEN  
 JILL OGDEN  
 TIMOTHY M. OHARA  
 JONATHAN P. OLSON  
 ALTANGEREL ORGIL  
 JOHN D. ORSINI  
 ANTHONY J. OSMAN  
 TIMOTHY T. OTT  
 ANDREW J. OWENS  
 ANDREW M. OWENS  
 BRIAN A. OWENS  
 JONATHAN S. PAGE  
 JAMES P. PAPAGNI  
 JIMMY P. PATNE  
 RYAN E. PEACOCK  
 ANTHONY D. PEARSON  
 AARON M. PECORA  
 STEPHAN A. PEREIRA  
 LOIS I. PEREZJARA  
 JOHN E. PETERS  
 MARVIN L. PHILLIPS  
 BIANCA S. PHILSON  
 ANDREW F. PLUCKER  
 MARK D. PODRAZIK  
 SHONDA L. PORTER  
 ANDREW P. POSTOVOIT  
 MICHAEL G. PRESCOTT  
 SPENCER D. PROBST  
 MICHAEL B. PULTUSKER  
 MICHAEL K. PUTTERILL  
 PEDRO F. QUINTEROMERCADO  
 JASON A. RAMNARINE  
 ROBERT J. RANSOM  
 MICHAEL R. REED  
 BRIAN S. REMSON  
 TIMOTHY G. RHODES  
 DAVID J. RICE  
 JAVIER R. RIVERASANCHEZ  
 LEE H. ROBERTS  
 JASON L. ROBINSON  
 ADAM P. ROBITAILLE  
 LUZ N. RODRIGUEZ  
 JOSE A. RODRIGUEZGUZMAN  
 EDDIE L. ROGERS  
 JOHN D. ROHN  
 PHILIP C. ROLL

DONALD R. ROSE  
 PATRICK G. ROUSH  
 JESSICA L. ROVERO  
 OWEN J. RYCKMAN  
 LASHANNA M. SAMUEL  
 MELVIN J. SANBORN  
 KEVIN C. SANDELL  
 JEREMIAH M. SASALA  
 SCOTT M. SAUNDERS  
 ALAN J. SAWYER  
 SEAN E. SCARCLIFF  
 GEDALLAH J. SCHAROLD  
 DAVID G. SCHLASEMAN  
 CODY R. SCHUETTE  
 CHRISTOPHER M. SEBAL  
 EDWIN J. SEDA  
 DAVID A. SEIDEN  
 ABEL A. SEIPLE  
 SAMUEL D. SELLERS  
 DAVID C. SENSEMAN  
 JOSEPH A. SHABBOTT  
 ADAM T. SHAW  
 LAWRENCE A. SHAW  
 MICHELLE E. SHED  
 ARLYNE R. SHELTON  
 MICHAEL J. SHEPARD  
 DAVID J. SHERMAN  
 SUSANNA L. SHIPMON  
 DAVID N. SIDES  
 VLADISLAV SILAYEV  
 TIFFANIE M. SITZE  
 SHAUN T. SLAWSON  
 BRIAN L. SMITH  
 BRYAN A. SMITH  
 CATHERINE E. SMITH  
 CHANCE L. SMITH  
 CHARLES A. SMITH  
 JASON K. SMITH  
 JAYLEN T. SMITH  
 LAURENCE S. SMITH  
 SHARONDA L. SMITH  
 WILLIAM B. SMITH  
 JESSE P. SODAM  
 MICHAEL K. SOGIOKA  
 DAVID M. SOLICH  
 PETER SONG  
 DAVID M. SONNEY  
 LEROY D. SPENCER, JR.  
 GREGORY STEWART, JR.  
 PETER M. STJOHN  
 JONATHAN W. STOCKWELL  
 JAMES E. STREAMS  
 STEPHANIE S. STUCK  
 KEVIN H. SUDBERRY  
 PEARLE M. SURFACE  
 JOSHUA R. TAFT  
 ZACHARY R. TARON  
 BENJAMIN A. TATER  
 MARK D. THIEME  
 DANIELLE M. THOMAN  
 ERNEST R. THOMAS  
 CHARLES R. TIMM  
 ANDREW C. TOLLEFSON  
 NICHOLAS E. TOTTH  
 TRUONG Q. TRAN  
 MARK E. TRAPP  
 NATHAN J. TRIBBLE  
 JOSEPH A. TRICOMI  
 JOHN P. TRIMBLE  
 ADA M. TRINIDAD  
 ALEXANDER M. TRIPLETT  
 CHAD D. TRUSLOW  
 LUKE A. TYREE  
 SHAHIN UDDIN  
 GENE F. UHLER  
 NICHOLAS M. UHORCHAK  
 MICHAEL J. URBANIAK  
 MELISSA A. VALKEN  
 BRIAN B. VARNIS  
 KENDRICK B. VAUGHN  
 JOSEPH V. VESNESKY  
 WALTER R. VOGEL  
 ANTHONY E. VUKELICH  
 BRIAN P. WADAS  
 DARICK J. WAGLACE  
 BRIAN A. WAGLACE  
 TIMOTHY C. WALSH  
 TYSON H. WALSH  
 PAUL A. WARD  
 WILLIAM S. WARNER  
 BOOKER T. WASHINGTON  
 IRA F. WATKINS  
 ZACHARY N. WATSON  
 CHRISTOPHER D. WEBB  
 KENNETH M. WEISS  
 LANARD S. WELCH  
 ZACHARY J. WEST  
 MARYDELL V. WESTMAN  
 LEROY WEYRICK IV  
 MICHAEL P. WHITE  
 JACQUELINE N. WIGFALL  
 ANDREW S. WILHELM  
 ANTHONY R. WILKINS  
 JUSTIN D. WILLIAMS  
 KENDRICK J. WILLIAMS  
 TIMOTHY D. WILSON  
 BENJAMIN M. WINCHESTER  
 JOSHUA T. WINSETT  
 BRET D. WISECUP  
 MATTHEW C. WOLFE  
 STEPHANIE R. WOOD  
 RYAN D. WOODWARD  
 CARMELA M. WOOTAN  
 KENNETH B. WORD  
 KELSEY L. WORLEY  
 MICHAEL B. WRIGHT  
 VONNIE L. WRIGHT

PHILLIP G. YEAKY  
 AMARILIS D. YEN  
 JOSEPH A. YETTER  
 CATHERINE M. YEU  
 JUNGSANG YOON  
 CHRISTINE M. YOUNG  
 JUSTIN M. YOURTEE  
 WEI J. YUAN  
 ADAM S. ZERR  
 JEFFREY K. ZIZZ  
 D011887  
 D012259  
 D012595  
 D012605  
 D012690  
 D012835  
 D013065  
 D013083  
 D013103  
 D013178  
 D013291  
 D013295  
 D013476  
 D013477  
 D013530  
 D013554  
 G010280  
 G010287  
 G010360  
 G010432  
 G010452

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 major*

STEVEN ABADIA  
 DANIEL A. ABALDO  
 ADAM O. ABEYTA  
 KURT M. ABLE  
 JASON D. ACKERMANN  
 CAMILLE J. ACRED  
 BENJAMIN T. ADAMS  
 ELISSA J. ADAMS  
 RAYMOND M. ADAMS  
 DALE M. AEBISCHER  
 JEREMY E. AHO  
 ADAM D. AKERS  
 SAMUEL G. ALBERT III  
 MICHAEL D. ALCH  
 GERREN M. ALEXANDER  
 RYAN P. ALEXANDER  
 TRAVIS K. ALLARD  
 DANIEL M. ALLEN  
 JON C. ALLEN  
 MICHAEL E. ALLEN  
 STEVEN E. ALQUESTA  
 EDUARDO J. ALVAREZ  
 ERNESTO D. AMADOR  
 JOHN J. AMBELANG  
 RYAN P. ANDERSEN  
 AARON F. ANDERSON  
 STUART M. ANDERSON  
 BRANDON L. ANDREASEN  
 JEFFREY F. ANDRILIUNAS  
 JAMES R. ANTONIDES  
 ABLAM A. APEDJHOUN  
 GREGORY D. ARCHOLD  
 REAMER W. ARGO IV  
 PATRICK J. ARMOURKOENIG  
 PATRICK J. ARMSTRONG  
 CHARLES C. ASHCRAFT  
 JACQUELINE M. ASIS  
 KEVIN J. ATWELL  
 JOHN N. AUGER  
 ROBERT E. AULETTA  
 PAUL B. AUSTIN  
 ARCADIO AVALOS  
 JASON L. BAHMER  
 JONATHAN C. BAKER  
 JENNIFER M. BALES  
 CHRISTIAN E. BALLESTER  
 JAMES R. BARKER  
 BENJAMIN R. BARNARD  
 CURT A. BARNES  
 PATRICK A. BARONE  
 ALEXANDER C. BARRON  
 BRETT W. BARTLETT  
 DEREK F. BARTLETT  
 GREGORY D. BASCOMB II  
 SHAILENDRA BASNET  
 ANDREW M. BATTLE  
 ANDREW B. P. BAUDER  
 BRENT B. BEADLE  
 DAVID B. BEALLE  
 KEVIN A. BEAVERS  
 DAVID L. BECKER, JR.  
 MARK D. BEDRIN  
 BRENDA L. BEEGLE  
 PAUL T. BELL  
 JAMES S. BELLENDIR  
 GREGORY M. BENDER  
 BLAKE L. BENEDICT  
 GREGORY A. BENJAMIN  
 LEVI J. BERCUMBE  
 KEVIN M. BERNHARDT  
 JOHN P. BILLINGS  
 JENNIFER L. BISECU  
 NITE W. BLACKFORD  
 ANDREW T. BLAKEMORE  
 MARCIE T. BLASINGAME  
 KURT H. BOEHM  
 JASON A. BOGARDUS  
 JESSICA R. BOHACHE  
 JUSTIN T. BOKMEYER  
 ERIC M. BONDHUS

DOUGLAS O. BOONE  
 JOSHUA M. BOSLEY  
 JAMES J. BOUCHARD  
 TRAVIS J. BOUDREAU  
 SHAWN G. BOURDON  
 LUKE C. BOWERS  
 KENNETH R. BOWLING II  
 JOSHUA C. BRACHER  
 JAKOB C. BRADFIELD  
 JOHN F. BRADLEY  
 LYLE R. BRANNAGAN  
 SION D. BRANNAN  
 MICHAEL T. BRANTHOOVER  
 PEARSON R. BRANTLEY  
 JOHN T. BRASHER  
 STEVEN P. BRAZELL  
 NICHOLAS A. BRENDENKAMP  
 EAMON P. BRESLIN  
 THOMAS J. BRETT  
 KYLE J. BRINKS  
 COLIN W. BRODMERKEL  
 SCOTT C. BROOME  
 BRADLEY D. BROWN  
 CRAIG L. BROWN  
 JAMES R. BROWN II  
 TAZH N. BROWN  
 ZACHERY G. BROWN  
 MICHAEL D. BRUCE  
 KYLE S. BRUFFY  
 LINWOOD L. BUBAR  
 MATTHEW P. BUCHANAN  
 KARL D. BUCKINGHAM  
 KELLY J. BUCKNER  
 JARED F. BUDENSKI  
 STEVEN P. BUHLER  
 ANTHONY L. BULACLAC  
 JEFFERY W. BURGETT  
 CORY L. BURIA  
 WILLIAM E. BURKE  
 COLBY M. BURKHART  
 JESSE B. BURNETTE  
 JUSTIN K. BURNEY  
 DAVID K. BURRIS  
 JAMES M. BURTON  
 TIMOTHY D. BURTON  
 JONATHAN M. BYRD  
 RICHARD L. BYRNE  
 EDWIN CABAN  
 JIM CABRERA  
 JESSE C. CAIN  
 MICHAEL A. CAIN  
 EDWIN C. CALLAHAN, JR.  
 JONATHAN D. CALLAHAN  
 CHRISTOPHER R. CAMPBELL  
 DOUGLAS R. CANNON  
 LAMAR K. CANTELOU  
 JACKIE E. CAPLE, JR.  
 STEPHEN J. CARALUZZI  
 WILLIE C. CARNES, JR.  
 BRENT A. CARR  
 FREDERICK J. CARR, JR.  
 ERIK R. CARROLL  
 JUSTAVO A. CARUSO  
 CHARLES W. CASSELS  
 JOSEPH K. CATLAW III  
 MATTHEW J. CAUDA  
 NATHANIEL C. CAVE  
 EDWARD M. CECIL  
 BRYAN C. CERCY  
 KRISTOPFER C. CHAMALES  
 DANIELLE A. CHAMPAGNE  
 ADAM C. CHAPPELL  
 PAUL T. CHARTERS  
 RICHARD S. CHEW  
 BENJAMIN E. CHINSKY  
 KEITH A. CHIRO  
 JOE S. CHIO  
 SHAWN R. CHRISTENSEN  
 LINDA K. CHUNG  
 IAN L. CHUSTEK  
 RICHARD G. CLARK  
 SCOTT A. CLARK  
 ANDRE L. S. CLEMENCIA  
 TRAVIS D. CLEMENS  
 VICTORIA CLEMENS  
 TRAVIS L. CLINE  
 SEAN M. COCKRILL  
 WESLEY R. COGDALL  
 CHRISTOPHER M. COGHLIN  
 SHAUN A. COLLINS  
 ROBERT J. CONWAY, JR.  
 ROBERT A. COOMBS  
 PAUL A. CORCORAN  
 JAMES C. CORKE  
 WILLIAM CORSON  
 VICTOR J. CORTESE  
 NICHOLAUS J. CORTEZ  
 KEVIN S. CORY  
 JOEL A. COSTA  
 NICHOLAS A. COSTELLO  
 DAVID COURTER  
 MICHAEL C. COX  
 MARCUS T. CRAIG  
 LARRY S. CREWS  
 RAYMOND M. CRONE  
 MICHAEL J. CROOKS  
 JENNIFER M. CROSLAW  
 DOUGLAS R. CRUISE  
 MICHAEL J. CULLER  
 MICHAEL T. CULLIGAN  
 BRANDON J. CUMMINGS  
 DANIEL L. CUMMINS  
 ANDREW G. CURRIER  
 TIMOTHY B. CURTIS  
 JOSEPH A. CYMERMAN  
 JOHN S. DABROWSKI  
 GRADY P. DACUS

CHRISTOPHER M. DAILY  
 FRANCIS I. DALLURA  
 NATHANIEL P. DAMS  
 CALEB S. DANIEL  
 MICHAEL L. DANIELS  
 DAVID A. DARLING  
 NICHOLAS B. DASON  
 ROBERT J. DAUGHERTY  
 LAZARIUS T. DAVIDSON  
 BRANDON R. DAVIS  
 CLINTON G. DAVIS  
 EMERSON T. DAVIS  
 JOSEPH P. DAVIS  
 ROBERT C. DAVIS, JR.  
 ROBERT L. DAVIS  
 TRAVIS M. DAVIS  
 JOHN C. DEAN  
 GABRIEL C. DEARMAN  
 KIMBERLY M. DEFTORI  
 JON D. DEGREEFF  
 STEVEN J. DEJESUS III  
 JAMES M. DELONGCHAMP  
 JARED A. DEMELLO  
 MARC T. DEREDITA  
 NATHAN P. DERRICK  
 JEFFERY R. DEVAULFETTERS  
 PHILIP DEVERA  
 JORDAN A. DILENA  
 SCOTT N. DIMAIO  
 WILLIAM F. DIONNE  
 BRYAN S. DIPALERMO  
 MICHAEL V. DIPIETRO  
 CHRIS DISPONETT  
 PHILIPDANIEL R. DIVINSKI  
 ALFRED D. DIXON, JR.  
 ROBERT L. DOAK  
 TRAVERS H. DOANE  
 CASSIDY T. DOBBINS  
 THOMAS W. DOHERTY  
 RAFAEL U. DOMINGUEZ  
 JOSHUA W. DONECKER  
 TIMOTHY D. DONOHUE  
 MARK A. DONOVAN  
 ADAM J. DORTONA  
 DANIEL E. DOTSON  
 JOANNE M. DOUGLAS  
 ELAÏR W. DOWNY  
 MICHAEL J. DUDA  
 IAN M. DUKE  
 RICHARD M. DUNKIN  
 DON M. DUONG  
 JOEL S. DUQUESTRADA  
 WILLIAM L. DURBIN  
 NATHAN B. DYER  
 JOSEPH D. DYWAN  
 MATTHEW J. EBBERTT  
 ROBERT T. EBERTS  
 JO A. EDMONDS  
 KEITH D. EDMONDS  
 PHILLIP M. EDMONDSON  
 BRANDON A. EICHER  
 AARON H. ELLINGER  
 TYANDRE D. ELLIS  
 RUSLAN K. EMELYANOV  
 ELLIOTT J. EMERICH  
 WESLEY C. EMERY  
 RICHARD S. EMMONS  
 DAVID P. ENGELMANN, JR.  
 JEFFREY L. EPPS  
 TARON X. EPPS  
 ERICH E. ESHELMAN  
 GABRIEL M. ESPINOSA  
 BRANDON J. ESSIET  
 ARTURO EUSEBIO  
 MEGAN E. EVANS  
 JASON R. PABJANOWICZ  
 JONATHAN N. FAGINS  
 DOMINICK V. G. FALCON  
 ROBERT C. FALES  
 MICHAEL A. FARINELLI  
 CALE W. FARQUHAR  
 JONATHAN C. FARWELL  
 JEREMIAH R. FAUGHT  
 ANTON V. FAUSTMANN  
 JEFFREY J. FEARING  
 KY R. FEHLBAUM  
 RAFAEL FELICIANO  
 DAVID T. FELTNER  
 JAMES R. FERGUSON  
 SCOTT R. FERGUSON  
 JULIO R. FERNANDEZ  
 JOHN J. FERNANDEZRUBIO  
 JOHN E. FERRY  
 JEFFREY A. FESER  
 CODIE G. FIELDS  
 MICHAEL S. FIFER  
 MICHAEL S. FINCH  
 PHILLIP D. FITCH  
 DAVID J. FITZPATRICK  
 JOSEPH C. FIX  
 JEREMY A. FLAKE  
 THOMAS C. FLANNIGAN  
 JOSEPH M. FLEMING  
 LEVI FLOETTER  
 HUGO E. FLORES DIAZ  
 ERIN M. FOLEY  
 ALEXANDER X. FOSTER  
 AMIE M. FOSTER  
 SAMY FOUDA  
 LAURA B. FOWLER  
 THOMAS F. FOX  
 ANTHONYMARK U. FRANCISCO  
 AARON A. FRANKLIN  
 ZACHARY M. FRANKLIN  
 BENJAMIN G. FRANZOSA  
 KYLE E. FRAZER  
 CHELSEY A. FREEMAN

CORA E. FREEMAN  
 BRANDON T. FREI  
 MICHAEL C. FREY  
 ANTHONY C. FUNKHOUSER  
 JAMIE J. GALE  
 KEVIN A. GALL  
 CHARLES R. GALLAGHER  
 CHRISTOPHER T. GALVEZ  
 FERNANDO L. GARCIA, JR.  
 LOUIS GARCIA, JR.  
 JONATHAN E. GARVEY  
 ERIC C. GEIGER  
 JOSHUA T. GEIS  
 CHRISTOPHER M. GENSLER  
 STEPHEN J. GIANOS  
 JAMES M. GIBBS, JR.  
 MICHAEL D. GIFFIN  
 JASON D. GILLESPIE  
 DANA M. GINGRICH  
 LOUIS H. GINN  
 ANDREW B. GINTHER  
 STUART D. GITTELMAN  
 WILLIAM R. GOLDSWORTH  
 JOHN P. GOMEN  
 VANCE A. GONZALES  
 WILLIAM R. GOODING III  
 STEPHAN M. GOODMAN  
 TREY C. GOODWIN  
 MARK T. GORDON  
 MATTHEW R. GOWENS  
 JEREMY GRAHAM  
 TERRANCE D. GREEN  
 NICHOLAS B. GREGORY  
 RYAN E. GREGORY  
 JOHN J. GRIFFIN  
 DAVID H. GRINDLE, JR.  
 JACIEL J. GUERRERO  
 BRIAN M. GULDEN  
 JACOB D. GUTIERREZ  
 GREGORY A. HALL, JR.  
 JOSEPH D. HALL  
 MARSHALL B. HALL  
 ERIK M. HAMILTON  
 MATTHEW T. HAMILTON  
 THOMAS W. HAMMERLE  
 ERIC J. HANFT  
 RACHEL M. HARDESTY  
 JOSHUA D. HARGARTEN  
 BRYAN C. HARKRADER  
 SCOTT M. HARRA  
 JOHN R. HARRELL  
 CHARLES C. HARRIS  
 JARROD A. HARRIS  
 JOHN P. HARRIS  
 ANDREW J. HARSHBARGER  
 JAMES P. HART  
 JERALEE M. HARTMAN  
 CHRISTOPHER J. HASSELL  
 CHRISTOPHER J. HAVILEY  
 REED O. HAYES  
 MARK S. HAYNES  
 WALTER C. HAYNES  
 MICHAEL D. HAYS  
 LEVI D. HAZLETT  
 RICHARD P. HELSHAM  
 JASON A. HENKE  
 JARROD V. HEREDIA  
 DAVID J. HERMANN  
 KATHRYN E. HERMON  
 JUAN C. HERNANDEZ  
 CHRISTOPHER J. HEROLD  
 GEOFFREY W. HERTENSTEIN  
 NATHANIEL J. HETHERMAN  
 DANIEL J. HEUMANN  
 BRIAN W. HEWKO  
 DANIEL J. HICKOK  
 JOSEPH C. HICKS  
 MATTHEW K. HILDERBRAND  
 JORDAN D. HILL  
 LOUIS D. HILL  
 RICHARD T. HILL  
 WILLIAM P. HILL  
 LOWELL E. HILTY  
 WOLFF E. HINDRICHS  
 MICHAEL J. HITZNER  
 ROMEO M. HIZON III  
 STEPHAN D. HOBBS  
 RYAN D. HODGSON  
 WILLIAM B. HOELSCHER  
 JOSHUA P. HOLLINGSWORTH  
 ROBERT D. HOLLINGSWORTH  
 COREY L. HOPKINS  
 JAMES D. HORNE  
 THOMAS A. HOWARD  
 KELLEN W. HOWELL  
 ROBERT B. HOWELL  
 DERICK M. HOY  
 JARRELL D. HUDDLE  
 ANTHONY J. HUEBNER  
 BEAU B. HUGHES  
 SPENCER E. HUNT  
 DAVID P. HUNTER  
 JOSEPH J. IMBRIACO  
 ANDREW T. INMAN  
 GERALD A. INOABRETON  
 JOHN A. IRVINE, JR.  
 DONALD W. IRWIN  
 FERNANDO L. ISIP IV  
 ELIAS M. ISREAL  
 MATTHEW J. IVEY  
 DAVID A. JACKSON  
 JABARI M. JACKSON  
 JOSHUA D. JACKSON  
 DAVID F. JACOBS  
 JOSEPH O. JANKE  
 ADAM D. JANNETTI  
 TIMOTHY D. JENNINGS

GABRIELLE JIMENEZ  
 CHARLES S. JOHN  
 BRENT J. JOHNSON  
 DEIRDRA D. JOHNSON  
 JEFFREY J. JOHNSON  
 NOLAN S. JOHNSON  
 CHARLES E. JONES  
 COLLIN R. JONES  
 WILLIAM S. JONES III  
 SEAN P. JOPLING  
 KENNETH S. JURA  
 NATHAN J. JUSTIN  
 RONALD C. KAMP  
 KI M. KANG  
 MICHAEL K. KARLSON  
 JOHN K. KARLSSON  
 CORY T. KASTL  
 OREN H. KAUFFMAN  
 MARY A. KEARNEY  
 LUKE A. KELLER  
 COLM A. KELLY  
 ROBERT T. KELLY  
 BART E. KENNEDY  
 JOHN R. KENNEDY  
 BRIAN R. KENT  
 CODY L. KILLMER  
 CHRIS KIM  
 DAVID KIM  
 EDWARD KIM  
 SAE H. KIM  
 CHRISTOPHER L. KINSEL  
 FRANK R. KIRBYSON III  
 JACOB W. KNELL  
 JONATHAN D. KNIGHT  
 DOREN S. KOLASA  
 JONATHAN E. KRALICK  
 STEPHEN C. KRAUS  
 DAMIAN M. KREBSBACH  
 MATTHEW W. KREIN  
 JONATHAN D. KREPEL  
 SAM H. KRIEGLER  
 SCOTT R. KROENKE  
 JASON R. KRUCK  
 DAVID G. KRUEGER  
 LEO T. KRYSIOF  
 JONATHAN D. KUHN  
 ANDRELUIZ D. KUHNER  
 PATRICK K. KUIPER  
 JOSHUA J. LAFLUR  
 JEREMY J. LAFOUNTAIN  
 TADD C. LAHNERT  
 GREGORY D. LAMBERT  
 KELLIE M. LANDAUER  
 CHRISTOPHER D. LANDERS  
 ALEXANDER K. LANDRUM  
 ALBERT T. LANSANA  
 BRANDON L. LAPEHN  
 JOSEPH M. LAPOINTE  
 JEREMY G. LARSON  
 BRADLEY D. LAUZ  
 PATRICK J. LAVIN  
 BRIAN C. LAWSON  
 WESTON S. LAYFIELD  
 STEPHEN J. LAZ  
 MEAGHAN L. LAZAK  
 NICHOLAS R. LAZZAREVICH  
 VINH V. LE  
 JOHN E. LEATHERMAN  
 KELLY R. LEAVERTON  
 JOSE J. LEDEZMA  
 JOHN C. LEE  
 KEVIN E. LEE  
 ROGER C. LEONHART  
 DANIEL J. LESSARD  
 HAROLD W. LESSNER  
 JOSEPH P. LEWANDOWSKI  
 TIMOTHY P. LEWIN  
 BRANDON M. LEWIS  
 HUGH A. LEWIS  
 MATTHEW S. LEWIS  
 TIMOTHY G. LIESKE  
 WILLIAM H. LIOGETT  
 BRIAN K. LILLY  
 ANDREW D. LINCOLN  
 LARRY B. LINEBERRY  
 JOSHUA W. LINVILL  
 MATTHEW C. LITVINAS  
 AUSTIN Y. LIU  
 COLE J. LIVIERATOS  
 JUSTIN M. LOCK  
 WILLIAM M. LONGWELL  
 HAROLD C. LOPEZ  
 JACOB J. LOPEZ  
 THOMAS J. LOPEZ  
 THOMAS F. LORENSON  
 AARON D. LOVE  
 CALEB L. OVE  
 RICHARD S. LOVERING  
 MICHAEL P. LOVETT  
 NATHANIEL P. LOW  
 RYAN F. LOWE  
 SHAOHONG LU  
 ROBYN E. LUCAS  
 COREY E. LUFFLER  
 NATHAN A. LUNDE  
 MATTHEW S. LYLES  
 PATRICK V. LYNCH  
 BERNARD A. MABINI  
 JASON M. MACRAE  
 JONATHAN S. MACRAE  
 KEVIN P. MAGUIRE  
 ROSS W. MAHNE  
 JAMES A. MAICKE  
 JESUS E. MALDONADO  
 EDWARD P. MALLUE, JR.  
 JONATHAN M. MANLEY  
 ERIC S. MANN

ASHLEY D. MANOCCHIO  
 HUGO A. MANZO  
 CHRISTOPHER A. MARCANO  
 JOHN M. MARHEVSKY  
 BRYCE M. MARKIEWICZ  
 CAMERON B. MARLOW  
 PATRICK J. MARTIN  
 WESLEY E. MARTIN  
 BENJAMIN MARTINEZ  
 FERNANDO E. MARTINEZ  
 CRAIG M. MASSIE  
 BRIAN M. MATTHEWS  
 GENEVA L. MATTHEWS  
 CHRISTOPHER J. MATTOS  
 MICHELPAUL G. MAURAIS  
 ERIN J. MAURER  
 STEVEN M. MAXWELL  
 CHRISTOPHER A. MAYR  
 JASON M. MAZZELLA  
 ZACHARY W. MCADAMS  
 EAMON G. MCARDLE  
 TYLER A. MCCALL  
 STEPHEN F. MCCARTHY  
 MICHAEL MCCAUGHEY  
 HOWARD L. MCCOLLUM, JR.  
 IAN D. MCCORMACK  
 BRENDAN M. MCCORMICK  
 MATTHEW M. MCCORMICK  
 JACOB N. MCDANIEL  
 JEROME C. MCDANIEL  
 PATRICK M. MCDONALD  
 ANTON M. MCDUFFIE  
 RILEY E. MCEVOY  
 TAYLOR B. MCKAY  
 ERIC D. MCKINNEY  
 MICHAEL P. MCLAUGHLIN  
 KEVIN P. MCMAHON  
 JUSTIN S. MCMILLAN  
 JAMES P. MCNALLY  
 SHAWN M. MCNEIL  
 MICHAEL A. MCQUEENEY  
 JOHN A. MEIER  
 MICHELLE E. MENDOZA  
 WILLIAM P. MERGL, JR.  
 LAUREN A. MERKEL  
 THATCHER H. MERRILL  
 JESSE O. MEYER  
 THOMAS E. MEYER  
 QUINN R. MEYERS  
 DAVID E. MICHELSON  
 MARCUS A. MILLEN  
 DANIEL B. MILLER  
 JAMES I. MINSHEW  
 ANDREW M. MIRALDI  
 MATTHEW B. MITCHELL  
 MICHAEL L. MITCHELL  
 DANIEL P. MIZAK  
 JONATHAN MLEYNEK  
 RAFFI MNATZAKANIAN  
 WILLIAM J. MOELLER  
 CHAFAC N. MOFOR  
 BRIAN T. MOLLOY  
 ADAM L. MOMA  
 BENJAMIN E. MONSON  
 ANDRES E. MONTENEGRO  
 MICHAEL C. MOORE  
 ROBERT E. MOORE  
 ROBERT G. MOORE  
 ROBERT W. MOORE  
 TIMOTHY A. MOORE  
 JEFFREY T. MORGAN  
 IAN R. MORRIS  
 STEVEN T. MORSE  
 VINCENT W. MORTARA  
 NATHANIEL W. MOTILEY  
 ANTHONY P. MUCCIO  
 JACK H. MULARKEY  
 VINCENT P. MULLEN  
 CLEOMAR MUNOZ  
 VICTOR A. MUNOZ  
 BARRETT K. MUNSON  
 BRIAN E. MURAWSKY  
 DANIEL W. MURPHY  
 BOBB W. MYERS  
 JAMES NANCE  
 JOHN M. NANCE  
 JOHN J. NASTUS  
 CHRISTOPHER S. NELSON  
 REBECCA L. NELSON  
 DANIEL J. NEWELL  
 LOGAN E. NEWSOME  
 KHIEM M. NGUYEN  
 TONY E. NICOSIA  
 GLENN R. NIERADKA  
 NATHANIEL NIX  
 JOSHUA T. NOLAN  
 JACOB J. NUSSALLAH  
 DANIEL F. OCONNOR  
 RODERIC J. OCONNOR  
 KEVIN F. ODONAGHUE  
 ANDREW A. OLIVER  
 BOB E. OLSEN  
 WILLIAM P. ONEILL III  
 TAYLOR S. ONEY  
 KEVIN G. ONG  
 ARON M. ORANGE  
 JEFFREY M. ORBAN  
 RYAN B. ORBISON  
 STEVEN J. ORBON  
 AUGUSTIN A. ORDONEZ  
 YANDY OROZCO  
 CHRISTIAN T. ORTIZ  
 BRIAN J. OTTESTAD  
 JASON A. OVERTREET  
 QUINN J. OVERTON  
 JUSTIN V. PADUA  
 BRIAN A. PAGE

AARON S. PALMER  
 SCOTT A. PANCOTTO  
 YOUNGMIN N. PARK  
 RYAN S. PARRISH  
 PATRICK T. PASSEWITZ  
 ASHISH S. PATEL  
 COURTNEY PATERSON  
 NORMAN PATTERSON, JR.  
 ERIK M. PATTON  
 AUGUSTINE H. PAUL  
 SAMANTHA J. PAVOLKO  
 TRAVIS J. PAYNE  
 ANTONIO A. PAZOS  
 GILBERT H. PEARSALL  
 CASSANDRA J. PERKINS  
 ANTHONY E. PERRIZO  
 CHRISTOPHER M. PERRONE  
 NICHOLAS R. PERRY  
 NOLAN J. PETERSON  
 DAVID M. PEVOTO  
 NATHAN D. PFAFF  
 CHRISTOPHER G. PHILPOT  
 RONALD D. PIERCE  
 MATTHEW P. PIERSON  
 CODY S. PILGER  
 ADRIANA M. PIN  
 JARED P. PIPKIN  
 LEVI T. PIPPY  
 DANIEL F. PLUMB  
 MICHAEL J. POCE  
 MARK W. POLLAK  
 ALEXANDER J. POMBAR  
 DANIEL W. POMEROY  
 KENNETH M. PORTER  
 ZACHARY H. PORTER  
 SHAWN M. POTHIN  
 JACOB C. PRESSLER  
 AARON B. PRICE  
 DANNY R. PRIESTER  
 BRADLEY S. PRIVETT  
 JONATHAN D. PROCTOR  
 MATTHEW C. PRYOR  
 AARON M. PUCETAS  
 JEREMY S. PUNDT  
 JONATHAN M. PUNIO  
 BENJAMIN D. PUSZTAI  
 ROBERT R. PUTNAM  
 RAMON QUINONES  
 BRANDEN L. QUINTANA  
 ALEXANDER M. QUITT  
 DALLAS L. RAINEY  
 BRADLEY J. RAKOCE  
 KEVIN RAMIREZ  
 JASON K. RANDOLPH  
 ROBERT L. RAPONE  
 ERIK A. RASTELLO  
 MEGAN S. READING  
 DAVID L. REAL  
 ADAM C. REAMS  
 CHRISTOPHER A. REDDING  
 JOSEPH M. REEVES  
 BRETT T. REICHERT  
 TYLER M. REID  
 MATTHEW R. REINSTEIN  
 ILYAS C. RENWICK  
 CHRISTOPHER J. REYNOLDS  
 DANIEL R. REYNOLDS  
 KRISTOFFER N. RHEINGANS  
 BENJAMIN H. RHODS  
 KATIE L. RICHESIN  
 GORDON T. RICHMOND  
 CONSTANTIN E. RIEGER  
 BRYAN N. RIGGS  
 CALEB L. RIGGS  
 CHRISTOPHER M. RIGGS  
 PHILIP A. RIGLICK  
 IDA S. RILEY  
 ALBERTO RIOS  
 MICHAEL J. ROBEY  
 KYLE J. ROBINSON  
 STEVEN E. ROBINSON  
 ANDREW C. ROCKWOOD  
 JASON A. RODRIGUEZ  
 JUAN J. RODRIGUEZ  
 NICHOLAS A. ROGERS  
 WILLIAM A. ROGERS  
 GULLERMO ROMO  
 ANGEL A. ROSARIOESCOBAR  
 ROBERT G. ROSE  
 GREGORY J. ROSS  
 RYAN B. ROTHCHILD  
 JOSHUA D. RUD  
 PAMELA M. RUSINKO  
 JOHN G. RYAN  
 JEREMY J. SALDANA  
 MICHAEL J. SALLECK  
 MATTHEW B. SAMSON  
 STEVEN R. SANFORD  
 GERARD G. SAPIENZA  
 STEVE N. SARANTOS  
 KENTON B. SATTERWHITE  
 TIMOTHY A. SCHAFER  
 MATTHEW D. SCHILLER  
 MATTHEW B. SCHLOSSER  
 TIMOTHY D. SCHLUCKEBIER  
 KEITH M. SCHNEL  
 ADAM T. SCHOFFSTALL  
 TIMOTHY M. SCHRIEVER  
 STEVEN R. SCHUERMAN  
 FRANCIS A. SCHWAGEL  
 DANIEL B. SCHWARTZ  
 JASON D. SCHWARTZ  
 JONATHAN W. SCHWARZ  
 BRANDON J. SCOTT  
 GEOFFREY W. SCOTT  
 JEFFREY A. SCOTT  
 SHAWN S. SCOTT

BENJAMIN A. SCRIVNER  
STUART F. SEARLE  
ERIC A. SEARS  
STACEY N. SEARS  
JUSTIN B. SEDLAK  
KURT W. SEMON  
RYKER SENTGEORGE  
DEREK J. SENTINELLA  
WILLIAM R. SESKEY II  
CHARLES F. SEXTON  
SHANNE A. SHADEL  
JEFFERY S. SHADWICK  
THOMAS C. SHANDY  
MATTHEW B. SHAW  
JEFFREY L. SHIELDS  
JASON M. SHINAR  
BRYSON W. SHIPMAN  
CATHERINE R. SHUTTERS  
DUSTIN R. SIDDLE  
KONRAD J. SIERSZEN  
KEVIN J. SILL  
JOSEPH T. SIMMONS  
MICHAEL L. SIMMONS  
STEVEN A. SIMMONS  
JOSH L. SIMMS  
ERIC J. SIMPSON  
JEREMY B. SINGER  
JOSEPH A. SINKIEWICZ  
BRANDON P. SIROIS  
MATTHEW A. SKINNER  
MATTHEW J. SKIRPAN  
VLADISLAV A. SKOTS  
MICHAEL A. SKUZA  
SCOTT A. SLOSS  
BRAD E. SMITH  
JUSTIN R. SMITH  
ZACHARY S. SMITH  
SALLY SOMOZA  
QUINN D. SORENSON  
JEFFREY SOTO  
MAXIMILIAN L. SOTO  
JOHN R. SOWDER  
ROBERT M. SQUIER  
CHRISTOPHER J. STACHURA  
KATHTHEA A. STAGG  
GABRIEL S. STAHL  
PHILIP J. STEENSTRA  
STUART J. STEGALL  
DWAYNE A. STEPPE  
NATHANIEL H. STICKNEY  
KYLE D. STILWELL  
DANIEL R. STINNETT  
KYLE R. STRAMARA  
TIMOTHY O. STRUBELL  
BENJAMIN C. STUMPF  
JASON E. STUMPF  
KYLE A. SURRIDGE  
CHRISTOPHER M. SUTPHIN  
ERIC C. SWANSON  
KEVIN S. SWEET  
NOAH C. SWITZER  
CALEB A. TALLENT  
ANDREW J. TALONE  
ANTHONY K. TANKIEWICZ  
NOAH J. TARTAL  
DEREK E. TAYLOR  
JAROD A. TAYLOR  
LUC A. TAYLOR  
STEPHEN P. TAYLOR  
TROY M. TAYLOR  
DEREK K. TELLESON  
ROMAN A. TEREHOFF  
BRYAN R. TERRY  
JOHN R. THIBODEAU  
ANDREW K. THOMAS  
BRANDON A. THOMAS  
ETHAN A. THOMAS  
MERRITT W. THOMAS  
ADAM T. THOMPSON  
DEREK J. THOMPSON  
ADRIAN E. TILSTON  
WILLIAM C. TOFT  
JEFFREY C. TOLBERT  
OWEN T. TOLSON IV  
KYLE A. TOMASINO  
KIRK M. TOOLEY  
MATTHEW A. TORMA  
DEREK P. TORREZ  
KELLAN S. TRAVIS  
ANDREW D. TRESCH  
JEREMY M. TRIMBLE  
STEPHEN K. TRUESDALE  
CONOR E. TRULSSON  
CHI L. TRUONG  
SCOTT TUNIS  
CHRISTOPHER W. TUNNING  
DUSTY S. TURNER  
JONATHAN R. TURNER  
STEPHEN G. TYMINSKI  
KYLE S. UNGER  
DAYNA J. URBANK  
GRANT M. URICK  
JOSHUA A. URNESS  
JESUS URRUTIA  
LANEKA A. VANBORKULO  
DONALD B. VANCE  
ADRIAN B. VANCE  
NENG P. VANG  
DIRK K. VANINGEN  
ANTHONY J. VARELA  
ANTONY V. VARGAS  
HENRY A. VASQUEZ  
JOHN V. VERWIEL  
MATVEY S. VIKHROV  
JAMES A. VILLANUEVA  
MATTHEW R. VISNOVSKY  
BENJAMIN R. VOGELSONG

DAVID M. VOLZ  
BRIAN D. WADDY  
JEFFREY S. WADE  
JASON F. WAIDZULIS  
JAMES G. WAKELAND  
MARK D. WALDEN  
CHRISTOPHER R. WALKER  
CLIFFORD S. WALKER  
DUNCAN G. WALKER  
GREGORY P. WALKER  
WESLEY N. WARD  
ALEXANDER L. WARREN  
KURT R. WASILEWSKI  
ANDREW J. WASSEL  
WILLIAM P. WATTS  
JOSHUA D. WAUCHOPE  
STEVEN J. WAX  
NATHANIEL A. WEANDER  
BENJAMIN N. WEARIN  
DAVID G. WEART  
TREVOR P. WEAVER  
NOAH G. WEBSTER  
MICHAEL WECHSLER  
ROSS M. WEINSHENKER  
NATHANIEL R. WELSH  
ZACHARIE T. WERT  
CHARLES J. WEST  
KYLE M. WEST  
SHAQUELLA S. WHITT  
WILLIAM G. WHITTAKER  
WESLEY A. WIBLIN  
TREVOR WIEGERS  
VINCENT R. WIGGINS, JR.  
JARED D. WIGTON  
MATTHEW E. WILCOXEN  
KEVIN A. WILEY  
JASON F. WILLENBROCK  
CHRISTOPHER D. WILLIAMMEE  
BRIAN T. WILLIAMS  
DANIEL B. WILLIAMS  
EVAN D. WILLIAMS  
GRAHAM H. WILLIAMS  
NICHOLAS T. WILLIAMS  
PHILLIP G. WILLIAMS  
JAMIN D. D. WILLIAMS  
KENNETH G. WILLIARD  
CHRISTOPHER M. WILLINGHAM  
JUSTIN L. WILLIS  
TODD M. I. WILLIS  
ALAN B. WILSON  
ERIC L. WILSON  
WILLIAM D. WILSON  
DANIEL R. WINSTORFER  
BRETT A. WITTERS  
JOSHUA T. WOLF  
TIMOTHY D. WOLF  
DOUGLAS L. WOLFE  
JAMES T. WOLFE  
KENNETH A. WOLFE  
CHRISTOPHER J. WONSETTLER  
GABRIEL L. WOOD  
JENNIFER D. WOODS  
JUSTIN L. WOODWARD  
VINCENT K. WORRELL  
GENE E. WRICE  
BRIAN M. WRIGHT  
TIMOTHY P. WU  
PAUL K. WYATT, JR.  
TRISHA E. WYMAN  
JAMES C. WYNN  
ERIC P. W. YAGER  
KRISTIN R. YAMPAGLIA  
CHRISTOPHER T. YANKEY  
CHRISTINA M. YEAGER  
CHELSEY L. YINGLING  
RODNEY E. YOST  
BRADLEY J. YOUNG  
JENNIFER L. YOUNG  
RANDY J. YOUNG  
TRAVIS H. YOUNG  
BENJAMIN M. YOUROUS  
HARRISON M. ZABELL  
KERRY L. ZANDERS, JR.  
STEVE Q. ZHANG  
D011883  
D012592  
D012872  
D013371  
D013556  
D013559  
D013666  
D013693  
D013733  
G010479

IN THE NAVY

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 captain*

THOMAS A. ESPARZA

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*

JAMAL L. HEADEN

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 P. ARRIGO

JEREMY J. BRICCO  
MATTHEW D. BURCHILL  
JOHN A. BURNS  
SCOTT A. CARPER  
BRYAN R. CHAPMAN  
JASON R. CROW  
JESSE D. DAVIDSON  
BRENDAN J. DOUGHERTY  
MARSHALL J. FUGATE, JR.  
LONDON M. FUHRMAN  
EMILY E. GEDES  
MIGUEL A. GONZALEZ  
WILLIAM A. GORUM  
JEREMY S. HALKIN  
CALVIN S. HARGADINE  
HUGH L. HARRON  
JACOB R. HARTSFIELD  
ANTONIO T. JONES  
BENJAMIN S. KALKWARF  
ALEXANDER M. KINNEY  
GRANT H. LEE  
MARTIN L. LEONARD  
CHRISTOPHER M. LESTER  
DIRK R. LUNDGREN  
MIGUEL A. MALAGONCORDERO  
AARON C. MARCHANT  
JEFFREY S. MCCORMICK  
EDWARD J. MCGUINNIS II  
NICHOLAS M. MEADORS  
BRADLEY T. OTREMBA  
ALBERT J. PERRY  
ADAM J. ROGELSTAD  
DERIK W. ROTHCHILD  
LONDON D. SHARRETT  
KRISTIN L. SHAW  
ZEBULUN J. SHAW  
STEVEN D. SIDERI, JR.  
JOHNNY L. STEVENSON, JR.  
BRETT G. STEWART  
SIAN E. STIMPET  
DIMITRY P. VINCENT  
KRISTOFER L. YOST  
OLIVER C. ZUFELT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

*To be lieutenant commander*

JESSICA M. FERRARO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be lieutenant commander*

VIJAY M. RAVINDRA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be lieutenant commander*

JUSTIN S. HEITMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be captain*

ELISABETH S. STEPHENS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED WARRANT OFFICER FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 6222:

*To be major*

DOUGLAS R. BURIAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

MICHAEL E. FEUQUAY  
JEFFREY A. GARZA  
GREGORY A. GRAYSON  
COLE B. HODGE  
VALERIE N. KYZAR  
ARMANDO J. MARTINEZ  
HEATH E. RUPPERT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

BENJAMIN S. ADAMS  
MATTHEW J. AGNOLI  
TOM E. AGUILAR  
KELLY B. ALLEN  
STEVEN C. ALLSHOUSE  
JUSTIN K. ARCHIBALD  
JASON C. ARMAS  
JONATHAN C. ASHMORE  
DAVID J. BACHTA  
WILLIAM V. BACKLUND III  
JOHN BACON, JR.  
CARL A. BAILEY  
GABRIEL M. BALCH  
JENNIFER P. BALLARD  
ANTHONY P. BALLETTI  
PAUL T. BARTOK  
NATHAN P. BASTAR  
BENJAMIN K. BAYLESS  
MICHAEL S. BEAMES



SCOTT E. BEATTY  
 RICHARD A. BEHRMANN  
 JUSTIN M. BELLMAN  
 JAMES R. BERARD  
 LYNN W. BERENDSEN  
 JUSTIN P. BETZ  
 JOHN R. BITONTI II  
 MARC E. BLANKENBICKER  
 PAUL B. BOCK  
 NICOLE M. BOHANNON  
 BRETT A. BOHNE  
 RYAN T. BRANNON  
 BRIAN K. BRISCOE  
 CASEY M. BROCK  
 DAVID L. BROWN  
 LANCE E. BROWN  
 NEIL H. BRUBECK  
 ARTHUR Q. BRUGGEMAN  
 THEODORE A. BUCIERKA  
 KEITH W. BUCKLEW  
 JOSHUA A. BULLARD  
 SHANE J. BURSAE  
 ALFRED L. BUTLER IV  
 JACOB D. BUTZ  
 LAUCLIN D. BYRD IV  
 MARC W. CALDWELL  
 CORY T. CALLISON  
 CARIN O. CALVIN  
 JOHN F. CAMPBELL  
 SEAN S. CARANO  
 TRAVIS D. CARLSON  
 DANIEL W. CAROFFINO  
 BRYCE W. CARTER  
 JOSE L. CASTILLO  
 MARCELO B. CASTRO  
 JESUS A. CHAPAGARCIA  
 BENJAMIN J. CHAVEZ  
 CARLOS CHAVEZ  
 ALLAN S. CHIU  
 ROBERT M. CHRISTAFORE, JR.  
 MICHAEL P. CICCHI  
 ZACHARY A. COATES  
 RYAN B. COHEN  
 AMANDA A. COLEMAN  
 MICHAEL T. CONTE  
 KEITH S. CRIM, JR.  
 DAVID M. DALBY  
 JASON N. DALE  
 JEREMY H. DAVIS  
 PHILLIP B. DAVIS  
 WILLIAM E. DELEAL II  
 JAMES J. DELIA II  
 CHRISTOPHER J. DENARDO  
 ARTURO J. DERRYBERRY  
 JARROD A. DEVORE  
 GABRIEL L. DIANA  
 ERIK S. DICKERSON  
 JOSEPH R. DIMAMBRO  
 JOHN D. DIRK  
 TRONG M. DO  
 AIXA R. DONES  
 BRIAN J. DONLON  
 DAVID J. DONNELL  
 TIMOTHY R. DRIESLEIN  
 JASON T. DUKE  
 TIMOTHY B. EGAN  
 JON S. ERSKINE  
 TODD F. ESLINGER  
 EDWIN A. ESPINET  
 ALEXANDER X. ESPINOZA  
 CHRISTOPHER Z. ESREY  
 CAMERON P. EVANS  
 SALLY A. FALCO  
 ALEXANDER FARSAAD  
 CHRISTIAN R. FELDER  
 TREVOR J. FELTER  
 DALE R. FENTON  
 DANIEL S. FIUST  
 GEORGE E. FLEMING  
 JAMES D. FLEMING  
 GREGORY K. FLETCHER  
 JULIAN X. FLORES  
 GEORGE J. FLYNN III  
 DAVID W. FORBELL  
 CHRISTOPHER A. FORMAN  
 GARRY L. FRANCIS II  
 JOSEPH F. FRESHOUR  
 BENJAMIN M. FRIEDRICK  
 BRADLEY N. FULTZ  
 THOMAS D. FUSS  
 JOHN L. GALLAGHER IV  
 TODD P. GAY  
 ALEXANDRA V. GERBRACHT  
 ROBERT P. GERBRACHT  
 THOMAS J. GIBBONS  
 FRED GLENCAMP III  
 JONATHAN C. GLOVER  
 JERRY A. GODFREY  
 CHARLES D. GODWIN, JR.  
 JASON R. GOODALE  
 ALEXANDER E. GOODNO  
 MELISSA I. GORDON  
 GEORGE R. GORDY IV  
 BRANDON J. GORMAN  
 MATTHEW J. GRABOWSKI  
 ANDREW J. GRAHAM

CHAD R. GRIMMETT  
 ROBERT M. GROCEMAN  
 MATTHEW J. GRUBA  
 MATTHEW L. HAGER  
 PATRICK M. HAINES, JR.  
 JAMES D. HALE  
 MATTHEW L. HALEY  
 BRADLEY W. HANSON  
 JAY D. HANSON  
 BRADLEY J. HAUSMANN  
 JONATHAN L. HAYES  
 LEE W. HEMMING  
 ANGELA S. HERRERA  
 MICHAEL S. HESTER  
 MARCUS A. HINCKLEY  
 BENJAMIN J. HODGINS  
 BRETT D. HOHMANN  
 TYLER J. HOLLAND  
 ROGER A. HOLLIDAY, JR.  
 JOSEPH C. HORVATH  
 CHRISTINE M. HOUSER  
 JONATHAN C. HOWARD  
 JUSTIN W. HUBER  
 STEVEN R. HULS  
 ALFRED E. HUNTER  
 CHRISTIAN P. HUR  
 ROBERT P. HURST  
 BRIAN P. HUYSMAN  
 CHARLES E. INGOLD, JR.  
 BROGAN C. ISSITT  
 DANIEL P. JAKAB  
 KELLY M. JOHNSON  
 RUSSELL V. JOHNSON IV  
 TROY A. JOHNSON  
 JASON R. JOHNSTON  
 CHRISTOPHER A. JONES  
 JACOB M. JONES  
 CHRISTOPHER A. JULIAN  
 CLINTON C. KAPPEL  
 STEPHAN P. KARABIN II  
 MEGHAN A. KENNERLY  
 CATALINA E. KESLER  
 DAVID S. KIM  
 SUNGWOOK KIM  
 DAVID L. KLINGENSMITH  
 DANIEL P. KNUTSON  
 ANDREW J. KONICKI  
 WALKER C. KOURY  
 SASHA J. KUHLOW  
 TIMOTHY J. KUHN  
 STEPHEN R. KULAS  
 MATTHEW J. KUTILEK  
 KEVIN R. LAMPINEN  
 KENNETH A. LARETTO  
 BRYAN E. LEAHY  
 HO K. LEE  
 THOMAS B. LEE  
 MATHEW K. LESNOWICZ  
 KEVAN D. LEWIS  
 MICHAEL A. LIGUORI  
 JOSEPH P. LOGAN  
 HOWARD L. LONGWELL  
 CLARENCE E. LOOMIS, JR.  
 NICHOLAS J. LOZAR  
 SERGIO H. LUNA III  
 MICHAEL R. LUPIENT  
 MICHAEL F. LYNCH  
 RYAN A. LYNCH  
 BROCK A. MANTZ  
 MARK A. MARKLEY  
 RICHARD D. MARSHALL, JR.  
 ISAIAH G. MARTINEZ  
 JOSHUA J. MAYORAL  
 CHRISTOPHER B. MAYS  
 JOSEPH J. MCMENAMIN  
 TAVIS C. MCNAIR  
 FRANK P. MEASE, JR.  
 JOE M. MEDEROS  
 ANTHONY M. MERCADO  
 BENJAMIN M. MIDDENDORF  
 WILLIAM F. MILES  
 SHAWN A. MILLER  
 TIMOTHY M. MILLER  
 KEVIN A. MISNER  
 JON D. MOHLER  
 MARK L. MONTGOMERY  
 ISAAC D. MOORE  
 SEAN R. MOORE  
 PATRICK H. MURRAY  
 DANIEL R. MYERS  
 SUMMER J. NAGY  
 FREDERIC R. NEUBERT  
 BRANDON H. NEWELL  
 MARK D. NICHOLSON  
 RANDALL L. NICKEL, JR.  
 JAMES W. NOLAN  
 ERIC R. NORTHAM, SR.  
 CHAD A. OBRIEN  
 JOSEPH E. OCONNOR  
 MICHAEL J. OGINSKY  
 JASON M. ONEIL  
 SANFORD C. ORRICK  
 PAGE C. PAYNE  
 CLAYTON R. PENTON  
 BRECK L. PERRY  
 DOUGLAS K. PETERSON

CHRISTIAN J. PFEFFER  
 PAUL D. PFEIFER  
 ZEBULON C. PHILPOTT  
 ERIC W. PICKELSIMER  
 JUSTIN D. POWELL  
 PETER F. PRIESTER  
 JAMES J. PRUDEN  
 BRIAN D. PSOLKA  
 COREY L. PULLIG  
 MATTHEW W. QUIGLEY  
 KERRY R. QUINBY  
 SEAMUS M. QUINN  
 SCOTT F. RAPIN  
 CRAIG Q. REESE  
 MICHAEL J. REGNER  
 ANNA V. REVES  
 PAUL E. REYES III  
 JAMES V. REYNOLDS  
 KEITH W. RICHARDSON  
 MATTHEW T. RITCHEE  
 JOHN L. ROACH  
 BENJAMIN A. ROBLES  
 MICHAEL C. ROCK  
 PAULINA S. ROJAS  
 MATTHEW C. ROMOSER  
 JULIAN D. ROSEMOND  
 KENNETH K. ROSSMAN  
 JAMES M. ROWLETT III  
 AMY B. ROZNOWSKI  
 JUSTIN M. SANDERS  
 KURTIS L. SARGENT  
 FRANK A. SAVARESE  
 JONATHAN D. SCHAAFPSMA  
 BENJAMIN M. SCHNEIDER  
 MARK D. SCHOUTEN  
 JOEL C. SCHUMACHER  
 BRIAN W. SCHWEERS  
 RAYMOND J. SCOTT, JR.  
 ROBERTO SCRIBNER  
 SCOTT G. SHADFORTH  
 KEVIN D. SHEPHERD  
 CHRISTOPHER D. SHORE  
 THOMAS F. SHORT  
 TODD N. SHUCK  
 ROBERT E. SHUFORD  
 CHARLES S. SIEDLECKI, JR.  
 ARLON D. SMITH  
 TIMOTHY J. SMITH  
 MICHAEL SMYCZYNSKI  
 DAVID P. SNIPES  
 JOHN F. SOTO, JR.  
 WILLIAM R. SOUCIE  
 CHRISTOPHER J. STARK  
 ERIC N. STARR  
 KEVIN J. STEPP  
 RICHARD J. STINNETT, JR.  
 ERVIN R. STONE  
 NATHAN J. STORM  
 CHRISTOPHER D. STORY  
 RUSSELL A. STRANGE  
 THERESA P. STREBEL  
 GEORGE A. SWEETLAND, JR.  
 ERIC P. TEE  
 ANDREW E. TERRELL  
 KHALILAH M. THOMAS  
 RYAN E. THOMPSON  
 DANIEL L. THUNEN  
 ANTHONY A. TILLELLI  
 AN K. TRUNG  
 CHRISTOPHER S. TSIRLIS  
 THOMAS B. TURNER  
 MICHAEL L. VALENTI  
 JEFFERY VANBOURGONDEN  
 JOHN E. VAQUERANO  
 DAVID J. VENETTOZZI, JR.  
 JON K. VONSEGGERN  
 ANNA M. VOYNE  
 BRIAN D. VUKELIC  
 BENJAMIN P. WAGNER  
 KATHRYN E. WAGNER  
 ETHAN D. WAITE  
 ROBERT J. WALKER  
 STEVEN L. WALKER  
 WILLIAM R. WALLACE  
 BRENDAN M. WALSH  
 SCOTT W. WARMAN  
 PAUL M. WEBBER  
 DANIEL A. WEBER  
 RYAN P. WELBORN  
 LIZETTE G. WELCH  
 KARL C. WETHE  
 RONALD WHITE, JR.  
 BRAD E. WHITED  
 RODNEY G. WILSON  
 ARON K. WISHERD  
 LUCAS M. WOOD  
 JAMES M. WOULFE  
 SEAN B. WRIGHT  
 MICHAEL D. WYRSCH  
 SHAYNE P. YENZER  
 TAYLOR N. YOUNG  
 RICHARD V. YUDT, JR.  
 JAY M. ZARRA  
 DAVID Z. ZARTMAN  
 MANUEL O. ZEPEDA  
 CARL L. ZEPPEGNO