



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 5, 2018

No. 92

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.

Holy One, Light of Light, You continue to reveal Yourself to us. Because You know our thoughts before we think them, we lay before You our lives to be purified and strengthened by the power of Your Spirit. Lord, prepare us to absorb the fragrance of Your forgiveness, as we trust You to keep us from stumbling or slipping.

Today, use our lawmakers for Your glory. May they be salt and light to this generation. Give them the knowledge and wisdom to startle the world with the confidence of their hope in You and with the generosity of their love.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The majority leader is recognized.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, yesterday, the Senate advanced the nomination of Robert Wier to serve on the Eastern District Court of Kentucky by a vote of 90 to 1. This was a needless delay, but I look forward to confirming this well-qualified nominee later this morning.

Next, the Senate will turn to Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., the President's selection to be a U.S. district judge for the Southern District of Texas. Mr. Rodriguez is a graduate of Yale and the University of Texas. He earned recognition for his tireless efforts to combat human trafficking. His peers praise his work ethic and his knack for tackling complicated issues.

President Trump continues to send us impressive judicial nominees with sterling qualifications. I would urge all of my colleagues to join me in voting to promptly confirm this slate.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Now, on another matter, Madam President, the Senate took a major step forward on behalf of our national defense. After years of harmful spending caps undermining the combat readiness of our armed services, we brokered a 2-year spending agreement that included the largest year-on-year increase in defense funding in 15 years. This significant accomplishment laid out a roadmap to deliver on the promises we make to our warfighters. Now it is time to take the next step and authorize the programs that are most needed. That is why the Senate will soon be turning to the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act.

Each year, reviewing the President's budget request provides an opportunity to hear directly from our Nation's military leaders about their needs. Months of hearings and markups allow Congress to direct resources and authorize programs, equipping our brave service men and women to confront emerging challenges.

The Armed Services Committee should be commended for their earnest, bipartisan work this year. The legislation they have produced is strong.

Following our agreement that eliminated harmful and arbitrary caps on

defense spending, this legislation will add to the process of untying our commanders' hands. It authorizes \$716 billion for national defense, enough for the Department of Defense to implement the national defense strategy and replenish and modernize America's fighting forces—as long as we meet our overall responsibility and pass the Defense appropriations bill later this year.

This authorization would expand our capabilities on the sea and in the air, provide long-term certainty and support for our All-Volunteer Force, renew oversight efforts, streamline personnel management, modernize acquisitions, and eliminate duplicative and wasteful programs. It sends a clear message that we have our warfighters' backs. How fitting, then, that it is named for our colleague, Senator McCain—a stalwart champion for our service men and women if this Chamber has ever seen one.

I look forward to discussing this legislation at length in the coming days.

JOB CREATION AND THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC

Mr. McCONNELL. Now, on a final matter, Madam President, I spoke yesterday about the new job opportunities flooding into the U.S. economy. It is all thanks to the ingenuity of American workers and job creators, with an assist from Republican policies.

Just this year, more than 1 million new jobs have been created, more than 3 million new jobs since January of 2017. The unemployment rate has sunk to 3.8 percent. It hasn't been that low in 18 years. In a big shift from the deeply uneven Obama era, communities all across America are getting in on the action. Rural areas led the whole Nation in relative job creation last year. Let me say that again. Rural areas led the whole Nation in relative job creation last year. Republicans are proud of the historic tax reform and

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2973

dramatic regulatory reform that helped make that happen.

In addition to these nationwide policies, we are also delivering targeted strategies to help the specific communities that have suffered the most.

In many parts of the country, including my home State of Kentucky, the Obama-era economic lag has intertwined with another major problem: the opioid epidemic. By one estimate, in 2016, more than 2 million Americans—2 million—were addicted to opioids.

This crisis that is shattering families and communities is not an isolated medical issue. There is a reason experts describe many of these fatalities as “deaths of despair.” It is, in part, a symptom of declining opportunity and communities literally falling apart. Recent studies suggest that opioid use increased the most in precisely the communities where employment rates have fallen the most, particularly in the manufacturing sector.

Complex problems demand comprehensive solutions, and that is exactly what this Congress will continue to deliver. We are attacking this from all angles. In a strong bipartisan fashion, we passed the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act and the 21st Century Cures Act to bolster prevention, treatment, and law enforcement. I recently introduced the CAREER Act to help recovering addicts find jobs and stable housing to get back on their feet, and the Senate allocated billions in resources for treatment and prevention on the frontlines.

The robust Federal response is helping our first responders and professionals combat the dangers of abuse, but, as is always the case, major challenges are rarely solved here in Washington. Congress can provide resources and support to vulnerable communities, but often we do the most good by getting government’s foot off the brake and letting American innovators get back to business.

For example, I recently heard some great news from one private sector problem-solver in my home State of Kentucky. In my hometown, US WorldMeds has spent the last 15 years working to bring relief to millions of Americans touched by opioid addiction. They have been working on introducing a medicine in the United States to help ease the symptoms of withdrawal. Just last month, we got word that they have received FDA approval. US WorldMeds’ CEO, Breck Jones, believes this nonnarcotic medicine can help more addicts kick the habit altogether.

I had the opportunity to visit US WorldMeds’ facility last year. I was so impressed by what I saw. Now that team can scale up their efforts and begin getting their treatment into the hands of Americans whose lives it could help transform—all of it made easier when Washington offers targeted support where it is needed but mostly gets out of the way of the innovators. Talk about a winning combination.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert Earl Wier, of Kentucky, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, over the past few weeks, we have all endured the increasingly novel legal theories dreamt up by the President and his lawyers regarding the special counsel’s investigation into the Russian interference in the 2016 election.

Over the weekend, we learned the President’s lawyers wrote a memo that asserted unfettered authority over all Federal investigations. Rudy Giuliani actually suggested that the President could have “shot James Comey” and not been indicted or prosecuted because, according to him, “in no case can [the President] be subpoenaed or indicted.” Is that incredible?

The President himself tweeted yesterday that he had the absolute right to pardon himself and that the appointment of the special counsel was unconstitutional, despite the fact that he regularly called for a special counsel to look into Hillary Clinton during the 2016 campaign. The two-facedness, the hypocrisy of saying Hillary should have it but, no, it is unconstitutional now that it applies to him—how can the American people tolerate that kind of thinking in a President? This morning, again, President Trump faulted Attorney General Sessions for recusing himself from the probe instead of helping to end it.

The President’s tweet regarding Attorney General Sessions this morning is part of a pattern where the President

admits out loud and shamelessly that he was trying to take steps to end the Russia probe. First, in a television interview, the President admitted that stopping the Russia probe was his motivation for firing Director Comey. Now he says he would never have hired Sessions if he had known he was going to recuse himself, even though recusal was required by Department of Justice rules.

This latest stunning admission is just more evidence that the President may have something to hide. If he did nothing wrong, President Trump should welcome a thorough investigation to exonerate him.

Each of the claims that I have mentioned has the same theme: That the President believes he is above the law. Of course, we know the idea that anyone in America is above the law is antithetical to the very idea of America, antithetical to the very idea of democracy, and antithetical to what millions of Americans have fought for and hundreds of thousands—millions—have died for in the course of our history. We don’t have a King. We have a President, bound by the same Constitution and the same laws that govern the average American citizen.

The Founding Fathers didn’t set out to create a monarchy; they set out to construct a system of government entirely distinct from the monarchies of their time. That is why they installed checks and balances and devolved power between three branches to ensure the liberty of the people and guard against the encroachment of tyranny. That was their great gift to us, and their ideas have kept American democracy alive for two and one-half centuries and the admiration of the world for an equal period of time. Trump is besmirching all of that with his recent activities.

So despite what the President and his allies may feel about his authority or his absolution from legal repercussions, the Constitution and the founding principles of our country tell us he is dead wrong. President Trump: We are not a monarchy. You are not a King. We are a constitutional democracy, so act like it.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Madam President, on another matter, this week the Senate is processing a number of judges. Some of these judges are noncontroversial. As I have said in the past, Democrats are committed to working with the majority to process these noncontroversial nominees, but there are several highly controversial nominees after this slate that bear attention.

Tomorrow, the Senate Judiciary Committee will consider the nomination of David Porter for the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, despite the fact that Senator CASEY has not returned a blue slip on Mr. Porter, who was nominated by the White House over the home State Senator’s repeated objections. Mr. Porter, like so many of the nominees submitted by this President,

is far outside the judicial mainstream. Throughout his career, he has maintained affiliations with anti-LGBT organizations and expressed personal views that are contrary to the interests of American workers—the very people President Trump defends: the American working people. He appoints judges who undo their rights, their opportunities, their ladders up. This is an example. Unfortunately, the majority is, once again, bucking a century-old tradition of respecting the opposition of home State Senators and moving forward with the consideration of yet another hard-right, anti-working class ideologue.

On Thursday, the Judiciary Committee will consider the nomination of Ryan Bounds for a circuit court seat in Oregon, although neither Senator WYDEN nor Senator MERKLEY, the two Senators from Oregon, have returned a blue slip on his nomination. Recently, we learned that Mr. Bounds had some rather offensive writings that he failed to disclose to the bipartisan Federal Judicial Selection Advisory Committee established by the two Oregon Senators to recommend potential nominees. Nonetheless, of course, the Republican majority, prodded on by the hard-right ideologues, is moving ahead with his nomination, over the tradition of the blue slips, over these recent revelations.

Next week, the Senate will likely move to the pending nomination of Thomas Farr to the Eastern District of North Carolina, currently the longest vacancy in the United States. Part of the reason the State seat has remained open for so long is because Republican Senators blocked an Obama nominee, Jennifer May-Parker, for nearly 3 years. With Mr. Farr's nomination, we have another example of a vacancy that only exists because Democrats recognized and respected the blue-slip tradition—a tradition the Republicans have so unceremoniously discarded.

Not only has Mr. Farr spent his long legal career working against the rights of unions and the rights of workers to organize, Farr has demonstrated himself to be a partisan.

After challenging multiple congressional maps drawn by North Carolina's Democrats, Mr. Farr vigorously defended the most recent maps drawn by North Carolina's Republicans which, in fact, were overturned by the Supreme Court for discrimination. Mr. Farr also defended North Carolina's restrictive voter ID law passed by the Republicans, arguing that voter ID was a "minor inconvenience" for voters. Might I remind my colleagues, this is the same voter ID law that the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals determined was passed with "discriminatory intent" and which "targeted African Americans with almost surgical precision." Those are the Fourth Circuit's words, not mine. That is whom we are putting on the bench—people who support laws that blatantly discriminate against people of color. What are we

coming to in this country? Where are our ideals when it comes to picking people for the bench? I am sure they can find conservative folks who don't have these kinds of egregious pieces of behavior.

I have long argued that we should judge our judges on three metrics: excellence, moderation, and diversity. By dint of his legal career in defense of partisan Republican issues, Mr. Farr clearly lacks moderation and is even willing to defend the most strident attempts by North Carolina Republicans to game the congressional maps and make it more difficult for minorities to vote.

I will strongly—strongly—oppose his nomination, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

THE ECONOMY

Finally, Madam President, on the economy, during the 8 years of President Obama's term, Democrats worked to turn the economy around, to dig our country out of the recession, and get back to growing the economy and the middle class. Now that Republicans are in charge, their policies are almost the reverse.

Instead of focusing on the middle class and those struggling to get there, Republicans have elected to turn over the keys to big corporations and the superwealthy—their benefactors. Instead of trying to bring down the cost of everyday items, Republican economic policies have driven up the costs of things like healthcare and gasoline. By sabotaging our current healthcare system, President Trump and Republicans have caused insurance rates to increase by double digits across several States. Yesterday, insurers in the States of Washington and New York both announced an average rate increase of about 20 percent, similar to double-digit increases in Virginia and Maryland. Americans were already struggling with the high cost of healthcare before these increases. Republican policies have only made these problems worse.

What about gas prices? By pulling out of the Iran deal and failing to get tough with OPEC, President Trump has contributed to the increase in gas prices. He hangs out and seems to be friendly with the Crown Prince, head of the UAE, even President Putin. Why isn't he jawboning them, his so-called friends, to help the average American family not have to pay increases in the high price of gas?

President Trump was quick to blame President Obama when gas prices went up. Well, what is good for the goose is good for the gander. American families are now paying over \$3 for a gallon of gas in many places, and prices are expected to continue to rise over the summer.

Meanwhile, as costs go up for the middle class, in many, many cases far outweighing any break they got on the tax bill, corporations and the rich are reaping a windfall from the Republican tax bill. Listen to this. So far, in 2018,

corporations have announced plans to spend more than \$450 billion in corporate stock buybacks, a maneuver that directs profits into the pockets of wealthy executives and shareholders but does little for workers. Even Republican Senator MARCO RUBIO has said that "there's no evidence whatsoever" that the corporate tax cut Republicans passed last year is overwhelmingly benefiting workers."

In a nutshell, this is the new Republican economy: a bonanza for the corporations and the rich, higher costs for everybody else. In November, the American people will get to decide if they want a government that works on their behalf or more of the same top-down, trickle-down policies that have failed time and again—and are failing once again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN-LED CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I want to take just a few minutes to talk about the last 18 months and what a Republican-led Congress has done during the first 500 days of the Trump administration.

I heard my friend the Democratic leader call this a Republican economy, and I am proud to embrace that for the reasons I will mention here in just a moment and contrast that to life in America postrecession, in 2008, where slow economic growth, high unemployment, and a disproportionate number of people not even seeking work were accepted as the new norm.

The American people understand they don't have to accept that as the new normal—that we can aspire to better, and we can do better, and that is exactly what we have seen manifested in the American economy. The rank-and-file American worker, every American family, and everybody in this country—regardless of race, ethnicity, whatever identity you might want to talk about—have benefited.

There have been many accomplishments, but perhaps the greatest, as I said, is the new energized state of the economy. There is a sense of hope and optimism once again. We can see that reflected in people's retirement accounts mainly invested in the stock market. The stock market has boomed since the Trump election, and that is not just for the big corporations. That is for the teachers, the pension funds, the firefighters, the first responders—for average Americans who invest their retirement savings in mutual funds or in the stock market—and they have benefited.

The unemployment rate has reached a 48-year low—a 48-year low—and 14 States have hit record low unemployment as well.

My friend from New York talked about gasoline prices. Oil output jumped to the highest on record in March, including a 4-percent increase in production in my home State. In

other words, we are depending less and less on imported oil from Saudi Arabia and Middle East countries, which have been the focus of our geopolitics for so many years because they have been the main source of the energy that drives the world economy, and now we are producing more of that here in America. That means more jobs and more national security right here at home.

Consumer confidence is at a 17-year high. People are feeling optimistic and hopeful about the future. Nearly 3 million jobs have been created since President Trump took office, including 304,000 in the manufacturing sector, 337,000 in construction, and 223,000 in May alone.

What I hear time and again when I go back to Texas is employers saying: We are having a hard time finding the workers we need because there is so much demand for workers, for laborers, that now employers are having to compete for the workforce they need in order to perform the jobs they have now, as a result of the growing economy. What does that mean? It means that paychecks go up as there are labor shortages, and employers have to compete more for that workforce. Sixty-seven percent of Americans believe that now is a good time to find a quality job.

The biggest challenge we have, given the rapidly evolving nature of our global economy and of technology and the jobs that are being created, is to train and equip the workforce of tomorrow for the jobs that will be available. That is why we have invested so much money in our community colleges and workforce training, in partnerships with industry—to make sure that more and more people can qualify for those good, well-paying jobs.

I am thinking about a single mom, a Hispanic woman in Amarillo, TX, who worked as a jail guard—until she went to Amarillo community college and learned how to be an aircraft mechanic. Today, she works on the production line for the V-22 Osprey tiltrotor aircraft, one of the most advanced air platforms in the world. My recollection is that she is making \$18 an hour now. That is a real solution for a real problem, and I bet every Member of this Chamber could talk about similar stories.

In Houston, as a result of the natural gas renaissance in this country—thanks to the science, thanks to the creativity and innovation of the American energy companies—we are now seeing a huge influx of petrochemical companies reestablishing themselves in places where they can get access to low-cost feedstock fuel. What that is doing is creating even more jobs.

In the Pasadena Unified School District and around the Houston area, they are working with San Jacinto community college to help people who don't yet have the skills they need get the certificates they need in order to qualify for those good, well-paying jobs. Not everybody needs to go to a 4-

year liberal arts college. If they want to, I am all for it. But many people want to get a good job, enjoying the solid middle class, and do jobs that need to be done. They need access to training in order to get the qualifications they need. That, to me, is one of the big challenges that confront us, particularly as the economy changes so quickly because of technology.

Another big reason the economy has taken off like a rocket is the tax reform package we passed last summer. That has been perhaps the biggest game changer. The problem my friend the Democratic leader has is that every single Democrat voted against it. Remember, NANCY PELOSI called the benefits of that “crumbs.” What it has done is open doors and new opportunities for American families.

According to the White House, American families will receive \$3.2 trillion in gross tax cuts, and they have seen the child tax credit double. The top corporate rate was lowered from 35 to 21 percent so that American businesses could be more productive.

When President Obama talked about the need for America to be more competitive by lowering that corporate rate, he talked about our need to compete in the global economy. When we debated the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, Democrats called it a corporate giveaway. That is absolutely indefensible.

The results of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act have been profound, indeed. More than 500 companies have used these tax savings to benefit their employees. They have announced pay raises, 401(k) match increases. There have been cuts to utility rates for seniors and people on fixed incomes because investor-owned utilities have had to lower their charges in order to comply with the law, which allows them a reasonable rate of return. They can't charge what the market will bear; they need to comply with their local laws. So what we have seen is that many investor-owned utilities have lowered utility rates for seniors and people on fixed incomes.

We have seen other businesses offer substantial bonuses and other benefits. A recent survey by the National Association of Manufacturers showed that 77 percent of manufacturers in America intend to increase hiring, and 93 percent of them have a positive outlook.

One of the things President Trump talked about during his campaign was that so much of our manufacturing had moved overseas. But what these numbers indicate is that the manufacturing sector is alive and well here in the United States when given the opportunity to compete on a level playing field.

This is the kind of optimism I am hearing when I visit places like College Station, Austin, and Amarillo, home of the Big Texan 72-ounce steak. If you can eat it in an hour, along with a baked potato, you can get the meal for free. I didn't try that, but some people do, and some people get the free meal—

but not a lot of people, would be my guess.

In Austin, I visited with one of the owners of Wally's Burgers and met with other small businesses—pest control companies and the like—and they talked about the benefits they are seeing in their small businesses from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. The stories just go on and on and on.

I have also had constituents write to my office, explaining how the boost in their monthly paychecks is making a big difference when it comes to buying groceries, paying bills, and starting long-delayed projects. Maybe no Democrat voter lives paycheck to paycheck, but I can tell you, some of my constituents do, and they appreciate the additional money in their paycheck as a result of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

I think what happened, when our Democratic colleagues unanimously voted against the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, they were making a big bet that we would fail to deliver that bill, and it would somehow be an embarrassment and setback for this side of the aisle. Well, they bet against the American people, and they bet against our commitment to make sure the benefits of this bill would be delivered to the average American family.

In one recent piece of news, Costco, which has ten locations in Texas, announced they would be increasing wages for 130,000 employees, not because the government mandated it but because they need to do that in order to be competitive, and they are passing the benefits on to their employees. But that is just the tip of the iceberg.

Amidst all of this good news, we also need to remember that there are two specific targeted measures that are often overlooked. It repealed ObamaCare's burdensome tax on the middle class, who refused to purchase Washington-mandated health insurance. This is the so-called ObamaCare mandate. It basically was a tax on poor and middle-income people who couldn't afford to buy the high-price ObamaCare policies.

We also opened up something that has been a point of contention for many, many years—the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to energy exploration.

Senator SCOTT from South Carolina talked about his Opportunity Zone provision, which provides tax benefits to businesses that start a business and grow a business in poor and blighted areas. Senator FISCHER from Nebraska talked about her tax provision, which provides encouragement to employers to provide family leave when families need that in order to deal with a family illness or a newborn child or whatever the case may be.

Those are real and tangible benefits to the people we serve. And our colleagues want to talk about corporate giveaways? That is pure demagoguery, short and simple. What else do you have when you have made a bet and you lost that bet by betting against the benefits from this bill?

It is not just the economy that deserves mention; another important accomplishment has been the confirmation of judges who will interpret the Constitution faithfully and say what the law is, not what, because of their personal policy preferences, they wish it might be.

In a former life, I served on the bench—the State bench, not the Federal bench—for 13 years at the trial court level and on the Texas Supreme Court. I believe very strongly in the importance of having judges—that third branch of government—who will understand and appreciate their role in the U.S. Government. In other words, the reason we don't elect judges is because we don't expect them to gauge public opinion. The reason we don't expect them to campaign on an agenda—we expect them to interpret the law, including the Constitution of the United States, the fundamental law, not to promote policies based on their preference or based on some ideology. To me, that is the opposite of what we want judges to do.

The Trump administration has seen confirmed 21 circuit court judges. These are the intermediate appeals court judges who essentially are the court of last resort for most cases since the U.S. Supreme Court now only hears about 80 cases a year. They provide the guidance in the most difficult cases, where the circuit courts are divided.

This now means that one in eight appeals court judges has been appointed by President Trump and confirmed by the U.S. Senate. These are people who will serve not just 4 years, not just 6 years, not just 8 years, but perhaps 20 years or 30 years or longer—a lifetime tenure. These circuit courts will hear appeals from district courts that set binding precedent for those lower courts on a wide range of issues.

It is worth pointing out that President Obama's 21st circuit court nominee was not confirmed until 33 months into his administration. So it is not just that we are confirming good judges; we are doing it at a very good clip, comparatively speaking.

The President has appointed and we have confirmed two judges to the Fifth Circuit who serve the State of Texas—Don Willett, a former justice on the Texas Supreme Court, and Jim Ho, the former Texas solicitor general. We have one in the queue who has been voted out of committee, Andy Oldham, the counsel to our Governor, who has been nominated to the Fifth Circuit. And that is not to mention some very talented district judges, the people who are at the ground level of our civil justice system, people like Karen Scholer and David Counts. We hope to have one more Federal district judge confirmed before the end of this week—Fernando Rodriguez, whom Senator CRUZ and I recommended to the President and he has nominated.

The other major accomplishment of this administration over the last 18 months is repealing burdensome over-

regulation from the previous administration. Many of these regulations were passed by the Obama administration as they were heading out the door, without a real opportunity for public input and review. We have repealed a historic number—16 of them—using the Congressional Review Act. Previously, there had been only one example where Congress had repealed a regulation using the Congressional Review Act.

Thanks to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, we have also repealed something that was a bullying tactic by the Federal Government. This was a scheme by the previous administration to use guidance from Federal agencies where they didn't pass a rule, where they were required under the law to gain input as part of that rulemaking process. So what they would do is they would issue guidance. You can imagine how that was treated by people in the private sector. They didn't want to have to defend a lawsuit, so they grudgingly complied with the guidance even though there wasn't any process and input from the public on what that guidance should be. Thanks again to our colleague Senator TOOMEY, we have successfully repealed those sorts of quasi-regulations, as well, using the Congressional Review Act.

Our use of the Congressional Review Act has been referred to as the most ambitious regulatory rollback since Ronald Reagan.

As I talk to people, the job creators in our country, they tell me that not only has it been the tax cuts, but it has been the regulatory rollback and it has been the signal that Washington is sending that businesses small and large will have more freedom to pursue their ends, their dreams, without the wet blanket of government regulation.

President Trump has also used his executive branch pen to issue 22 deregulatory actions for every new regulatory one. These are big wins, including for our farmers and energy producers.

On top of that, when it comes to ObamaCare, one of the aspects of ObamaCare was something called the Independent Payment Advisory Board. We repealed that in our budget agreement earlier this year, which will allow seniors and their families to take greater control of their healthcare decisions without being subjected to the whims of unelected bureaucrats.

What "unelected bureaucrats" translates into is "unaccountable bureaucrats." In other words, if you don't like what the bureaucrat is doing, you have almost no recourse, and that is by design in this Independent Payment Advisory Board. When it comes to your healthcare, you want to maintain your ability to petition your representatives if you feel the government is not treating you correctly, which this Independent Payment Advisory Board eliminated.

A fourth major accomplishment is providing relief to our community and midsized financial institutions, which

have been hit hardest by some of the one-size-fits-all rulemaking approaches under Dodd-Frank. We all remember that Dodd-Frank was a response to the financial crisis of 2008, followed by the great recession. Congress, as it often does, went too far. The pendulum swung too far and affected our community banks and credit unions. I tell my community bankers in Texas: You weren't the target, perhaps, but you were the collateral damage.

We want small businesses and working families to succeed. We want them to get access to credit, the credit they need in order to succeed. Regulating community banks out of business is not the answer.

This bill was sponsored by the senior Senator from Idaho, Mr. CRAPO, and was passed on a bipartisan basis. This bill, which just passed the House, is a big win for smaller financial institutions, and it will make it easier for them to serve their communities by approving mortgages, providing credit, and lending to small businesses. This isn't mainly a win for the small banks; this is a win for their customers, for the small businesses and individuals who need access to the credit they could not get under the status quo.

Another thing that we have done recently which I think bears note—unfortunately, so much happens in Washington, and it seems like every 15 minutes there is breaking news, and sometimes we overlook and don't celebrate these great victories, in this case on behalf of our veterans. We have been accomplishing a lot for our servicemembers and veterans. Last year, we helped restore America's defense with the greatest investment in our military in 15 years and largest troop pay increase in 8 years.

We have a bad habit here in Congress: After we have fought a war, we begin to think we can cash the peace dividend. We start to think, OK, now the world is safe, and now we can roll back our money spent on national security. Unfortunately, the world continues to be a dangerous place, and the world needs American leadership. Unfortunately, that is expensive, but there really is no option because if we don't have peace, if we don't have stability, none of the other benefits of life—liberty and the pursuit of happiness—can exist.

Getting back to our veterans, we passed the VA MISSION Act in the last couple of weeks, which will make significant reforms to the Department of Veterans Affairs, strengthening the healthcare and community care options that are available to American veterans. This bill provided \$5.2 billion for the Veterans Choice Program. For example, if you are a veteran and you call to make an appointment and they say "Well, come see us in August" and you can't wait, or if you have to drive 100 or 200 miles—and in the Rio Grande Valley in South Texas, if you really need to go to the veterans hospital, you have to drive all the way to San

Antonio to get your healthcare—what the act did and what we passed on a bipartisan basis allows veterans a choice. You can go see a local healthcare provider, and you can go to a local hospital if they can provide that service quicker and more efficiently.

We also provided for expanded caregiver assistance. This is a big deal. The times I have been to Walter Reed visiting Texans who were injured in Afghanistan or Iraq, frequently that injured servicemember had a spouse or family member who basically would have to give up their job in order to take care of their injured spouse. It is only right and it is only just that we provide expanded caregiver assistance to those individuals who do that.

Finally, we have seen a crackdown on imported illegal drugs. As of April, the Border Patrol had seized 284 pounds of fentanyl—already greatly surpassing the total amount seized in fiscal year 2017. I don't have to repeat what a devastating impact the opioid crisis—prescription drugs or the alternatives, which are heroin and fentanyl—has had on our communities.

These are just a handful of ways we are doing what the American people elected us to do. We put money back in their pockets. We rolled back regulations. We strengthened our military. We have given healthcare flexibility to our veterans. We protected our communities from harm. The best part of this story is, we are just getting started.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 95, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 113 Ex.]

YEAS—95

Alexander	Burr	Cornyn
Baldwin	Cantwell	Cortez Masto
Barrasso	Capito	Cotton
Bennet	Cardin	Crapo
Blumenthal	Carper	Cruz
Blunt	Casey	Daines
Booker	Cassidy	Donnelly
Boozman	Collins	Durbin
Brown	Corker	Enzi

Ernst	Klobuchar	Sanders
Feinstein	Lankford	Sasse
Fischer	Leahy	Schatz
Flake	Lee	Schumer
Gardner	Manchin	Scott
Gillibrand	Markey	Shaheen
Graham	McCaskill	Shelby
Grassley	McConnell	Smith
Harris	Merkeley	Stabenow
Hassan	Moran	Sullivan
Hatch	Murkowski	Tester
Heitkamp	Murphy	Thune
Heller	Murray	Tillis
Hirono	Nelson	Toomey
Hoeben	Paul	Udall
Hyde-Smith	Perdue	Van Hollen
Inhofe	Peters	Warner
Isakson	Portman	Warren
Johnson	Reed	Whitehouse
Jones	Risch	Wicker
Kaine	Roberts	Wyden
Kennedy	Rounds	Young
King	Rubio	

NOT VOTING—5

Coons	Heinrich	Menendez
Duckworth	McCain	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

Mitch McConnell, Tom Cotton, Roger F. Wicker, John Cornyn, Thom Tillis, Orrin G. Hatch, Roy Blunt, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Richard Burr, John Thune, Joni Ernst, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Steve Daines, Chuck Grassley.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 114 Ex.]

YEAS—94

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

NAYS—1

Hirono

NOT VOTING—5

Coons	Heinrich	Menendez
Duckworth	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 94, the nays are 1.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for such time as I may consume.

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

MAKING PROGRESS TOGETHER

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I am so proud to be here. This is my first time speaking on the Senate floor, and because I represent the great State of Minnesota, I thought I would do the polite thing and start out by properly introducing myself.

I came to Minnesota right out of business school, just married, with my husband Archie, in a beat-up orange car, and with a ton of student loans. Most people who have never been to Minnesota know us for our weather, but we have a thriving business community with a number of Fortune 500 companies, and I got my start working for one of them: General Mills.

The winters were every bit as cold as we had heard, but Archie and I fell in love with Minnesota anyway and, before long, we put down roots. We have two sons, Sam and Mason, and instead of just building a career, suddenly we were building a life.

I am so glad Archie and my dad Harlan, whose 88th birthday is this Saturday, could come to Washington to cheer me on today.

So that is the story of how I became a Minnesotan. The story of how I wound up in the Senate really starts in 1990. I had left General Mills and started a small business that I ran out of our house. Sam was 3, Mason was 1. It was a busy, exciting, and happy time for us.

My parents had raised me to believe that if you are truly going to be part of a community, it is not enough to just pay your taxes and keep your lawn nice and say hi at the grocery store. You have to find a way to get involved in civic life. When I was young, they had been involved in local politics. So I looked around the community, where Archie and I had decided to raise our kids, and saw we had a State senator who was really out of touch with the values my neighbors and I shared. Not only that, but there was a young, energetic candidate running against her, and he had young kids, just like we did.

In those days, campaigns tended to put their focus on traditional neighborhoods with single-family homes. I guess the idea was that if you own your own home, that probably means you are old enough to be likely to vote and invested enough in your community to really care about what is happening, but a lot of my neighbors lived in apartment buildings, and they had a lot to say about how they thought things were going, and frankly they were kind of tired of being ignored. As I have always seen it, if you really listen to people, you will find that everybody has a story worth hearing, everybody has a problem that is worth working to solve, and when it comes to making big decisions in the community, everybody deserves a seat at the table.

So I packed up the stroller with Sam and Mason, and we went off to organize in the apartment buildings. People were surprised to see me, but I had a great time. I got to know my neighbors, asked a lot of questions, listened to their answers, and we built relationships. The guy I was organizing for became the first Democrat to win that seat in a decade.

After that, I stayed involved in campaigns and issues I cared about, especially when it came to women's issues. My dad had been on the board of Planned Parenthood in Ohio, and I got a chance to work for Planned Parenthood in Minnesota.

Then one day I got a call from the mayor of Minneapolis, R.T. Rybak. He had been in office for a few years and was working on a whole range of challenges, starting with an epidemic of violence among young people. R.T. is a really creative thinker, and he thought that if I could bring my business experience to the position of chief of staff, we could do some good work together. I was intrigued, so I made the leap.

It was one of the best professional decisions I have ever made. I loved the

challenges of that job. Later, I held the same job for the Governor of Minnesota, Mark Dayton.

Then one day, to my utter shock, Governor Dayton asked me to run with him and serve as Lieutenant Governor. I will be honest. That took a little bit of getting used to. When it comes to public service, I have always been a lot more comfortable with the service part than the public part, but that job involved a lot of the same skills I used in my business career: building relationships, looking for new solutions to old problems, creating coalitions to get things done, and it involved one of my favorite parts of politics, which is listening to people's stories.

A lot of times, when a big, powerful politician walks into a room full of people, everybody kind of clams up and waits for him to say what is on his mind. After all, that is why people came and, at the end, maybe he has time for a couple of questions before he has to run off to the next event, but there is rarely a chance for a real conversation.

This is where being kind of a low-key person works to my advantage. I would come into coffee shops or community centers or even people's homes, and I would introduce myself and ask people questions: What is going on with you? What have the last few weeks been like for you? What keeps you up at night? That is when people really start to open up.

You know, it is one thing to go around the table at a forum and have someone say "healthcare is my big issue," but when you are in someone's living room and you are drinking their coffee—and we love coffee in Minnesota—you have met their dog, you get the chance to hear stories like this:

I just went to visit my mom in a nursing home. She is 40 miles away. With the kids in soccer and karate and the school band, I am just so busy, I only get there a couple of times a month. The nurses are great, and they work so hard, but they only stay there for 6 months at a time because they get hired away by a big hospital system that can pay them more. So I worry that my mom is never going to get the same nurse for more than 6 months at a time. I wish there was some way these nurses could get paid more so they don't have to leave.

I can't tell you how much these conversations mean to me, and so, when I was Lieutenant Governor, I made Minnesotans' living rooms my office, and I spent as much time as I could just talking to people. I have always found that when you ask people what they think and then you really listen to what they say, instead of just waiting for the answer that you were expecting, that is when you start to get a sense of what you can do to improve people's lives.

Now that I have this opportunity to serve the people of Minnesota in Washington, I am so focused on the issues that they tell me about when I am sit-

ting in their living rooms, around their family pictures, and talking about what is happening to them.

The thing that keeps coming up in these conversations is a very simple but a very powerful idea; that is, freedom. In this country, you are supposed to have the freedom to build the kind of life you want—and not just the freedom but the opportunity. If you are putting in 16-/18-hour days and still struggling to make the rent and put food on the table, let alone pay for childcare or if you have a child who doesn't want to go to a 4-year college and you have no idea how he or she is going to find a decent job out of high school or if someone in your family is sick and the cost of medicine is blowing a gaping hole in your budget, well, then you are not getting that opportunity, are you? You don't have that freedom.

Minnesotans who aren't getting that opportunity, who are being denied that freedom, deserve to have a voice here in Washington, and that is the kind of Senator I want to be.

So this is the story of how I came to be here and what I want my work here to be like, but I am also well aware of the way the story sometimes gets told here in Washington, and it is not actually a story about me at all. Sometimes I am barely a character in the story.

Instead, it is a story about a man who held this seat before me, a man I consider to be a good friend and a champion for the progressive values that brought me into politics, or maybe it is a broader story about how we should hold powerful men accountable for their actions and about the hope so many of us have that this moment represents a turning of a tide. I get that. I understand that.

My presence here in the Senate will always be seen by some as a symbol of a broader conversation we are having in this country today about the experience of women, so I want to give my perspective about that and say my piece about where I hope this conversation goes.

My grandmother, Avis, was born in 1898. This is Avis here, standing in the background with a cigarette in her hand. She was 17 years old when the suffragettes crashed Woodrow Wilson's inauguration and demanded franchise, and she grew up to be the president of a small community bank in rural Indiana at a time when such a thing was unheard of. Avis didn't seize the bank in a hostile takeover or anything; her father owned the bank. He had three daughters, so the only way for him to keep that bank in the family was to pass it on to them. When he did that, instead of handing it over to their husbands, what my grandmother and their sisters did was they went ahead and ran that bank themselves.

Avis's daughter, my mother Chris, was 33 years old the year that *Griswold v. Connecticut* was decided, confirming that married women had the right to

contraception and thus to control their futures. But when mom graduated from college a few years earlier, the options for women were still pretty limited. My mom wanted to be a journalist, but her father told her that she had better come out of school prepared for a career that would allow her to take care of herself. Back then, that meant she could be a teacher, a secretary, or a nurse. Mom picked teacher.

We lost my mom not quite 2 years ago to Alzheimer's. She was such an inspiration to me, and I think she would have been an incredible journalist. But mom didn't sit around and feel sorry for herself. Just like her mother before her, she was a fighter, and she figured out how to make the best possible life for herself and for the people she loved, no matter what the constraints anyone else tried to put on her.

As for me, I was 16 the year *Roe v. Wade* was decided. I grew up in a time of incredible progress for women, and with women like my mother and my grandmother in my family tree, I believed it when my mother and father told me that I could do whatever I wanted to do when I grew up, which isn't to say that I didn't notice the way the world worked.

It is interesting. I graduated from business school in 1984. That year, the big story among MBA types was about Mary Cunningham. Mary was a brilliant woman. When she graduated from Harvard Business School, the dean had said she might someday become Harvard's first female graduate to become chairman of a noncosmetic company. That is what passed for a compliment back then. Indeed, she went on to become one of the first women who had ever held a senior leadership role in a Fortune 100 company. But that is not why she was famous. Mary was famous because of gossip that she had slept her way to the top of the corporate ladder. That was the context for young women like me when we started in business.

I remember that my graduating class in business school was about one-third women, and we all dressed like men—suits and white shirts and red power ties. We were dressing in a world where women could dream of professional success, but the best way to do that was to pass like a man.

I have been fortunate in my career and in my life. I have always been surrounded by strong women and thoughtful men. I don't have a horror story to share like the ones we have heard from so many women in the "me too." movement or the millions of similar stories that have gone unheard simply because the men in those stories weren't famous. But when you really listen to women, you begin to understand the million little ways in which all women are made less and denied the opportunity to contribute to their communities and their country.

The day that Governor Dayton announced he was appointing me to fill this Senate seat, I stood next to him feeling proud and excited and ready to

serve the people of Minnesota. Why not? Here I was, with a graduate degree, having worked at General Mills and started my own company, having managed 34,000 people and a multibillion-dollar budget as chief of staff for the Governor and served as Lieutenant Governor. Then a reporter raised his hands and he asked: "So, do you think you'll be able to do this?" Like a lot of women, I brushed it off. You learn to deal with stuff like this.

The indignities are one thing, but there are also injustices that are holding women back, and a lot of them start with the policies that get made right here in Washington. There is the stuff that gets a lot of attention, like trying to defund Planned Parenthood, which millions of women rely on for healthcare, rolling back women's access to basic reproductive services, and standing in the way of equal pay for equal work. Then there is the stuff that you only really understand when you listen to the realities in women's lives. The high cost of childcare isn't a woman's issue per se, but who winds up having to drop out of the workforce when a family can't afford childcare? Women do. The high cost of prescription drugs isn't a woman's issue per se, but who winds up shouldering the responsibility of caring for aging parents? Women do. Just last month, the conservative majority on the Supreme Court decided that employers should be able to force workers into signing mandatory arbitration agreements that prohibit them from going to court when they are mistreated. That isn't a woman's issue per se, either, but millions of women who are sexually harassed or abused in the workplace lost their ability to seek justice in the process.

All of these things add up to a world in which women are unfairly denied that freedom I was talking about earlier—the freedom to build the kind of lives they want. We may have moved past the days when that freedom depended on your father or your husband, but much of it still depends on what we do here in Washington, and we are letting too many women down.

You don't have to be a woman to care about these problems or to be part of the solution. In fact, Senator Franken led the fight to ban those mandatory arbitration clauses when he was serving in this seat. But the fact is, a lot of these problems have endured because women haven't had a seat at the table here in Washington.

I am the 51st woman to take the oath of office as United States Senator, but we have had 50 different Senators named Charles—and I mean no disrespect to my minority leader. Put another way, nearly half of all the women who have ever served in the United States Senate are serving right now. You can slice and dice these numbers a million different ways. They are all sobering. But it is changing. Since I took the office, my friend from Mississippi became the Senate's 52nd-ever woman

and the 27th Smith. So instead of my place in the Senate reminding people of all the ways in which women have been held back from contributing in our country, I want it to be a reminder of the contributions women can make when we have the freedom to do so.

One of the best things about my time here so far has been getting to know the other women in the Senate. Some of us are very progressive Democrats, and some of us are very conservative Republicans, but we get together once a month, and we listen, and we talk to each other, and we find a lot of common ground.

My friend LISA MURKOWSKI and I have something in common. It turns out we both worked on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline on the North Slope of Alaska. I know I don't look like somebody who worked on a pipeline, but after high school, I joined the union and spent a summer working in the kitchen—a kitchen in a construction camp on Prudhoe Bay. It was only an entry-level job—I wasn't allowed to touch anything hot or sharp—but it was an interesting summer, and all these years later, it gave LISA and me something to talk about. Once we started talking about that, we found ourselves talking about something else we have in common: We both are really concerned about the fact that kids in rural communities don't have access to the mental health services they need. We have both met with too many parents and too many teachers who worry that kids are slipping through the cracks. So we decided to team up, and now we have a bipartisan bill to bring mental health professionals in the National Health Service Corps into more schools so more kids can have access to services.

The truth is, when women are empowered to contribute more fully, we all benefit. We have seen it in our economy for the last generation. We are seeing it in our politics, as women drive the resistance to policies that hurt working people and leave our children vulnerable to gun violence. We are seeing it more and more here in the Senate. I am so proud to be a part of that.

I know that I am going to always be known in part for the circumstances that brought me here, but I will tell you what I told that reporter when he asked whether or not I thought I could handle this job: Do not underestimate me.

I believe that, as a woman and as a progressive and as a Minnesotan, I have a lot to contribute to this body, and I am so ready to do that work. I intend to stand up to this administration when it attacks the values I believe in, but I am also ready to listen, to learn, and so ready to work with anyone who wants to expand freedom and opportunity for women and men across this country.

I believe we can find ways to work together and make some progress for the people we represent. And I will tell

you something else: I believe we can actually enjoy doing it. I know that is not a trendy thing to say. I know we are supposed to come here and immediately start complaining about how broken everything is, how horrible the other side is, and how much we hate these jobs that we spend all this time and money campaigning for. I have to say, I don't get it. I think it is so amazing that we get to go out and talk to people about their lives and then bring their ideas and their concerns to the table here in Washington and try to figure out how to make progress for them.

I grew up out West, in New Mexico. In fact, Senator UDALL and Senator HEINRICH tell me I am the only Senator currently serving who was born in New Mexico. Our town was informally divided into two parts, and mine was one of the only White families in our neighborhood, which was mostly populated by Hispanic families who had been there for generations. Most of the kids I grew up around spoke Spanish at home. So from a very early age, I grew up with this sense that everyone around me had something different to offer.

My parents sent me to the public school in our neighborhood, and my school, frankly, lacked some of the resources that the schools where more of the White kids went had. So my parents got involved. My dad joined the school board, my mom volunteered, and they both devoted part of their lives to making things better. Do you know what? They loved it. They loved doing that work.

I was raised to believe that the world is full of people who share the same hopes and dreams but have very different experiences and perspectives and that part of being a good citizen is to go out and listen to those different experiences and perspectives and do your part to help and that it can even be fun.

Maybe that is why Minnesota was the right place for me to go into public service. Minnesotans really love doing the hard work of democracy. We vote in higher numbers than anyone else. We love talking about the issues of the day in the checkout line of the supermarket, along with the weather, which we really love talking about. We almost always elect people who enjoy working to protect people's lives, to improve people's lives, and there is no better example of that than my friend and senior Senator, AMY KLOBUCHAR. She is effective because she doesn't buy into the cynicism. She really believes that by listening to people and working hard to make a difference for them, progress is possible, and she proves it every single day. The same was true of my predecessor, Senator Franken, who brought not just wit but heart and passion to his work. It has been true for a long line of Minnesotans, from Hubert Humphrey and Walter Mondale to Paul Wellstone and Dave Durenberger.

The other thing you learn when you spend a lot of time listening to Min-

nesotans is just how hard they are willing to work to create opportunity for their families. They deserve a Senator who will work just as hard on their behalf, and I am not just ready to do that, I am excited to do that.

I know there will be some rough days here in the Senate, but what an honor to have the chance to do this work alongside all of you. With my mother and my grandmother beside me, I am so thrilled to be here, and I am full of hope about the progress we can all make together.

Thank you.
I yield the floor.
Mr. ALEXANDER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). 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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, all postcloture time on the Rodriguez nomination be considered expired at 2:15 p.m. and the Senate immediately vote on the nomination; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid on the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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 12:43 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.
The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Ex.]

YEAS—96

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

NOT VOTING—4

Coons	Heinrich
Duckworth	McCain

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Annemarie Carney Axon, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

Mitch McConnell, Thom Tillis, John Cornyn, John Kennedy, Richard Burr, Mike Lee, David Perdue, Steve Daines, James Lankford, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jeff Flake, Lindsey Graham, Patrick J. Toomey, Marco Rubio, Tom Cotton, James E. Risch.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Annemarie Carney Axon, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator

from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 11, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 116 Ex.]

YEAS—84

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

NAYS—11

Gillibrand	Menendez	Stabenow
Harris	Merkley	Warren
Hirono	Peters	Wyden
Markey	Sanders	

NOT VOTING—5

Coons	Heinrich	McCain
Duckworth	Isakson	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 84, the nays are 11.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Annemarie Carney Axon, of Alabama, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Axon nomination postcloture.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I see nobody else seeking the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 10 minutes as in morning business.

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

FORCED FAMILY SEPARATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, for those of us who read history, we know that throughout history, including at times in our own country many years ago,

the forcible separation of families was used as an instrument of terror.

I struggle to imagine a more damaging and inhumane governmental policy than to forcibly and needlessly tear children away from their parents. For decades, the United States has rightly led the world in condemning such practices as flagrant abuses of government power and human rights.

Yet, today, in an extraordinary breach of our most basic values, the Trump administration is now regularly employing these very tactics. It is true that some children were separated from their parents during the previous administration. I vocally and forcefully opposed it then, because I believed and I am still convinced that there are alternatives that are far more humane and effective than the tearing apart of families.

But the family separation we are seeing today is so vastly different both in purpose and in scope than what occurred during the Obama administration. There is no comparison. Separation is no longer limited to narrow circumstances where it is arguably in the best interest of the child. Separating children, even infants, from their parents is now being carried out as a blanket policy. It is frightening. This disturbing policy is happening by design.

The Trump administration's decision to criminally prosecute every adult who arrives at our border without documentation establishes a de facto family separation policy that is going to rip thousands of innocent children away from their loved ones. The administration's claim that this policy is necessary to deter illegal border crossings rings hollow. The administration has also separated families who follow the rules and lawfully present themselves at ports of entry with claims of asylum. They are asking for asylum.

There is simply no way we can sanitize the cruelty of this policy. The anguish we are inflicting is evident in the story of each parent who is losing a child. Let me tell my colleagues a couple of those stories.

Here are the words of Maria, who was separated from her children, ages 7 and 2, just last month when she sought asylum at the San Ysidro Port of Entry.

She said:

[A]t about 8 a.m. they called just my two children and I went out and they said, "Miss, only they are going." . . . [T]he officer said, "They are here for them. Can the little one walk?"

"Yes," I told the officer.

"Let him down," they told me.

The older one took his hand and they started to walk. Then they turned around to look and when they saw that I was not going after them, they cried.

I will tell another story, the ordeal of another mother with two sons, age 4 and 10. She is seeking asylum from El Salvador.

I was only given five minutes to say goodbye before [my sons] were torn from me. My babies started crying when they found out we were going to be separated. It breaks my heart to remember my youngest wail, "Why

do I have to leave?" . . . My youngest cried and screamed in protest because he did not want to leave my side. My oldest son was also confused and did not understand what was happening. In tears myself, I asked my boys to be brave, and I promised we would be together again soon. I begged the woman who took my children to keep them together so they could at least have each other.

This is a description from a father seeking asylum at the San Ysidro Port of Entry:

I was told I was going to be separated from my son. I suffer from high blood pressure and felt as though I was having a heart attack. . . . I feel like I was in shock and do not remember what happened next or even how I got to the detention center after that. All I can remember is how much my son and I were both crying as they took him away.

The anguish inflicted on these parents and children at the moment they are separating is excruciating. For those of us who are parents, it is inconceivable, but it is just the beginning. Parents are given limited information—sometimes none at all—about where their children are being held, in whose care, or for how long. Some have begged the courts for information, frustrating judges who know little more than the parents. Some are deported while their children remain in unknown locations in the United States. Pediatricians describe the trauma that can be inflicted on these children as toxic stress. It results in lasting damage to a child's health.

Who here would tolerate such a thing if it were happening to American children? Who would defend such an abhorrent practice that was happening in another country—say, Russia or any other country? None of us would. We would condemn it.

But all of this lays bare the ugly truth about the true intent of this policy: to strike fear into the hearts of families who are seeking refuge from gang violence, chaos, murder, and rape in their home countries. The message could not be clearer: If you try to seek refuge in the United States, which is your right under international law, if you seek your right, if you seek refuge, if you seek the right you have under international law, we in America will punish you and punish your family because you are not welcome here.

This policy unquestionably flouts our domestic and international legal obligations. Worse, it flies in the face of who we are. In the past, we have shown the world that protecting our homeland is not incompatible with providing refuge to the vulnerable. We have proven that being a nation of laws is not antithetical to being a country of compassion. We have demonstrated that our unmatched power is derived in part from how we treat the most powerless among us. But President Trump's policy abandons our principles. Actually, it abandons our identity as a moral beacon for the world.

Republicans and Democrats must speak with one voice to condemn this cruelty. Family separation is no more a Republican policy than a Democratic

policy. It is neither. It is an un-American policy.

The United States, this great country that beckoned my maternal grandparents to come to the United States and Vermont, or my great-grandparents, paternal grandparents to come to the United States and Vermont—this great country must not be seen as terrorizing children to score political points. That is beneath the greatness of the United States. It is wrong. It is abhorrent. We must not be seen as pursuing policies with the intent of inflicting pain and anguish on vulnerable people, on children.

I hope Senators of both parties with join me in condemning this outrageous practice of forced family separation. We are a nation that is better than this. We have always thought of ourselves as better than this. Well, it is time we acted like we are better than this.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE REPUBLICAN-LED CONGRESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, the May jobs report came out last Friday, and here are some of the headlines.

This is from Bloomberg: “U.S. Payrolls Rise 223,000; Jobless Rate Matches 48-Year Low.”

This is from CNN: “Unemployment rate matches lowest point in half a century.”

From the New York Times: “We Ran Out of Words to Describe How Good the Job Numbers Are.”

In other words, the May jobs report was more good news for American workers. The economy created 223,000 jobs in May. The unemployment rate dropped to 3.8 percent—the lowest rate since April of 2000. That is right. The last time unemployment was this low, the iPod hadn’t even been invented.

When the Republican-led Senate passed tax reform in December, there were estimates that this historic legislation would create nearly 1 million jobs for the American people. Well, the economy has already created more than 1 million jobs since tax reform was passed and 3.6 million jobs since President Trump was elected. The Republican pro-growth, pro-jobs agenda is working.

Government cannot create prosperity. It can’t create the jobs and opportunities that Americans need for a secure economic future. Only businesses can do that. But government can create the conditions for economic prosperity. It can make sure businesses are free to create jobs and opportunities by making sure they are not weighed down with burdensome taxes and regulations.

As everyone knows, the economy stagnated during the last administration. Recovery from the recession was historically weak. Wages were stagnant, and opportunities were often few and far between. A big reason for that was the fact that businesses large and

small were weighed down by burdensome regulations and an outdated Tax Code. So when President Trump took office, Republicans and President Trump made reversing our economic decline a priority. We rolled back burdensome regulations, and in December, we passed a historic reform of our Tax Code.

Before the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the Tax Code was not helping businesses grow and create jobs. In fact, it was doing just the opposite, and that had real consequences for American workers. A small business owner struggling to afford the hefty annual tax bill for her business was highly unlikely to be able to hire a new worker or to raise wages. A larger business struggling to stay competitive in the global marketplace, while paying a substantially higher tax rate than its foreign competitors, too often had limited funds to expand or increase investment here in the United States.

So when it came time for tax reform, we set out to improve the playing field for American workers by improving the playing field for businesses as well. To accomplish that, we lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small- and medium-sized businesses, farms, and ranches. We lowered our Nation’s massive corporate tax rate, which up until January 1 was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. We expanded business owners’ ability to recover investments they make in their businesses, which frees up cash that they can reinvest in their operations and their workers. We brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century so that American businesses are not operating at a disadvantage next to their foreign competitors.

Now we are seeing results. Company after company has announced higher wages, better retirement benefits, bonuses, increased investment, new jobs, and more.

A recent survey from the National Association of Manufacturers reported that 77 percent of manufacturers plan to increase hiring as a result of tax reform, 72 percent plan to increase wages or benefits, and 86 percent report that they plan to increase investments, which means new jobs and opportunities for workers. Meanwhile, a recent survey from the National Federation of Independent Business reports that 75 percent of small business owners think the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will have a positive effect on their businesses.

The Republican economic agenda is working, and Republicans are going to keep working to ensure that American businesses can thrive and that American workers have access to the jobs and opportunities they need for long-term economic security. While we are doing that, we are also going to continue to focus on the rest of the work the American people elected us to do. As I have said before, Congress can walk and chew gum at the same time.

While we have been laser-focused on removing obstacles to economic growth

and job creation, we have also accomplished a lot of other things so far this Congress.

By the end of the Obama administration, our Nation’s military was facing a serious readiness shortfall. So this year we made the most significant investment in our military in 15 years, and we are going to continue to make sure that the men and women of our military have the resources they need to meet and defeat the threats of the 21st century. We recently passed legislation that makes much needed reforms to ensure our veterans have access to the healthcare they need, when and where they need it.

We also took action to preserve healthcare for children in need by enacting the longest extension of the Children’s Health Insurance Program in history, and we repealed ObamaCare’s burdensome individual mandate which forced many, many Americans to buy health insurance they didn’t want or couldn’t afford.

We passed legislation to fight sex trafficking, to combat opioid abuse, to help community banks, to increase school safety, to keep energy affordable, and more. Of course, we confirmed a number of highly qualified judges to fill vacancies in our judicial system.

Republicans are working to honor the trust the American people have placed in us. We are fighting to make life better for hard-working Americans. We have accomplished a lot so far this Congress, but we know there is a lot more work to be done. We are up to the challenge.

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

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

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

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

REFUGEE CRISIS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, history is a great teacher, if you learn your history. The history of the United States, when it comes to refugees, is a checkered history.

Back during World War II, there were people who came to the borders of the United States and begged for our mercy, begged for our help. Nine hundred of them were on a ship called the *SS St. Louis*. They were Jews who came from Europe seeking refuge in the United States from the Nazis. Sadly, the United States turned them away. Several hundred of them were forced back to Europe and died in the Holocaust. On the floor of this U.S. Senate, a Democratic Senator from New York,

Robert Wagner, offered a measure to allow 10,000 Jewish children to come to the United States during World War II and escape the possibility of imprisonment and death during World War II in the Holocaust. That measure was defeated on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Those children were denied refuge in the United States.

Toward the end of the war, things started changing. Our policies became more open. We started accepting more people, but the record had been written. During the darkest days of World War II, the United States virtually closed its borders to those who were trying to escape Nazi terror.

After World War II, we decided we were wrong, that we had made a mistake, and that the United States would demonstrate to the world that we did care about those who came to the United States as refugees and those who came from other countries seeking asylum. We wrote an amazing history after World War II. When you think of the many different nations that turned to us when they faced the worst circumstances imaginable, you think about what happened in the United States.

The Cuban population escaping communism in Cuba, where did they come? They came here, and you can still find them. You can find them all over the United States but especially in Florida, near Miami, in New Jersey—but everywhere. The Cuban Americans have made an amazing contribution to this country. They came as refugees, but they became real Americans. In fact, they love this country so much so that I believe three of our Members of the U.S. Senate are Cuban Americans today.

That is quite a story, but it is not the only story about refugees coming to this country. You could add to that litany of people who came the Vietnamese after the end of the war in Vietnam, the Soviet Jews who escaped persecution in Russia to come to the United States, and the list is long. It includes refugees from all over the world who came to this country.

Now, we don't just open our doors and say: Walk in and make yourself at home. We ask questions. We do background checks. We do everything we can to be sure the person coming is the person they say they are and that they will be safe for the United States.

Over the years, the number of refugees we accepted on an annual basis went up to 80,000 and 100,000, and the United States developed an international reputation—a reputation for caring for people who were in the worst circumstances who came here looking for refuge. I run into refugees, their families, their children, and their grandchildren every single day. They have made a great contribution to our country, and we have made a great model for the world when it comes to accepting people who are in the worst, most terrifying circumstances.

That is about to change. We are in the process now of facing the worst ref-

ugee crisis in the history of the world in so many different places, and the United States, instead of maintaining this image and this model of accepting refugees from other countries, under President Donald Trump, has decided to do just the opposite. It would cut in half the number of refugees we would clear, review, interrogate, and accept in the United States each year to 45,000, which is the official number, but in actuality only about 14,000 have been accepted so far in the few months of this year. It is an indication we will not even reach 45,000.

There is something going on as well when it comes to those who seek asylum or refuge in this country that is equally horrifying and objectionable. The Trump administration has decided to discourage those who would come to our borders looking for safety by telling mothers who bring their infants and children that those children will be taken away from them by the Government of the United States when they arrive at our border. It is hard to imagine, but that is the stated policy now of the Trump administration. It is a cruel policy. It is not a policy consistent with American values.

Since our Nation's tragic failure during World War II to help Jewish refugees fleeing Adolph Hitler, generations of Americans have tried to set an example for the world by providing a safe haven to the world's most vulnerable people. Now we face the worst refugee crisis in the history of the world, with more than 65 million people around the world displaced from their homes, but the Trump administration is admitting the fewest refugees since World War II and going to extreme lengths to prevent victims of war and terrorism from seeking asylum in the United States.

So far this year, about 15,000 unaccompanied children have been apprehended at our southwest border. This is not necessarily a crisis in a nation of 325 million people, especially at a time when we are asking friendly nations—our allies in the Middle East—to do much more in accepting refugees.

The real crisis that gives cause to people showing up at our southern border asking for asylum can be traced to three countries—Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala—the so-called Northern Triangle. These countries in Central America have among the highest homicide rates in the world. Young girls face a constant threat of sexual violence with little or no protection. That is why families are doing desperate things, taking extraordinary risks to come to our border and ask for protection. Is there any parent who would not do the same to save their child?

How has the Trump administration responded to this refugee crisis on our border? They are trying to discourage families from fleeing to our borders by separating parents from their children. In March, we learned in my office in Chicago about a 7-year-old girl and her mother who came from the Democratic

Republic of the Congo. I have been there. It is a land of terrible massacres, barbarism. It is a land of violence. The Democratic Republic of the Congo had these two, a mother and daughter, come to our shores. They were separated for 4 months—a 7-year-old girl from her mother.

I asked the Department of Homeland Security inspector general to investigate this. Why would we separate a 7-year-old girl from her mom who is coming from the Congo seeking protection? Well, at the time, the Trump administration said: We don't separate families. That was the official statement at the time.

Last month, Attorney General Jeff Sessions announced that the separation of children from their parents was a new “zero tolerance” approach, and now family separation has become the official policy of the Government of the United States of America. In just the first 2 weeks of this policy under Attorney General Sessions, 658 children have been impacted.

White House Chief of Staff John Kelly says separating families is “a tough deterrent” to parents who are fleeing persecution, and he dismissed any concerns because “the children will be taken care of—put into foster care or whatever.”

Well, our Nation's leading medical experts disagree. The American Academy of Pediatrics and the American Medical Association have condemned this official policy of the Trump administration separating families in immigration detention. Here is what the President of the American Academy of Pediatrics said:

Separating children from their parents contradicts everything we stand for as pediatricians—protecting and promoting children's health. In fact, highly stressful experiences, like family separation, can cause irreparable harm, disrupting a child's brain architecture and affecting his or her short- and long-term health. This type of prolonged exposure to serious stress—known as toxic stress—can carry lifelong consequences for these children.

The Trump administration has been taking some heat, deservedly, for separating families. In typical fashion—no surprise—they have decided the real cause of the problem would be the Democrats. Just this morning, President Trump tweeted: “Separating families at the Border is the fault of bad legislation passed by the Democrats,” but the law he is talking about wasn't passed by the Democrats. It is the bipartisan Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act, which was passed by unanimous consent in the Senate and was signed into law by Republican President George W. Bush. President Trump has his facts wrong again.

This law has nothing to do with the separation of families. Instead, it ensures the United States meets its international obligations to protect unaccompanied children seeking safe haven in our country. It was a response to concerns by Republicans and Democrats that children apprehended by the

Border Patrol were being returned to countries where they might be further persecuted or killed.

Under this law, unaccompanied children from the Northern Triangle countries I mentioned earlier are transferred to the Department of Health and Human Services and placed in deportation proceedings, giving them a chance to make their case to a judge as to why they are seeking protection in America.

Consider “Samuel” and “Amelie,” who are siblings, ages 3 and 6, from Honduras. They are 3 and 6. When they arrived in the United States, they were traumatized and refused to speak. After months of counseling, Amelie revealed that both children had been raped by drug cartel members. Without the protection of this law which the President condemned this morning, these children would have been returned to Honduras and almost certain exploitation or death.

Two weeks ago, there was a hearing on unaccompanied children in the Senate Immigration Subcommittee which I serve on as a ranking member. We examined the administration’s claim that the law the President objects to is being exploited by gangs. Here is what we learned:

Unaccompanied children undergo multiple screenings and background checks when they present themselves at the border, and the law gives the government the authority to place any unaccompanied child in a secure facility if there is any notion of a threat. Since the year 2012, 6 years ago, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection has processed more than 250,000 unaccompanied children. Of those, how many were confirmed or suspected of affiliation with the MS-13 gang that the President talks about nonstop? Sixty. It was 60 out of 250,000—60 over 6 years, which is 10 a year, fewer than 1 a month. The President says we have to separate these kids because of drug gang worries. I don’t want a single member of any gang anywhere admitted into this country, period. For goodness’ sake, 250,000 children and 60 over a 6-year period were confirmed or suspected of affiliation with MS-13? Instead of stoking fears, we should focus on preventing unaccompanied children from being recruited by gangs.

Sadly, the Trump administration’s budget is slashing funding for the Office of Refugee Resettlement, the government agency that is responsible for these important gang prevention efforts.

At our hearing, we also discussed the conditions in the Northern Triangle countries in Central America that are driving families to flee to our border. If people were migrating because of the so-called legal loopholes, which we hear so often about from this administration, they wouldn’t be just coming from three countries; they would be coming from all over the region, but we learned more than 90 percent of the unaccompanied kids referred to the De-

partment of Health and Human Services are from three nations—the three of the Northern Triangle.

Instead of addressing the root causes that are driving migration from these countries, the Trump administration is making the situation on the ground worse. The administration’s budget request for the region would slash aid by more than one-third, and the administration is terminating the temporary protected status for two of these countries—El Salvador and Honduras, forcing many people to return to them even though these countries are clearly unstable.

Last year, the administration also ended the Central American Minors Program, which permitted children from the Northern Triangle to apply for refugee resettlement from their home country. We said to mothers with their babies and their infants: Don’t make this dangerous journey. If you are in danger in your home country and want to seek asylum or refuge in the United States, make the application from where you are before you have to make that journey. Unfortunately, that came to an end with the administration’s request to stop the program.

There are many issues to come before the American people but few that have stoked emotions more than this issue. The notion that the United States of America—over 300 million good and caring people—would make it an official policy to separate these infants and toddlers and children from their mothers and fathers is not American. It is extreme, it is mean, and it is cruel. Sadly, it is the official policy—the so-called zero-tolerance policy that has been announced by Attorney General Sessions.

We learned a bitter lesson back in World War II. We ignored the realities of human suffering. People across the world asked: What is going on in America? What are their values? After that war, we tried to make it clear what we do stand for, the things that are clearly important, and now this administration has decided we can no longer afford to do that. We have to separate children from their mothers, separate them by thousands of miles, put them into foster care, remove them from their mothers, even if that parent qualifies for protection here in the United States under our laws of asylum.

This is a sad and cruel policy. I hope Americans across the board will stand up and speak up. We are a better Nation than this.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BIG BANKS AND THE SECOND AMENDMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I rise today because, in my judgement, we are in the midst of a deeply troubling trend regarding banking and the Second Amendment. I know that seems a bit strange. What does banking have to do with the Second Amendment? I have wondered that myself. Allow me to explain.

We have 120 million gun owners in America. Like those Americans, I am alarmed by the activist anti-gun policies unveiled by the “we are smarter than you” financial elites who run two Wall Street banks: Citigroup and Bank of America. They have a political agenda, and those banks’ political agenda stands to hurt many small businesses in my State of Louisiana that are going to lose their banking services simply because these small businesses choose to exercise their constitutionally protected Second Amendment rights.

On March 22 of this year, Citigroup issued a press release. That press release detailed how Citigroup will penalize banking clients who follow Federal, State, and local gun laws. Citigroup’s new policy will tell businesses what kinds of firearms they can stock, what kinds of accessories those small businesses can stock in their stores, and who they can sell them to. I thought this was America.

This new policy has already taken effect all across Citigroup, and it has impacted hundreds of small businesses, institutional clients, and even their credit card partners.

Not to be outdone, 2 weeks later, Bank of America joined in. On April 10, Bank of America announced that it will no longer loan money to businesses that, in its opinion, are “deplorable” because those businesses manufacture legal semiautomatic rifles. Targeting firearms owners and business owners is not only an affront to responsible, law-abiding, constitutional gun owners across this country; it is a threat to the sanctity of our very Constitution and the Second Amendment.

I realize that the management of these two banks have a constitution whose bill of rights jumps from one to three, but I can assure them that in the Constitution read by the rest of America, there is a Second Amendment.

I have written to both the chief executive officers of Citigroup and Bank of America about my concerns, and they have yet to respond. I understand that Mr. Brian Moynihan, the CEO of Bank of America, is actually here in Washington lobbying folks on Capitol Hill this week. I suppose he was too busy to come by and address my concerns. Once again, I invite him to come by my office and speak about this in person.

I can’t overstate the gravity of this issue. It is important for consumers and businesses all across America. Both Citigroup and Bank of America are considered by the U.S. Government to be “systemically important banks.”

That means they are too big to fail. That is why the American taxpayers had to bail them out in 2009.

The American taxpayers, many of whom Citigroup and Bank of America now condescend to across our great land, gave Citigroup \$476 billion of their hard-earned money—not \$476 million to bail out Citigroup, \$476 billion. And the American taxpayers, many of whom choose to exercise their rights under the Second Amendment and whom these banks are trying to now punish, gave Bank of America \$336 billion in 2008 and 2009 to keep them from going broke.

These banks are supposed to act as a source of credit for households and businesses and local and State governments and as a source of liquidity for the entire banking system, but that also means their corporate policies will have ripple effects through every corner of our economy, from consumers and businesses of all sizes to banks and nonbank holding companies.

If the banking system worked like a grocery store, I would still disagree with these new anti-gun rules by Citigroup and Bank of America, but I would respect their rights to enact whatever corporate policies align with their beliefs. But banks are not grocery stores. A grocery store doesn't need a government charter to operate. A grocery store doesn't have a government corporation backed by the taxpayers of this country to insure their deposits. A grocery store doesn't have a government bank that pays them interest. Banks do.

One grocery store doesn't get so big that it lends and borrows and buys and sells from nearly every other grocery store in the country. Citigroup does, and so does Bank of America.

A grocery store doesn't need an \$812.3 billion bailout from the American taxpayers, many of whom choose to exercise their rights under the U.S. Constitution, including, but not limited to, the Second Amendment.

Citigroup and Bank of America have decided to make banking a red-versus-blue issue by trampling on the Second Amendment rights of small business owners and therefore all Americans.

If additional big consumer banks come out with similar anti-Second Amendment policies, it will get harder and harder for businesses in my State of Louisiana and small businesses in other States and elsewhere to find banking services. We will have red banks, and we will have blue banks. I don't think that is what we want in America.

I want to make sure that the Federal Government isn't rewarding this behavior with even more taxpayer dollars. I think \$1 trillion to bail out these two banks by the American taxpayers is quite enough.

I have already petitioned the General Services Administration to cancel the Federal Government's \$700 billion contract with Citigroup, and I have urged officials in the State of Louisiana to

reevaluate all State contracts with any Wall Street bank that chooses to implement an extra-legal policy that infringes on the Second Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Citigroup and Bank of America owe their continued existence to the generosity of the American taxpayer. If it weren't for the American taxpayer, there would be no Citigroup; there would be no Bank of America. I find it very disturbing that these Wall Street banks may be profiting from taxpayer-funded contracts at the same time they are pushing a political agenda—and that is what it is, a political agenda—and severing ties with law-abiding businesses in the process. Given the size of these banks, it is likely that the same is true in States across America.

I find it offensive—I find it offensive—that Wall Street banks are taking taxpayer dollars with one hand and condescending to them with their “we know better than you do” attitude by using the other hand to come after the guns those taxpayers lawfully own under the Second Amendment. Rather than impose its political agenda on law-abiding citizens, these Wall Street banks ought to remember how taxpayers spent billions of dollars—almost \$1 trillion—to bail them out after the 2008 financial crisis. They owe a tremendous debt to the American people, and it seems they have a very short memory.

We don't need red banks in America. We don't need blue banks in America. We need safe banks in America.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO DENNIS WILLIAMS

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to someone who has been fighting for working men and women his entire career.

Just for a moment, let's think back to 1977. The top movie that year was “Star Wars”—the original one—and the average movie ticket cost \$2.23. The Apple II computer went on sale. It cost \$1,298, not including the television you needed to use for a monitor. The space shuttle *Enterprise* took its first test flight, perched on top of a Boeing 747. And a young Marine Corps veteran and salvage welder at J.I. Case first joined UAW Local 806 in Rock Island, IL. He began fighting at that point for workers' rights.

A few things have changed since then. “Star Wars” and Apple have evolved, and the space shuttle has retired. Yet one thing hasn't changed: Dennis Williams is just as dedicated to the working men and women of the UAW today as he was four decades ago. Over the years, he has served them in a number of ways, including negotiating

the first contract at Mitsubishi Motors North America in Bloomington, IL; organizing Indiana State employees; helping Local 844 in Vermont, IL, obtain their first contract; and serving locals throughout the nine States of Region 4.

In 2010, he was elected UAW's secretary-treasurer. In 2014, he was elected United Auto Workers' president, a position he has held with distinction since then. It hasn't been an easy time to lead the UAW. The great recession hit the American automobile industry very hard. Some folks thought we should just let the auto industry go bankrupt. Instead, the United Auto Workers made sacrifices, stood strong, stood together, and weathered the storm. Under Dennis Williams' leadership, the UAW ended 2017 with a fiscal surplus for the third straight year and with more than 430,000 members—up 60,000 members since 2011. It is no surprise. Anyone who has worked with Dennis knows just how dedicated he is to his members and to the communities where they live and where they work.

Just ask the people of Flint. During the water crisis—which, by the way, continues on—UAW members from all over the country were some of the first ones there to help. They collected bottled water and distributed it in their own vehicles, going door to door to help, even traveling to Washington, DC, to demand action from Congress. We are so pleased that they helped us get action to help the families in Flint.

That tells us a little something about the character of the members of the UAW. Yet, it also tells us a little bit about their leader—a man who long ago signed up to serve his country and has simply never stopped. I think that Dennis would say it is about solidarity. He wrote in an editorial in the Detroit News last month:

We believe that no matter where you come from, who you are, what language you speak, or what religion you practice—being in a union is about working men and women standing up for each other. That's how it was in 1935 when the UAW was formed, and that's how it is now.

To Dennis Williams, thank you for your service, your hard work, and your dedication to making life better for working men and women so that we can actually have and sustain and grow an American middle class. I know that the members of the UAW join me in wishing you the very best in your well-earned retirement.

I know that my partner and colleague from Michigan will be coming to the floor in just a bit.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PETERS. 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. PETERS. Mr. President, the history of the United Auto Workers is at the heart of what has made the United States a global economic powerhouse. It is tied to the growth of the thriving manufacturing sector and the birth of the American middle class.

Dennis Williams, UAW president since 2014, is a strong contributor to this history. His leadership reflects a deep commitment to American workers and a clear eye toward the future. Since the union's formation in 1935, UAW members have stood together to ensure that their hard work is met with fair wages, safe workplaces, and reasonable hours. For over 80 years, the voice of the UAW has amplified the voice of the American worker. Dennis Williams is a champion of keeping this voice strong in the 21st century.

Williams joined UAW Local 806 as a salvage welder in 1977, following his service in the U.S. Marine Corps. There, he started his long path of elected union leadership and served as chairman of the Bargaining Committee. In the coming years, Williams would rise to the positions of international representative, Region 4 assistant director, and Region 4 director. In 2010, UAW members elected him as secretary-treasurer, followed by the presidency in 2014.

No matter what position Williams undertook during his decades of UAW leadership, he always stayed true to his roots. After becoming UAW president, he prioritized visiting union plants and locals to engage with members directly. He stated: "I love the smell of black coffee and the smoke of the factory and walking up to UAW members and saying, 'brother' or 'sister'."

His passion for everything the UAW stands for, along with his businesslike approach to tough decisions, enabled Williams to take on some difficult challenges during his presidency.

Just as Williams started in his role, Michigan—home to around one-third of UAW members—had recently become a so-called right-to-work State. Michigan is now one of 28 States with policies designed to undermine union participation and workers' rights to collective bargaining. Despite tides of State and Federal anti-worker efforts, Williams remained practical and optimistic about overcoming any challenges that came the UAW's way. He emphasized the importance of sitting down and talking through issues rather than resorting to confrontation.

Williams was steadfast about not giving up on organizing, and he has actively pursued new approaches to organizing that would keep the UAW strong in the future. His strategy has definitely paid off. During Williams' tenure, he successfully fought for the establishment of local unions at Volkswagen and Mercedes locations in the United States and for casino workers in Las Vegas. Under Williams' leadership, UAW membership has increased by almost 7 percent—over 27,000 new members—between 2014 and 2017. The

growth rate and membership over this past year has been the highest in a 1-year period since 2010.

I am deeply honored by Dennis Williams' representation of over 430,000 UAW members, including tens of thousands of workers in my State of Michigan. I wish him well in his retirement, along with his wife, Donna, of 43 years, his sons, Ryan and Matthew, and his grandchildren, Kendahl and Kai.

I know I speak on behalf of many Michigan workers when I sincerely thank Dennis Williams for his admirable service as the UAW's 11th 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.

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

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, 30 years ago this month, Dr. James Hansen testified before the U.S. Congress on the need to address climate change—30 years ago this month. He was a top NASA climate scientist. On a hot summer day in June of 1988, before the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Dr. Hansen testified that "global warming has reached a level such that we can ascribe with a high degree of confidence a cause and effect relationship between the greenhouse effect and observed warming." He said, "It is already happening now."

Thirty years have passed since then—30 years of added science, 30 years of new science, 30 years of updated reports, and 30 years of mounting evidence of how right Hansen was. Yet, here we still are in Congress still willfully ignoring the unprecedented changes to the climate and the oceans—changes that threaten our planet and its rich array of plant and animal life, changes that put at risk homes, farms, forests, and coasts, changes that affect our very human health and well-being. These are not computer model projections of the distant future but changes we are seeing right before our very eyes now.

Carbon-driven climate change is particularly acute in polar areas. Today, I want to focus on the melting and destabilization of the Antarctic polar ice cap.

Rhode Island is a long way from Antarctica. Florida is a less long way from Antarctica—it is still a pretty long way—but we are coastal States. In Rhode Island, the sea level is already up 11 inches along our shores, and far

more sea level rise, accelerating sea level rise, is expected. The coastal towns and cities in the Presiding Officer's State are seeing similar encroachments of the ocean into their territories.

Here is how Antarctica is changing and what it means for our American shores.

The Antarctic ice sheet spans the South Pole, extending almost 14 million square kilometers—roughly the size of the contiguous United States and Mexico combined. The Antarctic ice sheet is the largest single mass of frozen water on planet Earth, containing 30 million cubic kilometers of ice. If the Antarctic ice sheet were to melt completely, you could actually do fairly simple math as to what would happen to that water. Sea levels could rise 200 feet above current levels, engulfing coastal regions worldwide.

This map shows Florida if we lose the West Antarctic ice sheet. As the map shows, it would inundate much of coastal and southern Florida, putting Miami and other cities completely underwater. It looks about the same here, if you lose the Greenland ice sheet, with there being similar damage and loss to Florida. Yet, here, if you lose the East Antarctic ice sheet, you more or less wipe out the entire State of Florida. You wipe out a few little islands here, a little nub below Georgia there, but essentially Florida is gone.

Imagine the entire population of Florida having to migrate to other States with its State now being uninhabitable. It seems like a crazy notion, but Kentucky's climate planning documents have included the prospect of climate refugees having to flee to Kentucky from America's inundated coasts. So it matters to understand how Antarctic ice sheets work and how they differ from ice shelves.

Ice sheets form on land when more snow accumulates in winter than melts during the summer. Over thousands of years, layers of snow pile up, growing thicker and denser as the weight of new layers compacts the layers below into ice. Over time, that ice flows downhill to the coasts and then ultimately out to sea as glaciers and then ice shelves.

Floating ice shelves surround Antarctica. These shelves physically brace the land-based ice sheet, slowing down its flow into the sea. A rough balance emerges as new snowfall on the ice sheets and the slow flow of the ice balance the melting of the ice shelf around the periphery where the ice shelf meets the ocean. We are now witnessing what appears to be an unraveling of this equilibrium. Climate change is what is causing this massive destabilization.

Since 1950, on the Antarctic Peninsula, the air has warmed 2.5 degrees Celsius. Warming ocean waters erode the West Antarctic ice sheets from below as the warming air melts them from above. Once the ice shelf melts back, you have the loss of the buttress

effect, and the ice sheet on land can then accelerate, with that buttress effect diminished, more rapidly into the sea, causing a more rapid rise in sea level.

The effect of this is actually measurable, and we measure it. Observations from the NASA and German Aerospace Center's twin Gravity Recovery and Climate Experiment satellites measure these losses to be around 125 gigatons of ice per year. What is a gigaton of ice? A gigaton is 1 billion tons. Meredith Nettles of the Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory at Columbia University described a gigaton-sized piece of ice this way: "If you took the whole National Mall"—here we are in Washington—"and covered it up with ice to a height about four times as high as the [Washington] monument. . . ."

Imagine walking out onto the Capitol steps, looking out all the way down the National Mall to the Washington Monument and imagining that not only to the top of the Washington Monument but four times as high is a single, giant mass of ice—as she said, "all the way down from the Capitol steps to the Lincoln Memorial" and four times as high as the Washington Monument. Then imagine 125 times that—every year.

The destabilization of the ice shelves is most dire in West Antarctica, where research shows the massive Thwaites Glacier retreating at 300 to 400 meters per year along a 125-mile segment. Larger than Pennsylvania, the Thwaites Glacier has discharged more than 100 gigatons of ice per year in recent years. That is the flood of 100 of those blocks that are four times the height of the Washington Monument and running from here all the way to the Lincoln Memorial 100 times every 3 days—another one into the ocean, piling up, piling up. If we lost the Thwaites Glacier, that alone would contribute several meters to global sea level rise.

So far, in Rhode Island, remember, we are dealing with less than 1 foot of sea level rise that we have experienced—6 to 12 feet is predicted—but add this in and the situation of our coastal States become quite dire.

These images were created with NASA satellite data. They show changes in Antarctic ice mass just since 2002. This data does not measure the floating ice shelves which are shown here in gray. On the ice sheets, dark orange and red colors indicate losses of ice sheet mass and light-blue shades indicate gains. Climate deniers focus on the gains in actually a fraudulent abuse of the data and the public's trust, but that is what they do; but, overall, during the past 15 years, the West Antarctic ice sheet experienced major ice mass loss. The darkest red, representing the biggest loss, is at the Thwaites Glacier.

Of course, when glaciers melt, the seas rise. In April, a U.S. Geological Survey study, funded by the Pentagon, found that our military bases on low-

elevation islands may become uninhabitable within mere decades. The recommendation is, we have to start planning to relocate them because they will no longer be useful. Just 2 weeks ago, our National Park Service released a report showing sea level rise damaging park sites like Jamestown and Assateague Island in Virginia and Jean Lafitte National Historical Park in Louisiana. NASA is concerned enough about this Antarctic ice situation that it is launching new satellites to monitor it.

Fossil fuel industry front groups continue to deny and disparage the work of scientists at NOAA, NASA, and other Federal scientific agencies. The polluters have an obedient mouthpiece in the Wall Street Journal editorial page, which just last month ran climate denier Fred Singer denying that rising sea levels observed around the globe are the result of global warming, and of course saying it is not the result of carbon pollution or fossil fuels. The Journal page, of course, neglects to mention this denier's deep connections to the fossil fuel industry, the Heritage Foundation, the Heartland Institute, the CATO Institute, and other climate denial front groups bankrolled by ExxonMobil and the oil industry and the Koch political apparatus.

We even heard a Republican Congressman claim that erosion and rocks falling into the sea are what is driving sea level rise—anything but fossil fuel. He said, "Every time you have that soil or rock or whatever it is that is deposited into the seas, that forces the sea levels to rise, because now you have less space in those oceans, because the bottom is moving up."

It is laughable. Phil Duffy, president of the Woods Hole Research Center and former adviser to the U.S. Global Change Research Program responded: "On human time scales, those are miniscule effects."

Once again, anything for the fossil fuel industry. Complete subservience to the fossil fuel industry seems to be the rule around Congress.

About this sordid political equation, retired U.S. Navy RADM Dr. David Titley probably said it best. He said:

The ice doesn't care. The ice doesn't care who is in the White House. It doesn't care which party controls your Congress. It doesn't care which party controls your Parliament. It just melts.

Of course, in addition to the melt, a warming ocean expands, following the law of thermal expansion, and our coasts, as a result, face new and serious dangers.

Republicans in Congress can continue to ignore all of the evidence, but that doesn't change what our carbon pollution does in the atmosphere and the oceans. Our carbon pollution will still trap heat in the atmosphere. It will still acidify the oceans. The laws of chemistry don't suspend because we can't pass sensible laws to solve this problem. The chemistry and the physics of these effects of our carbon pollu-

tion don't care what we do. The polar icecaps melting don't care that fossil fuel flunkies deny it. Denial of these facts doesn't protect our coasts and doesn't protect our coastal communities from looming danger. One day soon, we are going to have to wake up. Fossil fuel influence or no fossil fuel influence, we are going to have to wake up.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the confirmation vote on the Axon nomination occur at 11 a.m. on Wednesday, June 6; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for the June 4, 2018, vote on the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 542, the nomination of Robert Earl Wier, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky. I would have voted yea.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 112, on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Robert Earl Wier, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 113, on the nomination of Robert Earl Wier, of Kentucky, to be United States district judge for the Eastern District of Kentucky. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 114, on the motion to

invoke cloture on the nomination of Fernando Rodriguez, Jr., of Texas, to be United States district judge for the Southern District of Texas. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM P. GETTY

• Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the retirement of William P. Getty as president of the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation. Since 1999, Pat has served as president of the foundation, and during his tenure, the region has been blessed with significant opportunities to grow and diversify the economy.

Established in 1944, the Claude Worthington Benedum Foundation issues grants primarily in West Virginia and southwestern Pennsylvania. The region served by the foundation is a tribute to the founder Michael Benedum's native home of West Virginia and his strong connection to Pittsburgh, PA, where he built a successful oil and gas exploration business. The foundation administers grants that support education, economic development, health and human services, and community development.

Pat's leadership as president has focused on regional collaboration to capture economic opportunity. First and foremost, the discovery of the Marcellus, Utica, and Rogersville shale deposits have created tremendous opportunity for West Virginia, Pennsylvania, and Ohio to not only explore these natural resources but to also capture more downstream value in affiliated sectors of the economy. Pat's leadership in fostering a regional approach and cooperation between leaders in the three States has been instrumental to creating initiatives like the "Power of 32" site development fund and the tristate shale agreement that will help the region maximize the benefit of this opportunity. In addition, he has been an invaluable partner and ambassador for the Appalachian Storage and Trading Hub project, participating in meetings with private sector leaders and government leaders to stress the importance of this project to the region. By working together, we can truly realize the potential for thousands of new jobs and billions in private sector investment.

Pat's contributions as president extends well beyond the energy sector. Under his leadership, the foundation has been a leader in focusing on the importance of STEM education, advanced manufacturing, and transitioning the region to a more technology based economy. Each of these areas is a significant growth opportunity for the region, while at the same time is a tribute to the region's history as a leader in manufacturing and developing natural resources. Pat has also been instrumental in working with community, State, and Federal leaders to

maximize Federal resources and partnerships to spur economic growth.

I wish Pat the best in his retirement and hope that he enjoys this special time with his wife, children, and grandchildren. I know that he will remain engaged as an ambassador for West Virginia and the region.●

TRIBUTE TO THE DALTON BROTHERS

• Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, May 8 of this year marked the 73rd anniversary of the end of War II in Europe. It was a time to remember the sacrifice of over 400,000 Americans who were killed and over 650,000 Americans who were wounded while fighting to defend our freedoms. In that spirit, I would like to call attention to the story of one of my constituents, James Dalton, and his three brothers: Robert, Rufus, and Harry. These four brothers served in the U.S. military during World War II at the same time, which was extremely rare. Their story is remarkable.

The Dalton brothers, who I am happy to say are still with us today, were born in Charlotte, NC, along with their sister Sally. While three of the Dalton brothers still live in Carolina, James Dalton ultimately settled in Atlanta, GA.

Robert Dalton, Jr., the eldest brother, was deployed in 1944. He landed in France and served as platoon leader in Company I, 3rd Battalion, 121st Regiment of the 8th Division. On September 2, 1944, he was wounded in action. After recovering from his wounds, he spent the remainder of his time in Europe with the 29th Infantry Regiment and advanced to the rank of captain. After returning to the United States, he was discharged with the rank of major. Because of his service, he received a Purple Heart Medal, the Bronze Star, the EAME Service Medal with five Bronze Stars, and the World War II Victory Medal.

James Dalton entered military service in 1943 at the age of 20 and sailed for Europe in November 1944. He served behind the in the Rhineland and Central Europe campaigns. He achieved the rank of technical sergeant and was decorated with the American Theater Service Medal, EAME Service Medal with two Bronze Stars, Good Conduct Medal, and World War II Victory Medal.

Rufus Dalton was deployed in October 1944, landing in Marseilles, France. His unit entered the line in the Vosges Mountains in November 1944. They were in constant contact with the German Army until April 1945. At one point, Rufus was injured with a shrapnel wound to the head; yet he still returned to his unit the next day. Rufus was awarded the Purple Heart and Bronze star for his service.

The youngest of the four brothers, Harry, entered into military service the day before his 18th birthday in 1945. Harry entered the Naval Radio School

and served at the Shelton Naval Station in Norfolk, Virginia. He also received the World War II Victory Medal and achieved the rank of yeoman third class.

The sacrifice and service of these four brothers is laudable and so is their work in their communities after the war. Between them, the four brothers went on to hold leadership positions in business, the arts, charitable organizations, and their churches over the course of long and successful careers.

I am proud to take this opportunity to honor the life and military service of one of my constituents and his family. The story of the Dalton brothers is an inspiration to us all. I join the entire country in thanking them for their service in one of our country's darkest yet most heroic hours.

Thank you.●

TRIBUTE TO KYLE DENCKER

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am honored to recognize Kyle Dencker, the Orange County Teacher of the Year from Timber Creek High School in Orlando, FL.

Kyle thanked colleagues, mentors, and administrators for receiving this award and challenged educators to make computer science available at all of the county's public schools. He believes every student should have the opportunity to take computer science.

Colleagues say Kyle recruits students who traditionally avoided computer science, sometimes just by walking around campus, introducing himself and explaining why they might want to learn to code. He has earned national awards for his efforts to recruit young women into computer science and help them succeed in those classes.

Many students have found success in his classroom, in State competitions, and in securing internships. He had 186 students take advanced placement computer science principles last school year, and nearly 77 percent passed the AP exam, exceeding the national rate.

Kyle has been a computer science teacher at Timber Creek High School for 9 years. In that time, enrollment in the school's computer science classes has grown from about 30 students to nearly 400, making it the largest such program in the Orange school district. He has spent nearly a decade getting students to see past the stereotypes regarding computer classes.

I thank Kyle for his dedication to expanding computer science to students that were previously uninterested in this important subject. I express my sincere gratitude to Kyle and look forward to hearing of his continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JASON POOLE

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jason Poole, the Clay County Teacher of the Year from Fleming Island High School in Fleming Island, FL.

Jason was named Teacher of the Year because he represents the core values of Clay County District schools: hard work, integrity, and respect. He acts as an example for everyone in the teaching profession. Jason said it was an honor to receive this award and is thankful for all of his colleagues and administrative staff who have supported him throughout his time at Fleming Island High School. He believes there are many great teachers throughout Clay County and will do his best to represent them.

Jason graduated from Western New England University with a degree in English literature in 2005. He teaches AICE Global Perspectives and coaches cross-country, a program he started at the school after he began teaching in 2006.

I extend my sincere thanks and gratitude to Jason for his dedication to his students and look forward to hearing of his continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KATE STURMAN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kate Sturman, the Flagler County Teacher of the Year from Rymfire Elementary School in Palm Coast, FL.

When Kate was named Teacher of the Year, she was honored because she felt there were many other amazing teachers at their annual celebration. Her fellow teachers believe she goes above and beyond for students by always volunteering to help with afterschool activities and has been flexible by teaching second, fifth, and sixth grade.

As she describes, there is nothing more rewarding than watching a student blossom from a seed into a magnificent flower. Kate considers herself as not only a teacher for her students, but as a cheerleader, advocate, and friend. She believes to have the most rewarding job in the world and loves teaching for these reasons.

Kate is in her 16th year as a teacher and has been with Flagler Schools since 2005. She moved to Rymfire Elementary School in 2006, teaching second grade for 10 years and sixth grade for 1 year. She currently teaches fifth grade English language arts and social studies. She is also a coach with the school's Future Problem Solvers and Community Problem Solvers.

I express my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kate for all her hard work for her students, and I extend my best wishes for her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KAITLIN VAN HEUSEN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I honor Kaitlin Van Heusen, the Bradford County Teacher of the Year from Bradford Union Technical Center in Starke, FL.

After receiving this award, Kaitlin told her peers that her inspiration for

teaching comes from the students taking her class. She finds these students to be the ones who are beginning to give up on teachers, the education system, and their own ability to succeed.

Kaitlin takes special pride in watching her students walk across the stage at graduation and speaking in front of their peers. Her joy as an educator comes from seeing their initial struggles and witnessing the moment when it all finally comes together for them.

Kaitlin graduated from the University of Florida in 2015 and Florida Gateway College in 2013. She is an agriculture and diversified career technology teacher and, since 2016, a Future Farmers of America adviser at Bradford-Union Technical Center.

I express my sincere gratitude to Kaitlin for her dedication to teaching and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KIERA VARGAS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I am pleased to recognize Kiera Vargas, the Madison County Teacher of the Year from Madison County High School in Madison, FL.

Kiera was honored with this award because of her motivation for encouraging and educating her students. As a teacher, she enjoys all aspects and feels her success comes from her personal interactions with her students. Her students note she listens to their needs and helps in every way she can.

These students feel empowered by Kiera as she encourages them to always believe in themselves. She tells them, if they do this while working hard and following their heart, they will achieve their dreams. Kiera feels her students have taught her more than she has taught them.

Kiera was offered her first teaching job while planning to take the dental admission test. She originally planned to be a dentist but realized teaching was her true passion. Kiera says she has never looked back since her first teaching job and has no desire to do anything except teach and assist her students.

She previously worked at the college level as a full-time lecturer for 7 years, taught in K–12 classrooms for 4 years, and served as an adjunct lecturer for several years. Kiera has a bachelor of science degree in journalism and mass communication with a concentration in public relations, a master of science degree in English education, a juris doctor from the Charlotte School of Law, and her masters in library science and information sciences from Drexel University.

I express my appreciation to Kiera for all of the great work she has done for her students and extend my best wishes on her continued success in the years to come.●

RECOGNIZING HIGHLANDS BAR & GRILL

● Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Highlands Bar &

Grill for winning the 2018 James Beard Foundation Award for outstanding restaurant on May 7, 2018.

After being a finalist for 9 consecutive years, the Highlands Bar & Grill has finally won this prestigious award. The James Beard Foundation annually presents awards for culinary excellence, and I cannot think of a more deserving restaurant.

Ever since the restaurant's opening in 1982, executive chef and owner Frank Stitt from Cullman, AL, and his wife, Parris, from Birmingham, AL, have provided a memorable and hospitable culinary experience. Their commitment to providing high-quality food and service have been the foundation for their nationally recognized success.

Contributing to the triumph of the restaurant is pastry chef Dolester Miles, who this year won the 2018 James Beard Foundation Award for outstanding pastry chef. One of the original employees of Highlands Bar & Grill, Dolester's 36-year career is certainly impressive and unparalleled.

Frank Stitt's mentorship and guidance have influenced many other chefs in the Birmingham area and beyond. His ever-changing and inspirational menu has elevated the standard for fine Southern cuisine.

I would like to extend my sincere congratulations to Highlands Bar & Grill. This restaurant is one of the finest restaurants in the United States and is an ambassador to the world of fine Southern cuisine.

Please join me in congratulating Highlands Bar & Grill for winning this award and for the restaurant's nearly four decades of success. I have no doubt that it will continue this path of excellence.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE REVISION OF THE DEFERRAL OF CERTAIN BUDGET AUTHORITY—PM 42

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with accompanying reports and papers; pursuant to the

order of January 30, 1975 as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, referred jointly to the Committees on Appropriations; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and the Judiciary:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 1014(c) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 685(c)), I am withdrawing four previously proposed rescissions and reporting revisions to six rescissions previously transmitted to the Congress.

The withdrawals are for the Federal Highway Administration Miscellaneous Appropriations and Miscellaneous Highway Trust Funds accounts of the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Programs and Management account of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the International Disaster Assistance account of the United States Agency for International Development. The six revised rescissions, totaling \$896 million, affect the programs of the Departments of Agriculture, Housing and Urban Development, Labor, and the Treasury, as well as the Corporation for National and Community Service.

The details of the rescission withdrawals and each revised rescission are contained in the attached reports.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 5, 2018.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, June 5, 2018, he had signed the following enrolled bills, which were previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY) of the House:

H.R. 3663. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Huntington, West Virginia, as the Hershel "Woody" Williams VA Medical Center.

H.R. 4910. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide outer burial receptacles for remains buried in National Parks, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

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

H.R. 5515. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 5, 2018, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 2372. An act to establish a permanent community care program for veterans, to establish a commission for the purpose of making recommendations regarding the modernization or realignment of facilities of the Veterans Health Administration, to improve construction of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to make certain improvements in the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs relating to the home loan program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INHOFE, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 2987. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-262).

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 754. A bill to support meeting our Nation's growing cybersecurity workforce needs by expanding the cybersecurity education pipeline (Rept. No. 115-263).

S. 1520. A bill to expand recreational fishing opportunities through enhanced marine fishery conservation and management, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-264).

By Mr. RISCH, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:

Report to accompany S. 2283, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115-265).

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. INHOFE:

S. 2987. An original bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Armed Services; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the tax treatment of amounts related to employment discrimination and harassment in the workplace, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, and harassment based on protected categories; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 2989. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to encourage soil health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 2990. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act to

further the conservation of prohibited wildlife species; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 2991. A bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to provide that cybersecurity and grid security improvements are eligible for electric loans and loan guarantees under that Act; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

S. 2992. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to publish a notice of proposed rulemaking concerning seat belts on school buses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2993. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to include energy storage as renewable energy under the Rural Energy for America Program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2994. A bill to deter, prevent, reduce, and respond to harassment in the workplace, including sexual harassment, sexual assault, and harassment based on protected categories; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 2995. A bill to establish the Rural Export Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2996. A bill to make available necessary disaster assistance for families affected by major disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2997. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to advance carbon utilization technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. HARRIS:

S. 2998. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish the Defense Quantum Information Consortium, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 532. A resolution designating the week of June 4 through June 10, 2018, as "Hemp History Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 533. A resolution commemorating the commissioning of the USS Manchester; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. Res. 534. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "National Travel and Tourism Week" and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 116

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 116, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit veterans who have a service-connected, permanent disability rated as total to travel on military aircraft in the same manner and to the same extent as retired members of the Armed Forces entitled to such travel.

S. 319

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 319, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish within the Department of Veterans Affairs a center of excellence in the prevention, diagnosis, mitigation, treatment, and rehabilitation of health conditions relating to exposure to burn pits.

S. 448

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 448, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of clinical psychologists as physicians for purposes of furnishing clinical psychologist services under the Medicare program.

S. 479

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

S. 783

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 783, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to distribute maternity care health professionals to health professional shortage areas identified as in need of maternity care health services.

S. 802

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 802, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal in honor of Lawrence Eugene "Larry" Doby in recognition of his achievements and contributions to American major league athletics, civil rights, and the Armed Forces during World War II.

S. 910

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 910, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to provide family members of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others, and law enforcement, with new tools to prevent gun violence.

S. 1633

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1633, a bill to promote innovative approaches to outdoor recreation on Federal land and to open up opportunities for collaboration with non-Federal partners, and for other purposes.

S. 1653

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1653, a bill to provide for the overall health and well-being of young people, including the promotion of lifelong sexual health and healthy relationships, and for other purposes.

S. 1676

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to provide grants for access to broadband telecommunications services in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1961

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1961, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to temporarily reauthorize certain pilot programs under the Small Business Innovation Research Program and the Small Business Technology Transfer Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2034

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2034, a bill to strengthen resources for entrepreneurs by improving the SCORE program, and for other purposes.

S. 2038

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2038, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for a presumption of herbicide exposure for certain veterans who served in Korea, and for other purposes.

S. 2114

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2114, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the 5307th Composite Unit (Provisional), commonly known as "Merrill's Marauders", in recognition of their bravery and outstanding service in the jungles of Burma during World War II.

S. 2501

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming

(Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2501, a bill to amend the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 to provide for the establishment of a Ski Area Fee Retention Account.

S. 2506

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 2506, a bill to establish an aviation maintenance workforce development pilot program.

S. 2579

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2579, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and expand a program of surveillance and education, carried out by the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention, regarding infections associated with injection drug use.

S. 2591

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2591, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration.

S. 2633

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2633, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to civil forfeitures relating to certain seized animals, and for other purposes.

S. 2652

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2652, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Stephen Michael Gleason.

S. 2719

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 2719, a bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a registry to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who may have been exposed to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances on military installations receive information regarding such exposure, and for other purposes.

S. 2735

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2735, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for the establishment of an enhanced cybersecurity assistance and protections for small businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 2764

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana

(Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2764, a bill to amend and enhance the High Seas Driftnet Fishing Moratorium Protection Act to improve the conservation of sharks, and for other purposes.

S. 2880

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2880, a bill to establish a pilot program for long-term rental assistance for families affected by major disasters in 2017.

S. 2934

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2934, a bill to increase the recruitment and retention of school-based mental health services providers by low-income local educational agencies.

S. 2938

At the request of Mr. SASSE, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2938, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to modify provisions relating to hours of service requirements with respect to transportation of livestock and insects, and for other purposes.

S. 2955

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2955, a bill to reform the Mobility Fund Phase II challenge process conducted by the Federal Communications Commission.

S. 2979

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2979, a bill to rescind certain budget authority proposed to be rescinded in special messages transmitted to the Congress by the President on May 8, 2018, in accordance with title X of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act 1974.

S. RES. 220

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 220, a resolution expressing solidarity with Falun Gong practitioners who have lost lives, freedoms, and rights for adhering to their beliefs and practices and condemning the practice of non-consenting organ harvesting, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 526

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 526, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that politicians should not interfere with a woman's personal health care decisions or attempt to

prevent providers from offering their full medical recommendations to their patients.

S. RES. 527

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 527, a resolution congratulating the people of Georgia on the 100th anniversary of its declaration of independence as a democratic republic and reaffirming the strength of the relationship between the United States and Georgia.

AMENDMENT NO. 2269

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 2269 intended to be proposed to H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 532—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF JUNE 4 THROUGH JUNE 10, 2018, AS “HEMP HISTORY WEEK”

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 532

Whereas Hemp History Week will be held from June 4 through June 10, 2018;

Whereas the goals of Hemp History Week are to commemorate the historical relevance of industrial hemp in the United States and to promote the full growth potential of the industrial hemp industry;

Whereas industrial hemp is an agricultural commodity that has been used for centuries to produce many innovative industrial and consumer products, including soap, fabric, textiles, construction materials, clothing, paper, cosmetics, food, and beverages;

Whereas the global market for hemp is estimated to consist of more than 25,000 products;

Whereas the value of hemp imported into the United States for use in the production of other retail products is estimated at approximately \$76,000,000 annually;

Whereas the United States hemp industry estimates that the annual market value of hemp retail sales in the United States is more than \$688,000,000;

Whereas, despite the legitimate uses of hemp, many agricultural producers of the United States are prohibited under current law from growing hemp;

Whereas, because most hemp cannot be grown legally in the United States, raw hemp material and hemp products are imported for sale in the United States;

Whereas the United States is the largest consumer of hemp products in the world, but the United States is the only major industrialized country that restricts hemp farming; and

Whereas industrial hemp holds great potential to bolster the agricultural economy of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of June 4 through June 10, 2018, as “Hemp History Week”;

(2) recognizes the historical relevance of industrial hemp; and

(3) recognizes the growing economic potential of industrial hemp.

SENATE RESOLUTION 533—COMMEMORATING THE COMMISSIONING OF THE USS “MANCHESTER”

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 533

Whereas the State of New Hampshire has a long and distinguished history of military service dating back to 1680, when militia companies were formed in the State to protect the citizens of New Hampshire;

Whereas New Hampshire sent 3 regiments of minutemen to Boston in the wake of the skirmishes at Lexington and Concord, and many of those minutemen went on to fight gallantly under the command of then Colonel, and future Major General, John Stark at the Battle of Bunker Hill on June 17, 1775;

Whereas Portsmouth shipbuilder John Langdon, who would later become a United States Senator, oversaw the construction of some of the first vessels of the United States Navy, including the sloop-of-war the USS *Ranger*, which was built and equipped for naval hero Captain John Paul Jones;

Whereas the city of Manchester, New Hampshire (commonly known as the “Queen City”), is—

(1) the largest city in northern New England;

(2) an engine for the economy of New Hampshire; and

(3) the namesake of the first industrialized city in the world, Manchester, England;

Whereas the first vessel of the United States Navy to be named for the city of Manchester, New Hampshire, was the USS *Manchester* (CL-83), which—

(1) was a Cleveland class light cruiser commissioned on October 29, 1946;

(2) served with distinction in 3 combat tours during the Korean War; and

(3) received 9 battle stars for her service;

Whereas, on April 16, 2013, Secretary of the Navy Raymond Edwin Mabus, Jr., announced that an Independence class Littoral Combat Ship (commonly known as an “LCS”) would be named the “USS *Manchester*” (referred to in this preamble as the “USS *Manchester* (LCS-14)”);

Whereas, on June 29, 2015, there was a keel-laying ceremony for the USS *Manchester* (LCS-14) in Mobile, Alabama;

Whereas, on May 7, 2016, the USS *Manchester* (LCS-14) was christened in Mobile, Alabama, and sponsored by United States Senator Jeanne Shaheen;

Whereas, on May 12, 2016, the United States Navy launched the USS *Manchester* (LCS-14); and

Whereas the USS *Manchester* (LCS-14)—

(1) will join the USS *New Hampshire* (SSN-778) fast attack submarine in the United States Navy fleet; and

(2) will be commissioned in Portsmouth, New Hampshire, on May 26, 2018: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commemorates the commissioning of the United States Ship *Manchester* (LCS-14), the mission of which will be to act as a networked, agile, stealthy

surface combatant capable of defeating anti-access and asymmetric threats in the littorals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 534—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF “NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK” AND HONORING THE VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS OF TRAVEL AND TOURISM TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HELLER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. BLUNT) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 534

Whereas “National Travel and Tourism Week” was established in 1983 through the enactment of the Joint Resolution entitled “Joint Resolution to designate the week beginning May 27, 1984, as ‘National Tourism Week’” (Public Law 98-178; 97 Stat. 1126), on November 29, 1983, which recognized the value of travel and tourism;

Whereas “National Travel and Tourism Week” is celebrated across the United States from May 6 through May 12, 2018;

Whereas more than 500 celebrations throughout the United States are scheduled in honor of “National Travel and Tourism Week”;

Whereas 1 out of every 9 jobs in the United States depends on travel and tourism;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry supports 15,600,000 jobs in the United States;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry employs individuals in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and all the territories of the United States;

Whereas international travel to the United States—

(1) is the single largest service export industry in the United States; and

(2) generates a trade surplus balance of approximately \$84,000,000,000;

Whereas the travel and tourism industry have worked to streamline the visa process and make the United States welcoming to visitors from other countries;

Whereas travel and tourism provide significant economic benefits to the United States by generating nearly \$2,400,000,000,000 in annual economic output;

Whereas leisure travel allows individuals to experience the rich cultural heritage and educational opportunities of the United States and communities in the United States; and

Whereas the immense value of travel and tourism cannot be overstated: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of “National Travel and Tourism Week”;

(2) commends the travel and tourism industry for important contributions to the United States; and

(3) commends the employees of the travel and tourism industry for important contributions to the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2271. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal

year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2272. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5515, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2273. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5515, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2274. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5515, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2271. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle I of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 896. SCALE-UP MANUFACTURING INVESTMENT PROGRAM.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Scale-up Manufacturing Investment Company Act of 2018”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that—

(1) the strength of the United States manufacturing sector is critical to the economy and the global competitiveness of the United States;

(2) United States manufacturers support 17,600,000 jobs in the United States and account for 12 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States;

(3) access to capital is essential to growth and innovation in the manufacturing sector;

(4) small, emerging manufacturers face unique challenges scaling commercial production in the United States, driving many young manufacturers to other countries;

(5) structural barriers exist in the United States that prevent key investments in first-commercial manufacturing facilities;

(6) a healthy manufacturing sector is essential to innovation economy of the United States, providing three-quarters of all private sector research and development, employing nearly two-thirds of all research and development workers, and producing the majority of all patents issued;

(7) technology-intensive manufacturing small businesses, some of which may be start-ups, with the potential to anchor the next generation of manufacturing production where they locate, face special challenges in accessing the capital to move from idea to prototype and into commercial production;

(8) already more capital intensive than software or services start-ups, manufacturing start-ups and small businesses face a “second and wider valley of death” when it comes to raising the capital to scale up for commercial production because of their capital intensity and novel technology;

(9) a number of countries, including the People’s Republic of China, South Korea, Germany, and Japan, provide publicly funded incentives to attract these firms, recognizing that despite the risks, the long-term benefits of establishing leadership in emerging technology areas are large;

(10) a study of manufacturing technology-intensive start-ups licensed by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology found that almost all that scaled up into commercial

production did so overseas largely because of this far more attractive capital and investment environment for manufacturing start-ups, which is a huge loss for the future of manufacturing in the United States;

(11) if the United States loses the first generation of production for a new technology or manufacturing process, history suggests that it is an uphill battle once lost to reclaim that capability here given the unique learning and know-how acquired during the building of that first factory; and

(12) to ensure that manufacturing technologies invented in the United States are ultimately made in the United States will require addressing the unique capital access challenges faced by these technology-intensive manufacturing start-ups.

(c) **SCALE-UP MANUFACTURING INVESTMENT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 681 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“PART D—SCALE-UP MANUFACTURING INVESTMENT COMPANY PROGRAM

“SEC. 399A. DEFINITIONS.

“In this part—

“(1) the term ‘Associate Administrator’ means the Associate Administrator described in section 201;

“(2) the term ‘Council’ means the Scale-Up Manufacturing Investment Company Credit Council that may be established under section 399K;

“(3) the term ‘participating investment fund’ means a privately managed investment fund licensed under section 399C to operate under the program;

“(4) the term ‘private capital’ has the meaning given that term in section 103(9);

“(5) the term ‘program’ means the scale-up manufacturing investment company program established under section 399B;

“(6) the term ‘qualifying manufacturing project’ means an investment in a small and emerging manufacturer for the purposes of building first commercial production facilities, novel manufacturing capabilities, or the introduction into production of emerging manufacturing technologies;

“(7) the term ‘small and emerging manufacturer’ means any advanced manufacturer that does not exceed the size standard established by the Administrator for the applicable North American Industry Classification System code under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

“(8) the term ‘small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals’ has the meaning given that term in section 8(d)(3)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 637(d)(3)(C)).

“SEC. 399B. ESTABLISHMENT.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall establish and carry out a scale-up manufacturing investment company program under which the Administrator shall provide leverage to participating investment funds to support debt and equity investments in qualifying manufacturing projects of small and emerging manufacturers in the United States.

“(b) **ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.**—The program shall be administered by the Administrator acting through the Associate Administrator.

“SEC. 399C. SELECTION OF PARTICIPATING INVESTMENT FUNDS.

“(a) **APPLICATION FOR LICENSE.**—

“(1) **SUBMISSION OF APPLICATION.**—An investment fund desiring to receive a license to operate under the program shall submit an application to the Administrator at such time and in such manner as the Administrator may require.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—An application submitted under paragraph (1) shall demonstrate that the investment fund—

“(A) has the requisite minimum private capital raised from investors; and

“(B) committed to operate under the program as of the date of submission of the application.

“(3) STATUS.—Not later than 90 days after the initial receipt by the Administrator of an application submitted under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall provide the applicant with a written report detailing the status of the application and any requirements remaining for completion of the application.

“(b) SELECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Administrator receives an application under subsection (a), the Administrator shall approve or deny the application for a license to operate under the program and notify the applicant of the determination.

“(2) CRITERIA.—The Administrator shall establish selection criteria to evaluate applications to operate under the program, which shall include, at a minimum—

“(A) the proven investment experience of the investment fund manager;

“(B) the proven, balanced, and positive-investment track record of a previous investment fund or the principals and fund performance analysis measured against benchmarks and peer funds;

“(C) the experience of the investment fund with investments relating to small manufacturers and emerging technologies related to advanced manufacturing;

“(D) an evaluation of the use of leverage by the investment fund managers in past deals;

“(E) evidence indicating a cohesive and effective team and team dynamic;

“(F) principals with strong reputations;

“(G) record of positive realizations and exits from previous investments in the investment track record;

“(H) clearly articulated focus, investment thesis, investment themes, and investment instruments to be used to capitalize companies; and

“(I) fund structure and economics that reflects standard practices and industry norms, such as—

“(i) preferred returns to limited partners;

“(ii) general partner carried interest allocations, fees and vesting schedules;

“(iii) adequate fund infrastructure and supporting back office services; and

“(iv) evidence of fund raising traction and capability.

“(c) FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administration shall prescribe fees to be paid by each applicant for a license to operate as a participating investment fund under the program.

“(2) USE OF AMOUNTS.—Fees collected under this subsection—

“(A) shall be deposited in the account for salaries and expenses of the Administration; and

“(B) are authorized to be appropriated solely to cover the costs of licensing examinations.

“SEC. 399D. PROVISION OF LEVERAGE TO PARTICIPATING INVESTMENT FUNDS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the Administrator approves and issues a license under section 399C to operate as a participating investment fund under the program, the Administrator may provide not more than \$1 of leverage for every \$1 of private capital raised by the participating investment fund.

“(b) MAXIMUM LEVERAGE.—The maximum amount of outstanding leverage made available in any given fiscal year—

“(1) to any participating investment fund may not exceed \$500,000,000; and

“(2) to all participating investment funds in aggregate may not exceed \$1,000,000,000.

“(c) PRIVATE CAPITAL REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The private capital of a participating investment fund shall be not less than \$250,000,000.

“(2) FINANCIAL INSTITUTION INVESTMENTS.—Any national bank, or any member bank of the Federal Reserve System or nonmember insured bank to the extent permitted under applicable State law, may invest in any 1 or more participating investment funds, or in any entity established to invest solely in participating investment funds, except that in no event shall the total amount of such investments of any such bank exceed 5 percent of the capital and surplus of the bank.

“(d) LEVERAGE FEE.—The Administrator shall charge and collect a leverage fee of not more than 5.5 percent and not less than 3 percent of the face amount of the leverage issued.

“SEC. 399E. BORROWING POWER.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Each participating investment fund shall have the authority to borrow money and issue debentures and preferred securities, subject to such limitations and regulations as the Administration may prescribe.

“(b) LIMITATION.—Of the leverage provided by the Administrator to a participating investment fund under section 399D—

“(1) not less than 70 percent shall be issued as debentures under subsection (a); and

“(2) not more than 30 percent may be issued as preferred securities under subsection (a).

“(c) FEDERAL FINANCING BANK.—The Federal Financing Bank may acquire a debenture issued by a participating investment fund company under subsection (a).

“(d) PURCHASE AND GUARANTEE BY SBA.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administration may purchase or guarantee the timely payment of all principal and interest as scheduled on debentures or preferred securities issued by participating investment funds under subsection (a), subject to such limitations and regulations as the Administration may prescribe.

“(2) FULL FAITH AND CREDIT.—The full faith and credit of the United States is pledged to the payment of all amounts which may be required to be paid under any guarantee under this subsection.

“(e) THIRD-PARTY DEBT.—The Administrator—

“(1) shall not permit a participating investment fund having outstanding leverage to incur third-party debt that would create or contribute to an unreasonable risk of default or loss to the Federal Government; and

“(2) shall permit such participating investment funds to incur third-party debt only on such terms and subject to such conditions as may be established by the Administrator, by regulation or otherwise.

“(f) CALCULATION OF SUBSIDY RATE.—All fees, interest, and profits received and retained by the Administration under this section and section 399D shall be included in the calculations made by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to offset the cost (as that term is defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) to the Administration of purchasing and guaranteeing debentures and preferred securities under this Act.

“SEC. 399F. INVESTMENTS IN SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A participating investment fund shall use leverage received under section 399D to make debt and equity investments in small and emerging manufacturers to carry out qualifying manufacturing projects.

“(b) LIMITATION.—Not more than 50 percent of the amount provided by a participating investment fund to a small and emerging manufacturer under subsection (a) for a qualifying manufacturing project shall consist of leverage provided to the participating investment fund under the program.

“(c) PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT.—A single investment made by a participating investment fund under subsection (a) may not exceed 10 percent of the total capital of the participating investment fund, which includes private capital and any leverage projected to be provided to the participating investment fund, if applicable.

“(d) INCREASED OUTREACH.—The Administration shall issue policy directives to provide for enhanced outreach efforts to increase investments by participating investment funds in—

“(1) a small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals; and

“(2) small business concerns owned and controlled by—

“(A) women;

“(B) veterans; and

“(C) individuals with disabilities.

“SEC. 399G. EXAMINATIONS AND VALUATIONS.

“(a) EXAMINATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Each participating investment fund shall be subject to examinations made at the direction of the Investment Division of the Administration in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) ASSISTANCE OF PRIVATE SECTOR ENTITIES.—Examinations under this subsection may be conducted with the assistance of a private sector entity that has the qualifications and the expertise necessary to conduct such examinations.

“(3) COSTS.—

“(A) ASSESSMENT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator may assess the cost of examinations under this subsection, including compensation of the examiners, against the participating investment fund examined.

“(ii) PAYMENT.—Any participating investment fund against which the Administrator assesses costs under subparagraph (A) shall pay such costs.

“(B) DEPOSIT OF FUNDS.—Funds collected under this subsection—

“(i) shall be deposited in the account for salaries and expenses of the Administration; and

“(ii) are authorized to be appropriated solely to cover the costs of examinations and other program oversight activities.

“(b) VALUATIONS.—

“(1) FREQUENCY OF VALUATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Each participating investment fund shall submit to the Administrator a written valuation of the loans and investments of the participating investment fund not less often than semiannually or otherwise upon the request of the Administrator, except that any participating investment fund with no leverage outstanding shall submit such valuations annually, unless the Administrator determines otherwise.

“(B) MATERIAL ADVERSE CHANGES.—Not later than 30 days after the end of a fiscal quarter of a participating investment fund during which a material adverse change in the aggregate valuation of the loans and investments or operations of the participating investment fund occurs, the participating investment fund shall notify the Administrator in writing of the nature and extent of that change.

“(C) INDEPENDENT CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not less than once during each fiscal year, each participating investment fund shall submit to the Administrator the financial statements of the participating investment fund, audited by an

independent certified public accountant approved by the Administrator.

“(ii) **AUDIT REQUIREMENTS.**—Each audit conducted under clause (i) shall include—

“(I) a review of the procedures and documentation used by the participating investment fund in preparing the valuations required by this subsection; and

“(II) a statement by the independent certified public accountant that such valuations were prepared in conformity with the valuation criteria applicable to the participating investment fund established in accordance with paragraph (2).

“(2) **VALUATION CRITERIA.**—Each valuation submitted under this subsection shall be prepared by the participating investment fund in accordance with valuation criteria, which shall—

“(A) be established or approved by the Administrator; and

“(B) include appropriate safeguards to ensure that the noncash assets of a participating investment fund are not overvalued.

“SEC. 399H. MISCELLANEOUS.

“The Administrator may take such action as set forth in sections 309, 311, 312, 314, 315, and 316 and an owner (including a member, partner, or shareholder), officer, director, employee, agent, or other participant in the management or conduct of the affairs of a participating investment fund shall be subject to the requirements of such sections.

“SEC. 399I. VIOLATIONS; REMOVAL OR SUSPENSION OF MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS.

“(a) **VIOLATIONS.**—If any participating investment fund violates or fails to comply with any of the provisions of this part or of regulations prescribed hereunder, all of its rights, privileges, and franchises derived therefrom may thereby be forfeited. Before any such participating investment fund shall be declared dissolved, or its rights, privileges, and franchises forfeited, any non-compliance with or violation of this Act shall be determined and adjudged by a court of the United States of competent jurisdiction in a suit brought for that purpose in the district, territory, or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, in which the principal office of such participating investment fund is located. Any such suit shall be brought by the United States at the instance of the Administration or the Attorney General.

“(b) **SUSPENSION OF MANAGEMENT OFFICIALS.**—Using the procedures for removing or suspending a director or an officer of a licensee set forth in section 313, the Administrator may remove or suspend any management official of a participating investment fund.

“SEC. 399J. REPORTS.

“Each participating investment fund shall, on a semi-annual basis, provide to the Administrator such information as the Administrator may require, including—

“(1) information related to the measurement criteria that the participating investment fund proposed in the application for the program;

“(2) information on the use of leverage by the participating investment fund; and

“(3) in each case in which the participating investment fund makes an investment in a small business concern that is not a small business concern owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, a report on the number and percentage of employees of the small business concern who are socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

“SEC. 399K. SCALE-UP MANUFACTURING INVESTMENT COMPANY CREDIT COUNCIL.

“(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The Administrator may establish a Scale-Up Manufacturing Investment Company Credit Council, which, if

established, shall consist of 5 members from the private sector with aggregate and collective experience in technology development, manufacturing financing, and capital investment.

“(b) **DUTIES.**—The Council, if established, shall advise the Administrator on carrying out the program, which shall include—

“(1) providing advice from time to time on advanced scale-up manufacturing industries; and

“(2) establishing and conducting an annual briefing beginning not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section.

“SEC. 399L. REGULATIONS.

“The Administrator may issue such regulations as the Administrator determines necessary to carry out the provisions of this part in accordance with its purposes.”

(2) **BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956.**—Section 13(d)(1)(E) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1851(d)(1)(E)) is amended by inserting “investments in 1 or more participating investment funds, as defined in section 399A of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958,” before “or investments”.

(3) **INELIGIBILITY FOR BANKRUPTCY.**—Section 109(b)(2) of title 11, United States Code, is amended by inserting “a participating investment fund as defined in section 399A of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958,” before “credit union”.

(4) **ELIGIBILITY FOR CRA CREDIT.**—Section 804 of the Community Reinvestment Act of 1977 (12 U.S.C. 2903) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **INVESTMENTS IN PARTICIPATING INVESTMENT FUNDS.**—In assessing and taking into account, under subsection (a), the record of a financial institution, the appropriate Federal financial supervisory agency shall consider, as a factor, investments made in 1 or more participating investment funds under part D of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.”

SA 2272. Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10. MODIFICATION OF FIRST DIVISION MONUMENT.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Society of the First Infantry Division (which is an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of that Code), may make modifications to the First Division Monument located on Federal land in President’s Park in Washington, DC, that was set aside for memorial purposes of the First Infantry Division.

(b) **INCLUSIONS.**—The modifications authorized under subsection (a) may include the construction of additional plaques, and the construction of additional stone plinths on which to place the plaques, to honor the members of the First Infantry Division who paid the ultimate sacrifice during United States operations, including Operation Desert Storm, Operation Iraqi Freedom and New Dawn, and Operation Enduring Freedom.

(c) **REQUIRED CONSULTATION.**—The First Infantry Division at the Department of the

Army shall collaborate with the Secretary of Defense to provide the list of the not more than 5,000 names of members of the First Infantry Division to be added to the Monument.

(d) **APPLICATION OF COMMEMORATIVE WORKS ACT.**—Subsections (b) and (c) of section 8903 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”), shall not apply to activities authorized under this section.

(e) **FUNDING.**—Federal funds may not be used to pay any costs of the activities authorized under this section.

SA 2273. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. . REPORT ON PARTICIPATION IN THE TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than February 28, 2019, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report on participation in the Transition Assistance Program under section 1144 of title 10, United States Code, by members of the Armed Forces.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Information on the participation of members of the Armed Forces in the Transition Assistance Program during 2018, including the following:

(A) The number of members who were eligible for participation in the Program during 2018, in aggregate and by component of the Armed Forces.

(B) The number of members who participated in the Program during 2018, in aggregate and by component of the Armed Forces, for each service as follows:

(i) Preseparation counseling provided by the Department of Defense.

(ii) Briefings provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(iii) Employment workshops provided by the Department of Labor.

(C) The number of members who did not participate in the Program during 2018 due to a waiver of the participation requirement under section 114(c)(2) of title 10, United States Code, for each service set forth in subparagraph (B).

(2) Such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, considers appropriate to increase participation of members of the Armed Forces in each service set forth in paragraph (1)(B).

(3) Assessments of the Transition Assistance Program by members of the Armed Forces who participated in the Program during 2018, including the following:

(A) A summary of the data obtained by the Department of Defense through assessments of the Program by participants in the Program during 2018, including data obtained through the assessments as follows:

(i) The Transition Goals Plans Success (GPS) Participant Assessment.

(ii) Status of Forces Surveys (SOFS).

(B) A summary of the conclusions derived by the Secretary of Defense from the data described in subparagraph (A).

(4) Such recommendations for improvements to the Transition Assistance Program as the Secretary of Defense considers appropriate in light of the data described by paragraph (3)(A) and the conclusions described by paragraph (3)(B), including recommendations for such legislative or administrative action as the Secretary considers appropriate to carry out such improvements.

SA 2274. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 5515, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2019 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . PROTECTING MILITARY FAMILIES' 2ND AMENDMENT RIGHTS.

(a) RECEIPT OF FIREARM OR AMMUNITION BY SPOUSE OF MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES AT A DUTY STATION OF THE MEMBER OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—Section 925(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting “, or to the spouse of such a member,” before “or to”;

(2) by striking “members,” and inserting “members and spouses,”;

(3) by striking “members or” and inserting “members, spouses, or”;

(4) by striking “member or” and inserting “member, spouse, or”.

(b) RESIDENCY OF SPOUSES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO BE DETERMINED ON THE SAME BASIS AS THE RESIDENCY OF SUCH MEMBERS FOR PURPOSES OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS.—Section 921(b) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) For purposes of this chapter, a member of the Armed Forces on active duty, or a spouse of such a member, is a resident of—

“(1) the State in which the member or spouse maintains legal residence;

“(2) the State in which the permanent duty station of the member is located; and

“(3) the State in which the member maintains a place of abode from which the member commutes each day to the permanent duty station of the member.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to conduct engaged in after the 6-month period that begins on the date of the enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I have 6 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 5, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the ses-

sion of the Senate on Tuesday, June 5, 2018, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Georgette Mosbacher, of Florida, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Poland, and Stephen Akard, of Indiana, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, with the rank of Ambassador, both of the Department of State, and Mark Rosen, of Connecticut, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 24, 2018, at 2 p.m. to conduct a closed hearing.

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, June 5, 2018, at 3 p.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Preventing Abuse in Olympic and Amateur Athletics: Ensuring Safe and Secure Environment for our Athletes.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OCEANS, ATMOSPHERE, FISHERIES, AND COAST GUARD

The Subcommittee on Oceans, Atmosphere, Fisheries, and Coast Guard of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 5, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “A Decade of the Digital Coast Partnership Program: Successes and Opportunities.”

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EAST ASIA, THE PACIFIC, AND INTERNATIONAL CYBERSECURITY POLICY

The Subcommittee on East Asia, The Pacific, and International Cybersecurity Policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 5, 2018, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled “Next Steps on U.S. Policy toward North Korea.”

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jennifer Ayscue, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

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

AUTHORIZING USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 113, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I 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 concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 113) was agreed to.

HEMP HISTORY WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 532, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 532) designating the week of June 4 through June 10, 2018, as “Hemp History Week.”

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 resolution (S. Res. 532) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

COMMEMORATING THE COMMISSIONING OF THE USS “MANCHESTER”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 533, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 533) commemorating the commissioning of the USS Manchester.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 533) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF "NATIONAL TRAVEL AND TOURISM WEEK"

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 534, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 534) supporting the goals and ideals of "National Travel and Tourism Week" and honoring the valuable contributions of travel and tourism to the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 534) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

SMALL BUSINESS 7(a) LENDING OVERSIGHT REFORM ACT OF 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 431, H.R. 4743.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4743) to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the Office of Credit Risk Management within the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 4743) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2017

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2333 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2333) to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to increase the amount of leverage made available to small business investment companies.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (H.R. 2333) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 6, 2018

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, June 6; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed. Finally, I ask that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Axon nomination under the previous order.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The Senator from Ohio.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, last month in the Banking Committee, we passed bipartisan legislation to give our country more tools to respond to foreign investments from countries like China that pose a threat to our national security. I appreciate the Presiding Officer's interest in this issue also.

The Senate Banking bill was attached to the Defense bill in the Armed Services Committee later that week, and the House also passed a similar bill through a key committee at the same time. This is good news as we try to address threats to our national security, and I hope we can get this to the President's desk quickly.

The Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States—so-called CFIUS—screens foreign investments for national security threats and

blocks those that undermine our national security. But as countries like China have adopted new tactics and new techniques to acquire our critical knowledge and know-how, the laws that give CFIUS its authority haven't been able to keep up with technology; hence, the reason that Senator CORNYN and Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator VAN HOLLEN and Senator CRAPO and I have worked on this. I want to thank them for introducing legislation last fall to expand CFIUS's authority to keep up with these new tactics.

The Banking Committee bill builds on their efforts to modernize CFIUS to make sure that it has the tools it needs to tackle today's threats. No country—not even close—no country has been more aggressive than the People's Republic of China in going after American technology in aviation, robotics, new energy vehicles, and others where the United States has established itself as a global leader for a long time.

In just 3 years, from 2013 to 2015—from the beginning of 2013 to the end of 2015—the number of Chinese acquisitions coming under CFIUS review jumped 38 percent. And China is getting more clever, more sneaky—you can choose the word you like—at finding ways to get around the rules to avoid review at all.

We have seen Chinese companies start to structure deals so that they can gain access to sensitive technology and information without triggering the CFIUS review. For example, if a Chinese investor wants to buy a controlling stake in an American company, CFIUS would review that deal and have the chance to block it. But if Chinese investors instead got seats on that company's board, they could still have access to the same sensitive technology without going through the CFIUS review. Or some foreign investors also might, for instance, decide to enter into a joint venture with an American company instead, giving them access to all of the technology and data and know-how but bypassing the CFIUS review process.

The American business may not even particularly like joining up with this Chinese company, but the Chinese company will coerce them into a joint venture as a condition. This is what China is really good at, and U.S. corporations have been too weak-kneed in succumbing to this as a condition for continued access to the Chinese market. They play for keeps. Our corporations play far too often for narrow profits, even if at the end it is bad for American national security and even if at the end it is bad for American economic security.

Our bipartisan bill will give CFIUS and our export control agencies the tools they need to ensure that these types of investments don't slip through the cracks. The bill strengthens the CFIUS review process, the export control laws, and enforcement of both, particularly when it comes to critical technology and investments from

State-owned companies. But, so often, and as important as these updates are, CFIUS was created only to deal with national security threats but can't do any more than that. Right now, we have no way to evaluate deals that may pose a threat to our economy.

In 2016, foreign direct investments in the United States totaled \$370 billion. None of that—not a dollar of that—was reviewed to ensure it was in our long-term strategic economic interests. So while some of those investments were reviewed to protect our national security from Chinese threats, not one dollar was examined, was screened, was looked at, was reviewed to ensure that it was in our long-term strategic economic interests.

That is why I joined with Senator GRASSLEY to introduce the bipartisan U.S. Foreign Investments Review Act. It would empower the Department of Commerce to begin screening all types of large foreign investments for their long-term economic impact and consequences for American workers and American businesses.

I thank Senator GRASSLEY for working on this important legislation. Updating CFIUS is important for our national security. That is paramount, but we also need to expand it because it is important that our economic interests be protected.

We understand that the Chinese subsidize their energy, water, land, and capital. They often are state-owned enterprises. They are so often able to come into our markets and simply break international trade rules and put our companies out of business and throw our workers out of work.

(Mr. KENNEDY assumed the chair.)

We have seen foreign investments here that have raised serious concerns,

including worries that those companies are pursuing investments for the sole reason or the principal reason of undermining American industries and giving their own companies an unfair advantage. Again, some of these companies are owned or controlled by foreign governments. When it is Chinese, especially, their water, land, capital, and energy are subsidized, and it takes away our ability to compete because we don't do that.

We took a first step with an amendment in the CFIUS reform bill. For the first time, the Department of Commerce—in this bill that the Presiding Officer and I worked on in the Banking Committee—for the first time, the Department of Commerce will be required to study what American companies China is buying and in what sectors so we can begin to assess how big the threat is. Now we need to move forward with our comprehensive bill.

We surely know there are Chinese investments in the Presiding Officer's State of Louisiana and my State of Ohio. There are Chinese investments coming in that could, in fact, undermine our economic security, could cost our companies business, and could cause some companies to go out of business because of Chinese subsidies for their investments and ultimately put workers in Louisiana, Ohio, and elsewhere out of business.

It is simple. Before we do business with a foreign entity—whether the Government of China or companies subsidized by governments in that part of the world—let's make sure it will create jobs, let's make sure it will grow the U.S. economy, and let's make sure it will not undermine our national security or American industries. We are already behind when it comes to pro-

tecting our economy from Chinese investment.

I welcome investment from around the world, but I don't welcome it if it is going to undermine our national security, and I don't welcome it if it is going to put American companies out of business and American workers out of jobs. Senator GRASSLEY and I will continue working to change that. It is time to move forward.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:28 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 6, 2018, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nomination received by the Senate:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN K. LOVE

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 5, 2018:

THE JUDICIARY

ROBERT EARL WIER, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY.

FERNANDO RODRIGUEZ, JR., OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.