



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10, 2019

No. 62

Senate

The Senate met at 9:45 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MARSHA BLACKBURN, a Senator from the State of Tennessee.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

God of grace and glory, we bless Your Holy Name. Give us a hunger and thirst for Your righteousness. Lord, we confess that we often fall short of Your high standards for living. Create in us clean hearts, O God, and renew a right spirit within us. Continue to bless our Senators. Give them the fulfillment that comes from knowing they are doing Your will. Protect them from dangers as You guide them through the myriad challenges they must face to keep this Nation strong. Work through them to fulfill Your purposes for our Nation and world.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, April 10, 2019.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MARSHA BLACKBURN, a

Senator from the State of Tennessee, to perform the duties of the Chair.

CHUCK GRASSLEY,
President pro tempore.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak to the Senate for 1 minute as in morning business.

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

CLINTON INVESTIGATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. On Monday, I spoke about the Clinton investigation, and I want to reiterate one very serious issue. The FBI apparently had highly classified information potentially relevant to the Clinton investigation in its possession.

The FBI drafted a memo in May of 2016 to get access to the information. That memo said review of the information was necessary to complete the investigation. Sadly, that memo was never sent.

How could the FBI finish the investigation of the Clintons if they never got access to all of the potentially relevant information?

Congress needs to know what happened in that instance.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 1585

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1585) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCONNELL. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate continues to build on last week's progress in restoring our normal tradition regarding lower level nominations. We are moving several well-qualified nominees more promptly through floor consideration. We are clearing the considerable backlog of those who had been mired for months in our Democratic colleagues' across-the-board obstruction campaign.

Make no mistake, there is still a very long way to go. There are still too many vacancies on the President's team. There are still too many would-be public servants waiting for partisan barriers to fall. But this body should be proud of the progress we are already making and the healthier precedent we are setting for the future.

Yesterday the Senate voted to confirm both Daniel Domenico, the President's choice to serve as U.S. District Judge for the District of Colorado, and Patrick Wyrick to be a district judge in the Western District of Oklahoma.

Today we will turn our attention to Cheryl Stanton's nomination to lead the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division. It has been 1 year, 7 months, and 5 days since Ms. Stanton's nomination arrived in the Senate. In that time the nomination has been favorably reported by the HELP Committee not once, not twice, but three

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2349

times—three times through committee for this graduate of Williams College and the University of Chicago Law School and two times sent back to the President for the former executive director of the South Carolina Department of Employment and Workforce. Well, hopefully the third time will be the charm, and we can finally do the prudent thing on the Senate floor. I hope each of my colleagues will join me in support of the Stanton nomination later this week.

Later this week, as I noted yesterday, we will finish with the nomination of David Bernhardt to join President Trump's Cabinet as Secretary of the Interior. Speaking of procedures coming in threes, this would be the third time Mr. Bernhardt will have been confirmed by the Senate. He served previously as the Department's Solicitor and as its Deputy Secretary. According to the American Farm Bureau Federation, his "proven leadership" in these roles "has helped restore the multiple use of America's public lands."

They are not alone. Over his tenure, Mr. Bernhardt developed a reputation among sportsmen, conservation groups, and western Native American Tribes as a strong leader and partner in their efforts. So once again, I hope each of my colleagues will join me in voting to confirm David Bernhardt later this week.

MEDICARE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on a completely different matter, for some time now, my colleagues and I have been speaking out about the Democrats' parade of fantastical new proposals—plans to spend unprecedented sums of Americans' money in order to seize unprecedented control over Americans' lives.

Just a few weeks ago, the Senate voted on the so-called Green New Deal. It was Washington Democrats' plan to power down the U.S. economy and have the Federal Government intrude on basically every economic transaction and personal life choice in radically unprecedented ways. The specifics of the proposal, limited as they were, painted enough of a picture for outside experts to roughly estimate the price tag at as much as \$93 trillion, which is more money than the Federal Government has spent in its entire history, in exchange for the systematic dismantling of American prosperity.

It advocated for the abolition of the most affordable and plentiful domestic energy resources available to American families and a hog-tied American economy that our competitors would leave in the dust.

So it should come as no surprise that for the sequel we see and hear that Senate Democrats may soon officially introduce their proposed Washington, DC, takeover of health insurance—the plan I call "Medicare for None."

It is a fitting name for a proposal that would gut the Medicare Program

as American seniors know it, reuse the label on a new, government-run, one-size-fits-all arrangement, and remove 180 million Americans from the private insurance they have chosen in order to funnel them into a system without choice.

What is especially ironic is that my Democratic colleagues are choosing to agitate for this pivot toward socialism during this particularly important economic period—at this particular moment, with more job openings than Americans looking for work for the first time since recordkeeping started, when we have seen unemployment reach a 49-year low and wages growing faster than they have in a decade. It is the kind of economy where a single mom in Mississippi says: "It's amazing that I'm getting paid almost \$20 an hour to learn how to weld."

It is the kind of economy where garage door installers in Nevada say they are literally afraid to let potential new hires walk out the door because American workers are in such high demand.

Let's remember that this transformation is being helped along by Senate Republican ideas and policies that are the polar opposite—totally opposite—of what our Democratic friends are now calling for.

Here is how Republican pro-growth and pro-opportunity policies helped us get where we are: by encouraging job creators to invest here at home instead of penalizing success; by recognizing that working families know best how to spend their paychecks, not Washington; and by creating conditions for an economic surge that touches every corner of our country.

Now all of America is reaping the benefits. This isn't like the last administration, where 75 percent of new jobs and 90 percent of the population growth flowed into the very largest metropolitan areas. This time it is an all-American comeback, and all kinds of communities are benefiting from more jobs, more opportunities, and more growth in pay.

Monday is tax day. It is not exactly a time many of us look forward to, but this year marks the first time Americans are filing under the new Republican tax reform law that has helped them keep more of their paychecks and has helped to create the outstanding economy we see today. Democrats may be working overtime to bring this bright chapter to an end, but over here, on this side of the aisle, we will keep making sure that this is still just the beginning of these brighter days for the American people.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

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

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF JOHN P. ABIZAID

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of General Abizaid's confirmation to be our Ambassador to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. It took this administration nearly 2 years to even nominate someone to this critical position, and, unfortunately, we have seen the results of the absence of serious, experienced U.S. leadership.

I was pleased that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee expeditiously moved his nomination. In the past 2 years, we have seen Saudi leadership take actions that have seriously strained the U.S.-Saudi relationship and that have run fundamentally counter to basic international norms.

Saudi Arabia has detained and reportedly tortured members of its own royal family and has effectively abducted the Lebanese Prime Minister. In Yemen, the Crown Prince's coalition has led an offensive that has been responsible not just for breeding the world's worst humanitarian crisis but also for potentially opening the door to more malign Iranian influence. To this day, we still also seek accountability for the brutal murder of American resident and journalist Jamal Khashoggi.

With the White House's having conducted freelance diplomacy, the American people have had little faith that there has been serious pressure on the Saudi leadership for it to correct course. Worse, we continue to learn that the administration appears to be rewarding the Kingdom with secret side deals in support of its nuclear program—far outside the scope of legally prescribed processes.

Amidst all of this, we must find a way to get the U.S.-Saudi relationship back on course, for we do continue to share some common challenges and interests. Yet U.S. alliances are strongest with partners with whom we share values and with whom we can have honest conversations.

General Abizaid faces a tall challenge, but I believe he is up to the job. He has the experience and leadership necessary to both manage a large mission and get the currently fraught relationship with Saudi Arabia back on track in a way that advances our security interests and stays true to our ideals.

I urge my colleagues to support General Abizaid's confirmation. His leadership, deep regional expertise, management skills, knowledge of Arabic, and experience in having served in conflict areas will make him an effective U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia.

CONFIRMATION OF PATRICK R. WYRICK

Mr. President, I want to spend a moment on the issue of judicial nominees—specifically the President's nominee for the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, Mr. Patrick Wyrick.

Mr. Wyrick's record suggests he is little more than a rightwing crusader in the war against the reproductive rights of women. In 2014, he spearheaded an amicus in the *Sebelius v. Hobby Lobby Stores, Inc.*, case, arguing that corporations' religious rights were violated by the Affordable Care Act's requirement that employers' health plans cover birth control. By a 5-to-4 margin, the Supreme Court agreed. Likewise, while representing Oklahoma in *Pruitt v. Nova Health Systems*, Mr. Wyrick defended a law mandating that women who seek abortions first submit to having ultrasounds. Fortunately, the Oklahoma Supreme Court struck down that law.

I could go on, but the bottom line is that Mr. Wyrick embodies President Trump's pledge to only nominate judges who are committed to rolling back reproductive rights even if they are seriously unqualified for lifetime appointments.

Let's be honest about why the Republicans seek to confirm these judicial nominations at record speed. After being punished at the polls for their assault on affordable healthcare, they want our courts to do their dirty work for them. How convenient it is that the Republicans can confirm judges who have hostile records on healthcare even as they distance themselves from the Trump administration's reckless decision to declare the entire Affordable Care Act as unconstitutional, including the law's protections for patients with preexisting conditions, the tax credits that help families to afford premiums, the expansion of Medicaid, and so much more.

I am tired of watching the majority stack our courts in favor of wealthy special interests even as they know full well that Americans overwhelmingly oppose their morally bankrupt agenda. Once again, Americans oppose letting health insurance companies discriminate against people with preexisting conditions. They oppose their plan to end Medicaid as we know it and their trillion-dollar tax cuts for big corpora-

tions. They oppose this President's assault on the rights of consumers, workers, students, and women.

Democracy is supposed to be a battle of ideas, but when it comes to healthcare or student loan debt or climate change, the Republican Party does not have any. When you can't win on the merits, what do you do? You tip the scales of justice in your favor. Well, I, for one, will not stay silent. I will continue to speak out against unqualified nominees like Patrick Wyrick, and I will continue to vote against judges whose views are grossly out of step with the views of the vast majority of Americans on everything from the environment to women's reproductive rights to healthcare for all.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

TAX REFORM

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, tax day is not anyone's favorite day, but thanks to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, millions of American families are facing a less painful tax bill this year. They are also seeing a lot of economic opportunity.

When Republicans took office after President Trump's election, we were determined to make things better for American families. Under the Obama administration, the economy had stagnated, wages barely grew, job growth was weak, business investment growth was low.

Republicans knew that if we wanted to make life better for families, we had to turn that around. American families can't thrive if the economy isn't thriving. You need a strong, growing economy to give Americans access to good wages, good jobs, and real opportunities.

So we got right to work. We repealed burdensome regulations that were acting as a drag on economic growth, and we passed a comprehensive reform of our Nation's outdated Tax Code.

Why the Tax Code? Well, the Tax Code has a huge effect on our economy. A small business owner facing a huge tax bill is unlikely to be able to expand her business or to hire a new employee. In fact, if her tax burden is heavy enough, she may not even be able to keep her business open.

Similarly, a large business is going to find it pretty hard to create jobs or improve benefits for employees if it is struggling to stay competitive against foreign businesses that are paying much less in taxes.

Prior to the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, our Tax Code was not helping our economy. In fact, it was doing the opposite, and so we made reforming our Tax Code a priority.

Our goal with the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act was twofold: put more money in

Americans' pockets immediately and get the economy going again to give Americans access to good jobs, good wages, and opportunities for the long term, and that is exactly what we did. To put more money in Americans' pockets right away, we cut tax rates for American families, doubled the child tax credit, and nearly doubled the standard deduction, and now families are seeing the effects.

The liberal Tax Policy Center reports that under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, 90 percent of middle-class families are seeing a tax cut. For 2018, the typical family of four saw a tax break of more than \$2,000. That is more money every month to put toward a family vacation, a home or car repair, or a kid's braces, or to tuck away in savings for a rainy day.

That is not all. As I said earlier, families aren't just seeing a lower tax bill; they are also seeing more economic opportunity thanks to the economic growth spurred by the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act lowered tax rates across the board for owners of small- and medium-size businesses, farms, and ranches. It lowered our Nation's massive corporate tax rate, which up until January 1 of last year was the highest corporate tax rate in the developed world. It expanded business owners' ability to recover the cost of investments they make in their businesses, which frees up cash they can reinvest in their operations and in their workers. It brought the U.S. international tax system into the 21st century so that American businesses are not operating at a competitive disadvantage relative to their foreign counterparts.

Those measures have done exactly what they were supposed to do: Get our economy going again. Economic growth is up. Job creation is up. Wages are up. Personal income is up. Business investment is up. Unemployment is down.

Since tax reform was enacted, job growth has averaged 215,000 jobs per month. That is almost twice—almost twice—the monthly average during the Obama administration.

In 2018, for the first time ever, the number of jobs outnumbered the number of jobseekers; 2018 was the first time ever.

The Department of Labor reports that the number of jobs available has now exceeded the number of those looking for work for 12 straight months. Unemployment has now been at or below 4 percent for 13 months. In the last week of March, the number of jobless claims hit its lowest level in 50 years.

U.S. manufacturing, which saw thousands of job losses during the Obama years, is booming. Since tax reform was passed 15 months ago, the manufacturing industry has added thousands of jobs.

Wages have been growing at or above 3 percent for 8 straight months. Since

wages are growing faster than inflation, that is translating to a real increase in purchasing power for American consumers.

Business investment is up. Since the passage of tax reform, business investment growth has averaged 7 percent, almost twice—almost twice—what it averaged during the Obama administration.

What do all of these numbers mean? They mean more and better jobs for jobseekers. They mean more money in your paycheck to spend or save for the future. They mean more and better opportunities to advance in your career.

Thanks to tax reform, more families can afford to pay that orthodontist bill and still save some money for a family vacation. More families can afford to cover that unexpected car repair or plumber's bill. More families can afford to put a little extra away each month for the kids' education or for their retirement.

I am proud that tax reform is making life better for American families. Republicans will continue working to secure the gains that we have made for the long term and to expand opportunities for hard-working Americans even further.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. 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.

NOMINATION OF DAVID BERNHARDT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, later this week the Senate will vote on the confirmation of David Bernhardt, a longtime lobbyist, to the position of Interior Secretary. An oil and gas lobbyist will be entrusted with our sacred—sacred—inheritance, the great lands of America.

I urge Senators to oppose this nomination.

The Department of the Interior is the Agency entrusted with protecting our Nation's public lands, our water supplies, our wildlife, and our energy resources. It grapples directly with some of the biggest questions our country faces: how to respond to climate change, how to protect endangered species, and how to care for our precious natural resources. Yet to lead our Interior Department, President Trump has nominated Mr. Bernhardt, an oil and gas lobbyist who has made a career harming the environment, subverting environmental protections, and helping polluters sidestep Federal regulation.

As former Secretary Zinke's deputy, he has paved the way for even more polluters to run rampant without accountability. Under his watch, the Department of the Interior has already opened a colossal 17 million acres of

Federal land for oil and gas leases, generating millions in revenue for energy companies, all while Bernhardt recklessly managed our national parks during the government shutdown.

I am especially troubled this morning because POLITICO reported that under Mr. Bernhardt's watch, the Department of the Interior might even greenlight offshore drilling off the coasts of Florida—a prospect both parties in the State say they oppose. This should be a wake-up call to my colleagues all up and down the coast—Atlantic, Pacific, and the gulf. If they can't find a reason to oppose this nominee based on the other serious and troubling issues that have been raised, maybe this is reason enough for them.

It is hard to imagine someone whose background is so at odds with the Department's mission as Bernhardt's. For all his talk of draining the swamp, President Trump wants to add yet another Washington swamp creature lobbyist to his Cabinet.

By the way, our resources—our oil and gas resources—are large. The motivation here to spoil public lands for oil and gas drilling—it is the power of the oil companies. It has nothing to do with the plan for natural resources. Bernhardt is an exemplary example of the power of these oil companies.

Gravely troubling is the long list of conflicting interests that Bernhardt brings to Trump's Cabinet. Up to 20 of his former clients have lobbied the Department of the Interior since his arrival, and the New York Times reported last week that he very likely has been less than forthcoming about when he stopped lobbying. No other Cabinet-level nominee in the Trump era has so many conflicts of interest, and that is a low bar. It is a distinction no one should be proud to hold.

Worst of all, Bernhardt is a hardened enemy of climate science. If you are a lobbyist for oil and gas companies, you would say that climate change isn't real too. The Washington Post reported he attended a session of administration officials that "debated how best to establish a group of researchers that could scrutinize recent federal climate reports." Translation: Bernhardt is actively working to set up the White House's fake panel to deny basic science.

I have already introduced legislation to prohibit any funding from going to this fake climate panel, but knowing Mr. Bernhardt's role in setting it up should send shivers down the spines of every American who is worried about the impact of our changing climate on their families, their farms, and future generations.

We cannot entrust our public lands to someone known to wage a campaign of censorship against facts and reason. Now, later today, I am going to be able to meet with Mr. Bernhardt to discuss his qualifications. I am letting him know now that I will ask him the same three questions I have asked my Republican colleagues in this Chamber.

One, does Mr. Bernhardt agree that climate change is real; two, does he agree it is a product of human action; and three, should the Federal Government have a role in combating its effects? His record suggests his answer to all these questions is no, but let's see what he says today.

Caring for our planet and being good stewards of our natural resources are the most important responsibilities we owe to future generations, so I am gravely concerned about Bernhardt's nomination to the Department of the Interior, and I urge my colleagues to vote no on his confirmation.

One final point. It still amazes me that Donald Trump campaigns on cleaning up the swamp, and he does exactly the opposite when in office. An oil and gas lobbyist is head of the Department of the Interior? My God, that is an example of the swampiness of Washington, if there ever was one. When are Donald Trump's supporters going to understand this; that what he promised them, in so many different instances, he is not delivering. It is baffling. It is a sign of the weakness of our democracy that someone can walk into the Presidency promising so many things and then just immediately do the opposite and still a large chunk of Americans say they support him. It is amazing to me.

H.R. 268

Mr. President, for months, American citizens have been reeling from natural disasters and are in desperate need of Federal aid. Parenthetically, I remind Mr. Bernhardt that a lot of these disasters, scientists believe, are because the climate is warmer, and the weather is changing, but rather than work with us to provide the much needed aid to large chunks of America, our Republican colleagues have once again decided to follow President Trump and refuse to compromise. They are so afraid of him that even when he proposes something they know is wrong and irrational, they do a 180-degree hairpin turn and support what he is doing.

Now, that would be just politics, except millions are awaiting aid and need help. Their homes, their farms, their offices, and their factories are underwater, literally, in a lot of places still.

Just yesterday, House Democrats offered a solution. We said: Let's provide disaster relief not to some Americans but to all Americans struggling to recover and rebuild from natural disasters.

Their new proposal that the House offered includes an additional \$3 billion—this is House Democrats, not Senate Democrats, by the way. Their new proposal includes an additional \$3 billion to address urgent needs following the floods in the Midwest and the tornadoes in the South. This plus-up includes \$1.5 billion for the Army Corps of Engineers to support flood risk reduction so crucial in the Missouri River Valley, \$1 billion in CDBG for long-term recovery needs, and \$500 million in agriculture funding to help

the farmers and ranchers rehabilitate farmland damaged by natural disasters and replace some of the farm animals that have been lost.

Yesterday's House bill comes in addition to the proposals Senator LEAHY and I offered last week—and it is similar to them—and in addition to the work Senator LEAHY did last month. So, again and again, Democrats presented option after option for disaster funding that helps the Midwest, helps the coasts, helps the South, and helps Puerto Rico and other territories. None of our offers are either-or, help this but not that.

Enough excuses from our Republican colleagues. We have had enough of the slow playing, but, more important, the people who need this help have had enough. The bottom line is very simple. The aid we seek is what Americans have always done. When there is a disaster, we all come together and aid those areas in a disaster because we know when a huge natural disaster hits from God, an area can't deal with it on their own. They don't have the resources or the ability, and they are, many times, in trouble because of the disaster itself.

We say: Come to the aid, but all of a sudden Donald Trump goes into the Republican lunch a week and a half ago and says: I don't want any aid for Puerto Rico. He falsely claims they have gotten \$91 billion—not true—and then all our Republican friends go along.

Well, we are not. The House will not. Senate Democrats will not. Plain and simple, we don't believe you should pick and choose. Why did President Trump single out Puerto Rico, which are American citizens like everybody else? A lot of theories, but regardless of what your theory is, that is not the way to govern as President, and, frankly, it is not the way we should govern as Senators. It is bewildering that our Republican colleagues have caved to President Trump's—what can we call it—temper tantrum, even though they are well aware of the problems and were ready to help Puerto Rico before he threw that temper tantrum.

Some say: Well, Puerto Rico is getting a little money. They are getting food stamp aid.

Well, great. Then let's just give food stamp aid to everybody else. Let's give it to everyone else. Now, what about all the farms that are underwater? What about all the homes that are flooded and needing help? If you give food stamp aid, that doesn't help them.

So let's be fair. Let's treat each area the same. Let's do what we have done in the American tradition: Come together, when there is a disaster, to help Americans. Let's not be so afraid of Donald Trump that when you know he is wrong, you just go along.

The idea that Puerto Rico should be treated differently from the rest of America is insulting. It is against our American values and a betrayal of the promise to look after all American citizens, not because of their politics

and not because of what their last names might sound like; as American citizens, we come together during times of need.

Democrats will not yield in our responsibility to all American citizens, and I tell that to all my friends from the farm States, even those who voted against aid to New York when we had our hurricane. I never even considered not voting for aid to any other place in the country. I always have.

I say to my friends: Let's treat everyone fairly, and we can get the much needed disaster aid out there quickly.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. President, finally, on chaos. Over the past 12 days, the President has sought to fix his broken policies by breaking down his administration piece by piece. Even in an administration where we have become used to seeing extremism and illogic rule the day, a government of whim, a government of erraticism, a government of temper tantrums, the last few days has reached a new low in dysfunction, and all of this has a simple root cause. Every time President Trump faces a new challenge, he just keeps pointing his fingers and blaming others—blame her, blame him, fire this one, and fire that one.

Mr. President—President Trump, you are not a TV host. You are the President. Work to fix it. Don't keep firing. Don't keep changing policies from one day to the next and then abandoning them. Roll up your sleeves, bring in the experts, and work to fix it. You are the President—but the President seems to much more enjoy blaming people, whether they are in his own administration, people of our political party, and everyone else in between, than actually solving the problems.

He says he wants to keep Americans safe, but President Trump fires the DHS Secretary and Secret Service Director on a whim and provokes shutdowns that cripple our airports and our ports of entry. The President says he wants to strengthen America's standing in the world. Yet no President has done more to undermine the work of diplomacy and the State Department than Donald Trump. He says Republicans will be the party of healthcare. Yet he sues to devastate our healthcare system, with no plans to replace it.

In this administration, chaos reigns, and the source of the chaos comes only from one place, the President of the United States and his erratic, vacillating, often vindictive attitudes toward personnel and policies. When will President Trump learn that the biggest problem is not the personnel executing his agenda; it is the extreme irrational policies that are abhorrent to American values and sometimes against the law, but he insists on it. Every day that President Trump treats the most consequential job in the world like it is some kind of reality TV show is another day that America's security, stability, and long-term prosperity is further in peril.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

DEBBIE SMITH ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I would like to start by sharing a story about one of my personal heroes, Debbie Smith. Debbie Smith is living proof that one person can change the world if they have the courage to tell their story and fight for justice.

In 1989, Debbie was at home doing laundry. Her husband Rob, a police officer, was asleep upstairs after working a night shift.

Suddenly a masked man entered her home and threatened to kill her if she screamed. He blindfolded and abducted Debbie and took her outside to a wooded area behind her home, where he robbed and repeatedly raped her. The man threatened her over and over, saying: Remember, I know where you live, and I will come back to kill you if you tell anyone.

After he finally left, Debbie ran upstairs to tell her husband. She begged him not to make her go to the police. But he, as a police officer, insisted that she report the crime and go to the emergency room for a sexual assault forensic exam, sometimes called a rape kit exam.

Debbie did go for that examination and did report the crime. But for Debbie and millions of other survivors there are no immediate answers. Because of the nationwide backlog of untested rape kits, it would be years before she was able to identify her assailant and find any sort of peace.

Although the exact numbers are hard to estimate, experts believe that hundreds of thousands of rape kits remain untested in the United States, and, of course, each one of them represents a unique story of a sexual assault victim and holds the key to apprehending a violent criminal.

Waiting for that evidence to be tested can be excruciating. Debbie said that fear took over her life. She was haunted by the man's voice threatening to kill her. She was terrified for herself and her family, and she even became suicidal for a time.

It wasn't until 6½ years later that Debbie finally got the answer she had been looking for when a DNA cold hit revealed the identity of her rapist. She later said in an interview that DNA gave her back her life.

Debbie chose to harness her pain and to use it to save others from living through years of uncertainty as she did. She has become the fiercest advocate in the Nation for eliminating the rape kit backlog. She has devoted her life to making a difference for victims of sexual violence.

The aptly named Debbie Smith Act was originally signed into law in 2004 to provide State and local crime labs the resources they need to end the backlog of untested DNA evidence from unsolved crimes through additional funding and increased capacity. Under this law, Congress has provided more than \$1 billion since then in vital funding to forensic labs for analyzing crime scene DNA evidence, uploading the results into the CODIS database, which is what happens to the test after it is completed, and identifying violent fugitives and taking these violent criminals off the street.

Not only does this sort of testing provide relief for victims like Debbie and justice for their attackers, but the evidence is also effective in assisting investigations for other crimes. This is important because violent offenders will often commit many different types of crimes in many different jurisdictions. For example, if a criminal commits a burglary in one State, DNA evidence from that burglary case can be used later to connect this offender to an unsolved rape case in another State.

The States, thankfully, are following suit. Texas, I am proud to say, has led the Nation in passing mandatory rape kit testing laws, conducting audits of the backlog, and using Debbie Smith funds to analyze untested sexual assault evidence. I am proud to report that over the last 7 years we have reduced our statewide rape kit backlog from more than 20,000 to just over 2,000. This is an astounding achievement, and thankfully it is being replicated all across the Nation because of this important legislation and because of the courage of one woman, Debbie Smith.

By ensuring the Debbie Smith Act funds can be used to analyze evidence from all types of crime scenes, we can help forensic labs address their systemic backlogs and holistically target the cycle of violence. The Debbie Smith Act of 2019 will reauthorize the Debbie Smith Act program to continue the testing of DNA evidence from unsolved crimes nationwide, including rape kits. It will also reauthorize DNA training and education for law enforcement, correctional personnel, and court officers, as well as forensic nurses who take this DNA evidence during these rape kit collections to make sure that all of them are prepared to gather the evidence and to test it. Since 2005, Debbie Smith Act funding has led to the creation of 43 percent of all forensic CODIS profiles. Again, this is the FBI database, where the rape kit information can be entered to see if it matches previously entered DNA profiles.

Let me say that again. Since 2005, Debbie Smith Act funding has led to the creation of 43 percent of all forensic CODIS profiles as well as 20 percent of all offender samples in CODIS.

In total, Debbie Smith DNA grants are responsible for 45 percent of all matches made in CODIS, which is truly remarkable. Reauthorizing this legisla-

tion once again is a top priority for me as we work to continue chipping away at the nationwide rape kit backlog and provide these victims with the answers and relief they need.

Over the years, I have had the pleasure of meeting and working with Debbie several times, and we have been fortunate to have her share her perspective before the Judiciary Committee on multiple occasions.

I have also worked with two other inspiring victims from Texas—Lavinia Masters and Carol Bart, who, like Debbie, had the courage to come forward and talk about a very difficult event in their lives, but to use their pain as a way to help others. Lavinia and Carol have also lent their voices in advocating for reforms to reduce the rape kit backlog.

I am grateful to these and countless other survivors who bravely share their stories and ideas as we work together to eliminate the backlog once and for all. I hope the Debbie Smith Act of 2019 will soon be reported out of the Judiciary Committee and will quickly make its way to the Senate floor, pass in Congress, and make its way to the President for his signature without delay.

H.R. 1585

Mr. President, on another matter, earlier this week the House passed a bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act. Our Democratic colleagues keep saying how important it is to quickly pass this legislation to restore funding to VAWA as it is known, but I think it is important to back up for a moment and remember why that funding lapsed in the first place.

Earlier this year our Democratic colleagues allowed VAWA to get caught in the crosshairs of our funding debates, and they insisted we should not fund this vital program because it was overdue for updates. Their argument was this: We want to reform or update VAWA, so we are going to let funding for it lapse. It just didn't make any sense at all.

It is no secret that folks on the other side of the aisle think it is time we made some changes to the program. It is something I support, but we don't need to let the funding lapse in order to do it.

This is an issue that our friend and colleague Senator ERNST continues to champion here in the Senate. But the approach taken by our Democratic colleagues to get those changes is a head-scratcher, to say the least.

There were, as I see it, two options on how to solve the problem. One was to provide an extension for the previous funding to the end of the fiscal year. That would have allowed us to work on the long-term reauthorization under the regular processes in the Senate, which, in my experience, is always the preferred action to take.

The second option our Democratic colleagues chose was to do nothing and let this important legislation expire

without a plan to replace it. For whatever reason, that was the option that Democrats in the House chose.

In the nearly 2 months since, we have tried to negotiate a short-term extension to fund these vital programs. As recently as last week, our Democratic colleagues had a chance to support the restoration of funding while our negotiations continued.

The supplemental appropriations bill introduced by Senator SHELBY would have funded the Violence Against Women Act through the end of the fiscal year—again, giving us time to negotiate changes in the law that Democrats obviously want. But our Democratic colleagues simply refuse to support even a procedural vote that would have allowed us to get on the bill and debate it and then amend it. It seems increasingly clear to me that rather than providing the funding for victims of sexual assault and other violence, rather than finding solutions, what is happening here is that politics is creeping in and rearing its ugly head.

It is clear to me that this isn't about finding a solution; this is about political game playing. Now, rather than going through regular order to create a long-term reauthorization that includes feedback from both sides, House Democrats are trying to jam a one-sided piece of legislation through the House and then through the Senate. I think this is very shameful.

Our Democratic colleagues first refused to fund the Violence Against Women Act. They allowed it to expire, and now they are using victims of violence as leverage to push through their rushed, one-sided piece of legislation. Throwing a temper tantrum and holding the Violence Against Women's Act hostage until you get what you want is not a responsible way to legislate.

I would encourage our colleagues across the aisle to put politics aside for just a moment and work with us to pass a short-term extension for VAWA while we use the regular order to discuss long-term solutions.

There is a good way and a bad way to do this, and, unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues have chosen the bad way, but we would ask them to reconsider and work with us—not for us, but for the victims of domestic violence who are suffering as a result of their game playing.

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.

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

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

All time has expired.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 70 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blunt	Grassley	Roberts
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	McConnell	Tillis
Cruz	McSally	Toomey
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Enzi	Murkowski	Young
Ernst	Paul	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Jones	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Leahy	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Udall
Duckworth	Merkley	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Gillibrand	Peters	Whitehouse
Harris	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Booker Klobuchar

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the Abizaid nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John P. Abizaid, of Nevada, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Abizaid nomination?

Mr. RISCH. 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. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 71 Ex.]

YEAS—92

Alexander	Fischer	Peters
Baldwin	Gardner	Portman
Barrasso	Graham	Reed
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Roberts
Blackburn	Hawley	Romney
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Isakson	Schumer
Cantwell	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cardin	Kaine	Shaheen
Carper	Kennedy	Shelby
Casey	King	Sinema
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Leahy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	McConnell	Tillis
Cramer	McSally	Toomey
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cruz	Moran	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Murray	Wicker
Durbin	Paul	Wyden
Enzi	Perdue	Young
Ernst		
Feinstein		

NAYS—7

Gillibrand	Merkley	Warren
Harris	Sanders	
Markey	Udall	

NOT VOTING—1

Booker

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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Pat Roberts, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Holly A. Brady, of Indiana, to be

United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) is necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 72 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Sinema
Crapo	Manchin	Sullivan
Cruz	McConnell	Thune
Daines	McSally	Tillis
Enzi	Moran	Toomey
Ernst	Murkowski	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NAYS—43

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Smith
Cardin	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Carper	Leahy	Tester
Casey	Markey	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Peters	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	
Harris	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—1

Booker

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, and the nays are 43.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Holly A. Brady, of Indiana, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today marks the 30th anniversary of a very important law—the Whistleblower Protection Act. It is very important because people in government ought to listen to whistleblowers. They are very patriotic people.

The law is a critical foundation for the whistleblower protections we have in place today. The Whistleblower Protection Act has helped to usher in a

new era at our Federal Agencies. Government employees who are aware of waste, fraud, and abuse can now step forward and do the right thing, and they can do it with the law on their side.

As one of the original cosponsors of the Whistleblower Protection Act, I remember what things were like before that law was passed. I will give some examples, and these examples aren't pretty.

Back in the 1980s, I used to say that the whistleblower's only hope was like the desperate Charge of the Light Brigade. There were rarely any survivors. At the time, the executive branch saw whistleblowers not as patriots but as threats. Agencies wouldn't even verbally acknowledge the importance of whistleblowers in making government accountable to the people. Our whistleblower laws had no teeth, so there was nothing to stop it from happening and nothing to provide any relief at all to the patriotic whistleblowers who were then experiencing retaliation.

To give an idea of just how bad things were, let's start in 1984. A study conducted by the Merit Systems Protection Board found that nearly 70 percent of government employees who knew of fraud and impropriety wouldn't even report it and wouldn't say what they knew about it. They believed that no corrections would result if they did, and their No. 1 reason for nonreporting was fear of reprisal.

The sitting special counsel from 1982 to 1986 said that if he were an attorney advising whistleblowers, he would tell them this: "Don't put your head up, because it will get blown off." At the time, the Office of Special Counsel was part of a bigger organization that we refer to as the Merit Systems Protection Board. Instead of protecting whistleblowers, it protected the merit system—not individual employees, and, let me emphasize, certainly not whistleblowers. The special counsel's office would pursue only those cases it thought it could win. If a whistleblower came to it with a retaliation case that was difficult to prove, the whistleblower was simply out of luck.

So the Whistleblower Protection Act, 30 years old, addressed all of these problems and then some. That law made the Office of Special Counsel into a separate body, and it firmly established that the Office of Special Counsel was there solely to protect employees, especially whistleblowers.

In doing so, it gave whistleblowers a new and important ally. The law also established that the Office of Special Counsel should act, not just when it had an open and shut case but whenever it was likely that a prohibited personnel practice had occurred against a whistleblower. It made the Office of Special Counsel a chief defender of employees subject to prohibited personnel practices. The law addressed other problems as well.

I remember back in the 1980s, the Office of Special Counsel had developed a

disturbing practice of providing information on whistleblowers to Federal Agencies conducting personnel inquiries; as an example, people like Elaine Mittleman. Elaine worked at the Treasury Department. She went to the Office of Special Counsel alleging reprisal against her whistleblowing. When her case was rejected, she learned that the Office of Special Counsel had leaked negative information about her to the Office of Personnel Management to do her damage. The old Office of Special Counsel effectively ensured that Elaine was blacklisted from any other Federal employment.

Thankfully, the Whistleblower Protection Act stopped that practice and stopped it cold. The act prohibited the Office of Special Counsel from responding to Agency personnel inquiries about Federal employees except in the most limited of circumstances. It also expanded the definition of a protected disclosure and made it easier for employees to show reprisal. Of course, the 1989 law wasn't perfect, and in the time since it was passed, Congress expanded it and strengthened the Whistleblower Protection Act in very important ways.

In 2012, I was proud to serve as one of the original cosponsors of the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act. That legislation plugged several holes in the original law and made it clear that the executive branch can't use nondisclosure agreements to prevent whistleblowers from making protected disclosures. If Federal employees are required to sign a nondisclosure agreement, specific language has to be included in that agreement making it clear that whistleblowers can still report waste, fraud, and abuse. Wouldn't the taxpayers expect a Federal employee who knows about waste, fraud, and abuse to report that as a responsibility to their office and then not to be reprisal against because they did?

It is safe to say that, taken together, the Whistleblower Protection Act and the 2012 amendments have had a transformative effect on our Federal Agencies. Things are still hard for our whistleblowers in too many instances, and we still have a long way to go, but we have come a very long way since I first started working on these issues. By the numbers, more whistleblowers now report waste, fraud, and abuse, and they have the ability to fight retaliation. I hate to say this, but too often whistleblowers are retaliated against, even with respect or even in consideration of the Whistleblower Protection Act.

In fiscal year 2017, to show progress and to show that the bill has made a difference, the Office of Special Counsel obtained 323 favorable actions, including stays, corrective actions, disciplinary actions, and systemic changes to Agency practices. That is an Agency record and a 16-percent increase over the previous year. Of those, 241 involved instances of whistleblower retaliation, and 44 involved stays with Agencies to protect employees from

premature or improper personnel actions against them.

One of those retaliation cases involved a Federal worker who reported an Agency official to her management and to the Office of Inspector General for suspected theft. In exchange for disclosure, the official who was reported demoted the worker to the lowest possible position she could.

That is just one example to show you how patriotic people in the Federal employment who are whistleblowers—who just want government to do what the law requires or spend the money accordingly—get shafted as a result of just doing what you ought to do as a Federal employee: report waste, fraud, and abuse and stealing.

This person had some help because, as I said, she was demoted to the lowest possible position that she could; that is, until the worker filed a complaint and the Office of Special Counsel investigated. Following the investigation of the Office of Special Counsel, the complainant was not only reinstated but given backpay and compensatory damages. Faced with punitive actions, including temporary suspension and a reassignment, the Agency official who had engaged in the retaliation decided to resign. That is just one example of how the Whistleblower Protection Act has made a difference. I could, of course, list many others.

The Whistleblower Protection Act and its amendments have also had an important effect on congressional oversight. Whistleblowers are the eyes and ears inside the executive branch. In fact, when people come to my office explaining why they ought to be confirmed by the Senate, there are a couple of things I always tell them: No. 1, either you run your Department or it runs you; No. 2, you ought to listen to the whistleblower. Whether you are a little Agency with a couple of thousand employees or whether you are the Veterans' Administration with 350,000-some employees, you can't know what is going on down underneath you. When people tell you something is wrong, you ought to listen. Like I said, I have found it very helpful with congressional oversight.

My own oversight efforts would not be possible without the courageous action taken by whistleblowers. For example, whistleblowers contacted my office during the Obama administration about criminals who should be ineligible for DACA but, due to an oversight by the Department, were still receiving benefits like work authorization. Scrutiny of the program led to more thorough recurrent vetting of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

I worked with a number of whistleblowers at the Department of Veterans Affairs who had the courage—and it takes courage—to stand up and do what is right.

More recently, my office worked with Brandon Coleman after he was put on administrative leave for more than a

year and kept from running an addiction treatment program for veterans. It happens that Brandon's only "mistake" was to point out poor treatment of suicidal veterans. Eventually, after a concerted effort by my office, Senator JOHNSON's office, and the Office of Special Counsel, Brandon was provided a new position within the VA's Office of Accountability and Whistleblower Protection. That is how it should be done.

Without the protections established by the Whistleblower Protection Act, Brandon's story might have turned out very differently. Without these protections, who knows how many other instances of waste, fraud, and abuse that we have been able to find and repair thanks to whistleblowers would be continuing now unabated?

Now, make no mistake, we still have a ways to go to ensure that whistleblowers are valued as they should be valued and supported as they should be supported. I still hear from far too many whistleblowers who have done the right thing only to experience retaliation from their Agencies as a result.

We in Congress, including this Senator, shouldn't be hearing those things at all. That is why continued oversight by Congress is so very important. Whistleblowers depend on us—you and me. All of our colleagues in this body ought to be listening to them. We ought to be supporting them and honoring them by following up on their concerns and taking action to fix serious problems when they bring them to our attention.

I thank the whistleblowers who worked with my office over the years. They are truly patriots willing to put their job on the line, willing to put their profession on the line. We have come a long way since the Whistleblower Protection Act first passed in 1989. We owe it to them to build on the progress we made and to continue to improve upon our whistleblower laws for years to come.

You can rest assured that I will be part of those ongoing efforts on this important anniversary of the Whistleblower Protection Act. I encourage my colleagues to reflect on the important role whistleblowers play in our government and to renew their commitment to the same.

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

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

REMEMBERING FRITZ HOLLINGS

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon in honor of my good friend from South Carolina, the late Senator Fritz Hollings, who spent many, many years right here in this Chamber.

As we mourn his passing today, we remember the great impact Fritz Hollings had both in the Senate and in his home State of South Carolina, where he served as Governor, as Lieutenant Governor, as a member of the State legislature, and so forth. From 1966 to 2005, which was nearly four decades, he also represented South Carolina in Washington—right here in this body.

Born and raised in Charleston, SC, Fritz Hollings was a distinguished graduate of the Citadel and served as an Army artillery officer during World War II, for which he was awarded, among other things, the Bronze Star.

For 36 years, Fritz Hollings served alongside Strom Thurmond in the Senate, whom the Presiding Officer will remember. He was the junior Senator of his State for six terms, which made him the longest serving junior Senator in the history of the Senate. Throughout his tenure, Fritz served as a senior member of the Appropriations Committee, where I served with him. He was also the chairman of the Budget Committee and the chairman of the Commerce Committee. He was a skilled legislator and statesman.

In terms of influential policy, Fritz made quite a mark. He was instrumental in the creation of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which we know as NOAA. When he was chairman of the Commerce Committee, he also helped to enact laws to alleviate childhood hunger and to expand competition in telecommunications during the early stages of the internet.

He may have spent nearly 39 years in the Senate, but his time in Washington was not all that made up his career.

Fritz Hollings served three terms in the South Carolina House of Representatives. He won his first election in 1948 at the age of 26. He went on to serve as South Carolina's Lieutenant Governor and then as its Governor at the age of 36. In 1984, while he was a sitting Senator here, he ran for President of the United States. He was a true public servant. He devoted his entire life to the betterment of his country, to his State, and to his people.

As we honor his lasting impact and achievements throughout his career, we are reminded that Fritz was what we would call a southern gentleman. With a distinguished Charlestonian southern drawl and a quick wit, Fritz was courteous and well mannered. He built his seniority with patience and respect.

I am grateful for his friendship and camaraderie over the last 40 years. Annette and I join his family as we mourn his passing and celebrate his life and the legacy he leaves behind in the U.S. Senate.

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

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

VENEZUELA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last year I made my first trip to Venezuela just 1 month before a Presidential election that by all accounts was about to be rigged by the incumbent, Maduro. His criminal regime was increasingly isolated by its neighbors in the world.

The Venezuelan people are suffering horribly—malnutrition, hyperinflation, levels of disease seen only in war zones around the world. As a result, 3 million Venezuelans have fled the country.

Neighbors in Colombia and Ecuador showed and continue to show incredible compassion to the hundreds of thousands of desperate Venezuelans who are pouring across their borders. In fact, my staff was just in Cucuta, Colombia, on the Venezuelan border, and my staff saw firsthand the humanity and patience of the Colombian people helping their Venezuelan brothers and sisters showing up desperate for food and safety, all amid the stark cruelty of barricaded bridges deliberately blocking aid trucks.

I might just add parenthetically—what a sharp contrast: the suffering in Venezuela and the people in Colombia, their neighbors who are trying to help, and what we are doing on our southern border when it comes to those who are suffering in Honduras and El Salvador and Guatemala. What a contrast.

During my visit to Venezuela last year, I told Maduro that if he went ahead with his stolen election, he would find himself isolated in the eyes of the world, and the Venezuelan people would suffer even greater hardship. I told him that in Washington both political parties don't agree on much, but they do on Venezuela.

Tragically, he ignored me and proceeded with this discredited election.

As a result, when the region's governments on both the left and the right decided to recognize the Venezuelan National Assembly President Juan Guaido as the country's interim President, as provided for under the country's Constitution, I promptly agreed. In fact, I called Guaido immediately, spoke to him personally, and came to the floor of the Senate to offer my support for his ascendancy as the leader of Venezuela.

I had met him in Caracas last year at a dinner that was kind of a secret dinner since he was in the opposition, and I remember at that dinner that five members of the National Assembly said: If you come back here in 2019 and look for the five of us, two of us will be exiled, two will be in prison, and one will disappear. That is what happened in Venezuela.

The courage they showed at that meeting and afterward should not be ignored by the American people.

As President Trump made his case that the world needed to act in Venezuela, in part because of the horrible situation and danger the Venezuelan people found themselves in, I joined in

bipartisan agreement. The danger and fear are well-placed and well-documented—armed vigilante groups, some in motorcycle gangs, that harass and beat innocent civilians; extended power outages, leaving already desperate medical care even more perilous; and arbitrary arrest and torture for those peacefully demonstrating against the Maduro regime.

Just the other week, interim President Guaido's Chief of Staff, Roberto Morrero, was arrested by the Maduro regime, and it is feared that he is enduring torture at the present time.

Judge Maria Afiuni, already cruelly jailed at a previous time and assaulted for making a judicial ruling against the Chavez regime, has now found herself facing another 5-year sentence under the Maduro regime.

Five dual U.S.-Venezuelan citizens and a U.S. permanent resident who are CITGO employees have been cruelly held hostage in a basement prison for more than a year after being tricked into going to Venezuela for a business meeting.

So amid the administration's accurate description of the misery and the danger that Venezuelans face, this administration still refuses to grant to the estimated 72,000 Venezuelans on visas in the United States—some of them students in my home State of Illinois—temporary protected status. This would be an obviously humanitarian move that would allow them to stay here until Venezuela is safe and stabilized.

In Illinois, where many Venezuelans are studying in our colleges and universities, I have heard repeatedly of their desperation. Their visas are about to expire, and unless the President—and he has the power to do it—extends their protected status in this country, they will be forced to go back to Venezuela, a country our government warns people to stay away from.

I held a townhall meeting in Illinois with my Venezuelan friends. They are heartbroken and worried about their families who are still in Venezuela to this day, and they worry about the danger and violence they are going to face. Is it any wonder, then, that many of them who are students or visitors here want to stay in the safety of the United States until this stabilizes?

I would say to the President: I know your opinion of immigrants, and I know your opinion of refugees, but don't give us a speech one day telling us how dangerous it is in Venezuela and then the next day refuse to allow these people who are here to stay safely.

Temporary protected status is not permanent. It is a short-term humanitarian measure. We ought to do it.

This temporary protected status can be granted to nationals of another country who are in the United States if returning to their country would pose a serious threat to their personal safety.

Do you know what the official line of the Trump administration is about

Americans who want to visit Venezuela now? Let me read it to you. Here is what the State Department says:

Do not travel to Venezuela due to crime, civil unrest, poor health infrastructure, and arbitrary arrest and detention of U.S. citizens. . . . Violent crime, such as homicide, armed robbery, kidnapping, and carjacking is common. . . . There are shortages of food, electricity, water, medicine, and medical supplies through much of Venezuela.

That is the official line of our government, warning people not to go to Venezuela. Yet even weeks after Senator RUBIO and I have requested it, the administration still refuses to give the Venezuelans in the United States protected status so that they are not forced to face the same thing.

Recent power outages have left the country even more desperate for basic water. Look at this photograph here. This shows people collecting water falling from a leaky pipeline along the banks of a river in Caracas. That is the desperation these people face.

How can we force people to return to Venezuela when our own State Department says it is too dangerous to travel there?

In fact, last month Senators Rubio, Menendez, and I—and 21 other Senate Democrats—sent a bipartisan letter to President Trump, urging him to take the obvious step that would match his rhetoric on Venezuela.

I have also raised this directly with Vice President PENCE and National Security Advisor Bolton.

Let me again urge here on the Senate floor that President Trump take action to grant TPS status to the Venezuelans in the United States. This would be a concrete measure that President Trump could take this afternoon with the stroke of a pen to protect tens of thousands of innocent people.

At a time when some have questioned America's real intentions toward Venezuela, this action by President Trump of granting TPS status to Venezuelan visitors in the United States would demonstrate that our true focus is on the safety and well-being of these innocent people.

This is not only the right thing to do, but it would fully align the President with his speeches.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

TAX REFORM

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, as we approach tax day, America's roaring economy keeps on speeding ahead as we continue to see the positive impact that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is having throughout Iowa and the rest of our country.

Last week, yet another outstanding jobs report was released, showing that the economy added 196,000 jobs in March—well above expectations.

Just think, since tax reform was passed, 3.2 million jobs have been created. And year-over-year wage growth remains strong at 3.2 percent in March.

After years of stagnant wage growth, we have now had 8 consecutive months in which it exceeded 3 percent.

Under the leadership of Governor Kim Reynolds, Iowa's unemployment rate is the lowest in the country and is tied for the lowest rate ever recorded in our State. I have seen the effects of tax reform firsthand in my home State, and they are paying off big time.

Thanks to Senate Republican pro-growth tax reform, a business owner in Pella, IA, has saved tens of thousands in taxes, allowing her to increase the wages of her employees, purchase new semi-trailers, and upgrade her facilities.

A small brewery in central Iowa has been able to hire a new full-time employee and purchase an additional fermenter, increasing their production by 17 percent.

In a survey of Iowa businesses last month, 87 percent of folks said they plan to make capital expenditures this quarter, and the vast majority expects sales to grow over the next year.

By lowering tax rates and doubling the standard deduction and child tax credit, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has also helped families throughout Iowa keep more of their hard-earned dollars.

In 2018 alone, Iowans saved an estimated \$1.8 billion in Federal taxes. A single mother earning \$30,000 a year is saving over \$1,000 in taxes. Iowans earning between \$40,000 and \$80,000 are receiving an average tax cut of \$1,128 dollars.

These savings are certainly not penalties, as some of our Democratic colleagues have suggested. These tax cuts are allowing families to get ahead and save for their future.

Iowans are feeling the strong effects of the pro-growth tax cuts that Republicans passed. Folks are keeping more of their own money, and at the same time, the rising tide of our economy is lifting wages.

A couple of years ago, we were in the midst of the most sluggish economic recovery in our history. Folks, it wasn't much of a recovery. Today, thanks to tax reform, Americans are able to keep more of their own hard-earned money, our economy is booming, wages are finally rising, and unemployment is at a near 50-year low.

Tax reform has created a more competitive tax system while providing much needed relief for hard-working Iowans and job creators of all sizes. And folks, this really is only the beginning.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, as we said when we began to talk about tax reform months ago now, the purpose of tax reform was stronger families and expanding opportunities for every American. I think the facts are clear that that is exactly what happened.

Over the past year, most people saw bigger paychecks. Many of those people saw bigger paychecks because they had less money taken out of their checks. Ninety percent of middle-class Americans received a tax cut. Pay increases

for lots of other Americans set new standards in recent years. I think the pay increases of slightly less than 4 percent in the last year are higher than at any time in recent memory.

Under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the child tax credit doubled from \$1,000 to \$2,000 per child. That credit is available to many more families than before and obviously is twice as big as before.

People are able to keep more of what they earn.

We have an economy right now where people actually believe for the first time in a decade that the chance they are going to get a promotion is greater than the chance they are going to lose their job. They have also stopped worrying about their neighbor losing their job or someone else in their family losing their job. At this time, we have an economy where people who want to go to work can go to work with confidence.

Unemployment last month was at a 49-year low. Around a year ago, for the first time, more jobs were available than people looking for work. That had never happened before since keeping these statistics, that there were more jobs available than people looking for work. When it happened the next month, it was the second month in a row that it had ever happened because it had never happened before the first month. I think we are now 11 months into that statistic where there are more jobs than people looking for work.

In 2018, we had the strongest economic growth that we had seen since before the financial crisis about a decade ago.

According to the Department of Labor, average hourly earnings have increased by 3.4 percent year over year. That is the largest increase in a decade. Job openings increased to 7.6 million at the beginning of the year. That is the third highest job-opening number in a long time. As I said earlier, for the 12th straight month, the number of job openings has exceeded the number of jobseekers.

There is no doubt that the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has been part of the economic turnaround and will continue to be. One of the ways it will do that is by promoting new investment in areas where they need it most, through what we call in the tax bill opportunity zones.

In Missouri, there are 161 areas that have been designated as opportunity zones, making them eligible for the investment incentives under the new Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

I want to thank my friend from South Carolina, our colleague from South Carolina, Senator SCOTT, for all of his hard work in making sure this provision not only makes sense to people but making sure we fought hard to see that it was included in the tax bill.

The majority of these zones were required to have an average poverty rate of at least 20 percent and a median family income of no more than 80 per-

cent of the statewide median income. So obviously there are areas where something needs to happen to improve those areas.

It is predicted that \$100 billion of private capital will go into those opportunity zones. These are places where, even unlike the 1031 exchange, you can take an asset that is no longer working for you or you are no longer excited about having and you can get rid of that asset and put it in an opportunity zone. It doesn't have to be a like-kind exchange. There is a difference in focus and focusing where people need it.

Attracting new investments to distressed urban and rural communities with high poverty rates and slow growth is a challenge. This is one of the things that the tax cut is beginning to do and that the new tax bill is beginning to do, bringing in that investment and creating more opportunities for families.

Just recently, Housing and Urban Development Secretary Ben Carson came to St. Louis to highlight opportunity zones. Here is what the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development said: "The Opportunity Zones present an incredible opportunity for people to take unrealized capital gains that would normally be invested into more traditional vehicles and focus them on areas that are traditionally neglected."

The opportunity zones are another example of how tax reform is working to benefit Missourians and people all over the country. I think the goal of a tax plan that would benefit families and benefit individuals is clearly being realized as we approach the day that none of us are ever excited about—tax day. It is not the most popular day in the year, but over the past year, people have been able to keep more of the money they earn, and maybe just as important, they have been earning more money than they earned before even if they didn't benefit directly from the new Tax Code.

While this is not the most favorite day of the year, it is a day that has been better for American families than this day has been for a long time, and hopefully it will be even better a year from now.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about our booming economy and the stellar jobs report we saw on Friday, thanks in part to tax reform.

With tax day just around the corner, I would like to briefly highlight the many benefits American families, workers, and job creators have experienced as a result of lower tax rates.

Since Republicans passed the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, 3.2 million new jobs have been created. Our 3.8 percent unemployment rate is near a 50-year low. The unemployment rate for women in particular matches the lowest rate since 1953. Ninety percent of middle-class workers have experienced a tax

cut, and jobless claims have recently dropped to the lowest level since 1969. Additionally, in 2018, manufacturing job creation was the highest it has been in over 20 years.

As the most manufacturing-intensive State in the Nation, Indiana particularly benefits from this tax cut bill.

Last year, in conjunction with tax day, I spoke on the Senate floor about the many stories that have already poured into my office from Indiana businesses that are paying their workers more and constituents who are earning more. This year, I am proud to say these stories continue.

My guest to last year's State of the Union, Chelsea Hatfield, is a prime example. When tax reform was signed into law, Chelsea, a young mother of three, was working as a teller at a rural bank, First Farmers Bank and Trust Company in Tipton, IN. She received a raise and a bonus as a result of tax reform. This additional income helped Chelsea go back to school to earn her associate's degree, and it enabled her to put money away for her children's future college education. I am proud to say that this summer, Chelsea graduated with her degree, and she has been promoted to a commercial loan administrative assistant position. What a powerful story.

I recently had the opportunity to visit with a third-generation small business owner in Fort Wayne. Dan Parker is the owner of Parker Towing & Recovery. He was able to purchase several new trucks thanks in part to tax reform. This means more trucks will be available to assist Hoosiers who have been in a car accident or have had their cars break down. Parker also recently expanded the company's office space and gave his staff raises. Parker said: "As a result, we have less turnover now."

Another Indiana employer, Cardinal Manufacturing Company in Indianapolis, rewarded its team members with bonuses and pay raises.

Albanese Confectionery, a candy manufacturing company in Merrillville, provided bonuses that it says will happen annually as long as the tax reform bill stays in effect.

Lastly, I would note that this new Tax Code incentivizes new investment into distressed rural and urban communities to help the least among us through the creation of tax-advantaged opportunity zones around the State of Indiana.

The bottom line is that Hoosiers continue to benefit from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Workers are taking home more of their hard-earned money, and businesses of all sizes are expanding, hiring, and investing in their employees.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to continue supporting policies like tax reform that have our economy booming.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I want to join several of my colleagues today who are noting that we are approaching tax day. It is not a day Americans look forward to, but it is part of our responsibilities. The old joke about the two things that are certain—death and taxes—is still certain for all of us.

This year, it is interesting to approach this tax season in the first year of everyone filing under the new tax law. It has been fascinating to read some of the stories about what some of the media—the national media in particular—is saying about the tax law. They are so desperate to find anything to criticize. It is fascinating to me to read the headlines versus the stories.

The headline in this story in particular is “This is going to wipe us out,” in reference to the new tax law. When you read through the story and find out who they say is going to get wiped out, here is their illustration of the person: a person moving from a \$400,000 house this past year to one valued at \$1.1 million. He concedes he has a first-world problem of his taxes going up, but he says that owing more in taxes is “a little disheartening”—as he moves from a \$400,000 house to a \$1.1 million home. I am excited for him and his new home. I am sure it is beautiful. But that was their illustration of who is going to get hard hit by the tax changes.

This article from a national source said: “Is a Tax Refund Ahead in Your 2019? Some Taxpayers Received a Tax Bill Instead.” You go to the middle of the story, and they make this one little note: “Only about 5% of taxpayers . . . are expected to pay more under the new law.” In other words, 95 percent of Americans—even in this story that is a negative story about the taxes, they hide the simple fact that 95 percent of Americans will pay the same or less. The vast majority of those will pay less in their taxes for the next year.

How about this one. Here is another national story that came out. “Small business owners struggling to understand Trump’s new tax law.” When you get down to literally the last line of the story, it ends like this, with the same small business owner:

I don’t know [yet] if it’s going to impact my cash flow, the way I have to put money aside for this year, because I’m not sure. I may even do better [under the tax law], I don’t know [yet].

That was their whole story to say that people are struggling under this tax law—it was just the uncertainty.

What am I finding in Oklahoma? I am finding more jobs and more opportunity across the State. This is not some accident of history; this is the direct result of a change in the tax law.

I am quite confident that my liberal colleagues have all been very excited to find something to complain about through this process, but they overlook the simple fact that this one story buries 95 percent of Americans who do

the same or better under the tax law and that the vast majority of those are doing better under the tax law.

It was interesting. There was a Vox tweet that came out from a news source from one of the reporters who made this one comment this past week, saying: “Nobody likes to give themselves credit for this kind of messaging success, but progressive groups did a really good job of convincing people that Trump raised their taxes when the facts say a clear majority got a tax cut.”

My favorite: The left-leaning Tax Policy Center had to begrudgingly study the tax cut and what is actually happening and say: Middle-class taxes actually went down. Families kept almost \$1,000 more, which would have previously gone into government coffers.

What happened as a result of that, as a result of people keeping their own money and the withholding tables changing this past year so that each month, people are actually keeping more of their own money? Here is what happened: Our GDP grew at 3 percent a year—a dramatic increase from what we have had in the past; inflation-adjusted business investment has gone up 7 percent just since the tax cuts; and 215,000 new jobs have started on average every month since the tax cuts. Those are very strong numbers across the country. Unemployment has gone to 3.9 percent since the enactment of tax reform. Beginning in April of last year, the number of job openings in the national economy has exceeded the number of unemployed Americans—something that had not been recorded prior to April since records have been kept.

So starting this past year, there are literally more people searching to find other opportunities than there are opportunities out there because there are so many jobs open. So many companies are still trying to hire and are looking for people that people have the opportunity to stay at their same job, get better pay, or switch to a new job and get opportunities. That is providing more opportunities for more people to transition to a new job or make more money at their own job.

Well, what has happened on wages? As a result of what is happening in the economy, wages have gone up 2.9 percent just since the tax cut; that is, individual wages have gone up. What happened to income during that time period? Let me go back to the Obama time period. When President Obama was President, on average, income went up 1.8 percent; that is, total take-home. Since the tax reform, income has gone up 4 percent for each American. That is double the amount during the Obama administration. Again, this is not an accident of history; this is the result of the tax reform. This is what happens when people are allowed to keep more of their own money and spend it. More companies are doing better. There is more investment hap-

pening, more job opportunities, more opportunity to get a different job or to get a raise at your current job, and take-home pay has increased.

What has happened in people’s taxes? Well, early on this year, the stories, as I referenced before, were all about how tax returns were down. They searched to find anyone who had tax returns that were down. All those stories disappeared in late February, when the IRS brought out the latest numbers, not from January and early February but from February and March, and said: Actually, tax returns are up this year from what they were in the previous year.

As of the latest number, April 5, tax returns for individuals almost are dead even, exactly as they were last year. So the stories have disappeared from headlines that their tax returns changed because the IRS continues to report the facts. Actually, the returns are almost exactly what they were from the previous time.

So what has happened to actually help people in their paying of their taxes? Well, I started asking some of my team in Oklahoma to just ask people. When you are traveling around the State and when you are visiting people, just ask them how their taxes have gone and what has happened because people are filing now—just find out what is going on.

One of the dry cleaners in Enid let our team know that he is doing better in his small business taxes this year, and he is actually going to be able to put a downpayment now on some brand new equipment at his dry cleaner in Enid.

With another one we talked to—he is in his early thirties, married, he and his wife both work. They said they saved enough on their taxes this year from last year that they are going to start paying off some of their student loans and start paying down their car loan faster.

We spoke to one other gentleman who is also in his late thirties. They have one child who was born this past year. They said they have saved enough in their taxes from the previous year that they are going to be able to take care of some healthcare costs they have, and they are going to start setting aside some money to allow his wife to start a Roth IRA account. Starting their savings for their retirement in their thirties, when you should start saving for your retirement, they are able to do this year because of the change in the Tax Code.

With another gentleman we talked to who works in Oklahoma City, he reported that with his withholding changes that happened, he is now actually in a—he was in a 25-percent tax bracket and has now moved to the 22-percent tax bracket, and he is using his savings to take care of some of the issues he had in his own personal debt.

We have a married couple in Davis, OK, down in South-Central Oklahoma. Their income actually went up \$4,000

this last year. When they finished all their tax payments, their tax actually decreased by \$700 from one year to the next, even though their income went up.

Another couple down the street from Davis in Sulphur, OK, own a small farm. Their income went up \$7,000 last year from the previous year, and they were panicked about what would happen with their taxes. Well, their taxes actually decreased \$1,400 from the year before.

We have a police officer in Norman, OK, just south of Oklahoma City. He actually—he and his family, after they finished filing all their taxes, he said this:

I now bring home more in my check every 2 weeks because of the change in the Tax Code. It is making things so much simpler for us to be able to make ends meet.

There was a teacher in an elementary school. She noted, as simple as this may sound, that she has received \$10 more every single time a paycheck came out, and that made a difference for her as a first-year teacher just getting started.

There is a farmer with two kids. He was able to use the new child tax credits, and although his income was higher than the year before, his tax burden was \$3,000.

There is a pilot married to a nurse in our State. Their income actually increased in the past year as well, but he said with the lower tax rates and the child tax credits, their tax burden also decreased by \$1,000 from the year before.

All these are real-life stories of what is really going on in the State. As I hear all the different stories that come out, people lose track of the fact of what is really happening. While some of my colleagues have been so focused on trying to find some way to be able to damage the effect of tax cuts, families in my State know the difference.

One of the families we encountered this past week made a comment that they had a child born in 2018. That child was born in 2018 but actually very premature. Their medical bills racked up pretty quickly because the child was in the ICU. Then they started filing their taxes this year as their medical bills were coming in—by the way, their child is doing well and healthy. As they started filling out all their forms and were thinking about some of their bills, being able to cover their deductible, their tax bill came back in, and they saw their taxes are lower, and they are using their higher return this year to offset the medical costs from the early delivery of their child.

This is what tax reform looks like. Some of my colleagues try to spend all of their time saying tax reform is all about big corporations and Wall Street. Interestingly enough, most of the high-income folks in my State have said, actually, their taxes went up a little bit this year, not down. They are part of that 5 percent of Americans who didn't end up with a tax change. For the vast

majority of Americans who are working and putting ends together and taking care of their family, in my State and in other States, they are finding that tax reform is not some theory to them. It was a real help to their family in paying off debt, starting retirement, taking care of medical costs, taking care of their family, getting going on with life, and as the police officer in Norman said, "just making things a little simpler."

Tax reform is determined to help our economy, to get us growing, to get us going as a nation and provide more opportunities, and I am grateful, even in all the complexity of filling out tax forms, it is showing a real result in pragmatic ways to Americans.

This past weekend, I stopped and filled out my tax information—going through all the details and gathering all the forms and filling everything out. It is still a pain, and it is still not the most pleasant experience in all of life filling out your tax forms, but at the end of it, I reflected on some of these direct stories and realized there are people who really do feel the real effects of what is going on. Understanding all the frustration of filling out taxes, which is a pain for everybody, there is some real benefit this year versus the year before and I hope for the years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, you have heard the quote: "In this world, nothing can be said to be certain except death and taxes." Of course, that was from Benjamin Franklin back in 1789.

Well, just as Franklin predicted, the tax man cometh on Monday. This year, tax day follows a very strong March jobs report. Our booming economy remains an incredible boon for U.S. workers. Employers added 196,000 jobs last month. It beat all expectations. U.S. unemployment is right now at historic lows. It has remained at or below 4 percent now for over a year. Weekly jobless claims have fallen to a 50-year low—50 years. It has never been lower, and the unemployment rate for women is now the lowest since 1953.

Wages have increased by more than 3 percent, the fastest growth in a decade, and it is worth noting that in recent months, the biggest pay increases have gone to lower income workers. Bigger paychecks mean a higher standard of living. Bigger paychecks mean the median household income continues to rise and is, today, at the highest level ever in the United States.

There are currently 7.6 million jobs open. We actually have more open jobs in America today than we have people to fill them. Small businesses recently set hiring records, and 60 percent of small businesses have additional plans to hire more people. You would have to go back 20 years—two decades—to find as many new manufacturing jobs as we have added last year.

So this solid jobs news reflects an American economic renaissance brought about by Republican tax reform. Republicans reduced tax rates across the board. We have done it for individuals and have done it for businesses starting in 2018. We lowered tax rates for small businesses, as well as for family farms and family ranches, which is certainly a big thing for me in Wyoming. We nearly doubled the standard deduction. We cut our excessively high corporate tax rate as well so U.S. companies are able to compete better globally. We made it easier for business owners to recoup the cost of their investments because we want them to invest and hire more people in the process.

As a result of Republican leadership, American workers have abundant opportunity. The Washington Post reports that due to the strong labor market, economists, they say, now foresee "almost no risk of an imminent recession." According to the Post article, "As long as hiring remains strong and wages are climbing, the economy is likely to continue growing, experts say, because people typically spend more when they are not worried about losing their job."

Our economy is strong. Our economy is healthy. Our economy is growing. The U.S. GDP has risen 3 percent year over year. Lower tax rates have freed job creators, giving companies the confidence to invest, to grow, and to hire. Employers have created more than 3 million jobs since tax reform passed and 5.5 million new jobs since President Trump took office. With faster job growth and better profits, businesses can invest more in their workers.

Last year, a number of Wyoming employers boosted pay and benefits due to tax reform. Darden Restaurants, with locations nationwide, including in Cheyenne and in Casper, invested \$20 million in its workforce. Kroger grocery stores and convenience stores, with more than 1,400 employees in Wyoming, well, they invested \$500 million to boost worker pay. Kroger plans to add, actually, 11,000 more jobs.

Many companies in Wyoming have made similar investments. I hear about them every weekend. Our utility company in Wyoming, Rocky Mountain Power, has rewarded our customers as well. It decreased its electricity rates last year by 3 percent, and, they say, as of course other utilities have across the country, it is a direct result of tax reform.

Democrats, on the other hand, are threatening to reverse these gains and dramatically increase taxes with their extreme socialist agenda. Democrats want to take over all of healthcare in this country and eliminate insurance from 180 million Americans. That bill was introduced today by the Senator from Vermont and cosponsored by, I assume, just about every Democrat who is running for President who is a Member of the Senate.

Medicare for All, let's be clear, is government-run healthcare. It has an

estimated 10-year price tag of over \$32 trillion, meaning massive tax hikes for American families.

Democrats also want to control our energy sector. It is called the Green New Deal. Its estimated 10-year price tag is \$93 trillion. This unaffordable, unworkable plan would destroy our economy and dramatically increase taxes.

Far-left Democrats are touting tax-the-rich plans that would punish success. These include raising the top marginal tax rate to 70 percent, imposing a 2-percent annual "wealth tax," and raising the top estate tax rate to 77 percent on farmers, ranchers, and business owners.

Republicans dramatically reduced the estate tax or the "death tax" as a result of tax reform. This tax is double-taxation. It taxes money that has previously been taxed already. It hurts family-owned businesses, and it hurts ranchers and farmers and should be fully repealed.

Clearly, Democrats have taken a sharp left turn. Their policies will send our strong, healthy, and growing economy careening over the liberal cliff.

Republicans' pro-growth tax relief has produced a booming economy with millions of new jobs and larger paychecks. We freed job creators to hire again. We put Americans back to work. We raised the standard of living. Thanks to Republican tax reform, America is back in business.

So I say, we must come together. We must do it now. We must embrace commonsense policies that will continue our progress. Republicans have provided successful solutions. Democrats are now promoting the failure and the horrors of socialism.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

SOCIALISM

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, thanks very much. Before I talk about the auto industry, the strength of our economy, and climate change, I want to say a word about socialism.

I am a Democrat. I am not a socialist. I was a naval flight officer for 23 years, plus 4 years as a midshipman before that. I had three tours in Southeast Asia, and I am the last Vietnam veteran standing.

I have no interest in supporting a socialist agenda—none at all, none at all. In fact, I don't know if many of my colleagues feel that way, either.

I do know this, though. I know an election was held in November of 2008. We were in the worst recession since the Great Depression. Banks stopped lending money. The unemployment rate reached 10 percent. Banks were not lending money to people to go to school, to start businesses, to buy cars. It was a terrible time.

We had an election. The voters of this country decided to change horses, and Barack Obama succeeded George W. Bush. Joe Biden was elected Vice President.

They started at the bottom. It hadn't been that bad in this country in terms of our economy since the Great Depression. Eight years later, we had another election, and the new administration inherited the longest running economic expansion in the history of this country.

I will say that again. The Trump administration inherited in January of 2017 the longest running economic expansion since the Great Depression.

Add to that the tax bill that pumps up the economy, and now we are 10 years into an economic recovery. That is the good news. It has been 10 years.

The unemployment rate is low. I think one of our earlier speakers said that GDP growth from last year was 3 percent. That was actually a little bit under 3 percent. He said it hadn't been that low for a long time. I think that low was reached maybe in a couple of quarters of the last year or so of the Obama administration.

But what I am concerned about are two things. One, a lot of money that goes to businesses through the tax bill—a lot of it—has been used for stock buybacks. It pumps up the value of stocks. It pumps up the value of the stock exchange, and it gives us a feeling of elation and jubilation. But we need to temper that a little bit with something else, and that "it" is called a deficit.

We had 4 years of a balanced budget. We hadn't been able to balance our budget from 1968 to about 1998. We couldn't balance our budget. The last 4 years of the Clinton administration, we had four balanced budgets in a row.

We also had a great recovery from an economic recession inherited in 1993, beginning with the Clinton administration, and we turned over a strong, robust economy to the George W. Bush administration in 2001. He also turned over to him a balanced budget—about four in a row.

Eight years later, we didn't have a balanced budget anymore. We had a huge deficit, and we were in the worst recession since the Great Depression.

Sometimes we reimagine history. I just want to set the record straight.

I used to be the treasurer for the State of Delaware when we had the worst credit rating in the country. We were at 29. We couldn't balance our budgets for nothing. We had the worst credit rating, tied with Puerto Rico. We were dead last. The people in Puerto Rico were embarrassed to be in the same shoes as us in terms of our credit rating. So I have some idea of what it is like to be in debt and some idea of how to get out of debt.

We are looking at debt right now in this country, coming off of the debts of the last fiscal year, of \$750 billion—"billion" dollars. This year's deficit is expected to reach \$850 billion—"billion" dollars. Next year, it is expected to reach almost \$1 trillion in 1 year—in 1 year.

That is no way to run a business, no way to run a government.

As a guy who is the senior Democrat on the Homeland Security Committee and viewing what is going on at the Department of Homeland Security, when we worked so long on a bipartisan basis to stabilize that Department and to enable them to do their job and to have the resources they need, to see the kind of turmoil that is going on in that Department breaks my heart. It breaks my heart.

That is the bad news.

The good news is that we had a markup today in the Environment and Public Works Committee. My colleague SHELDON WHITEHOUSE was there. We passed three pieces of legislation, all with bipartisan support. I think all of them passed unanimously.

One is called the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act. What does it do? It reduces emissions from diesel engines. The good thing about diesel engines is that they are in cars, trucks, vans, trains, boats, and locomotives. There are probably several million diesel engines in this country. They last a long time. A lot of them are really old, and a lot of them put out a lot of pollution.

Did you ever watch a diesel truck at a stoplight? The light changes and the diesel truck starts out, and black plumes of smoke come out of the back of the diesel truck. That is called particulate matter, and some of that particulate matter is called black carbon.

What does that black carbon do? It is about 1,000 times worse for our climate and our atmosphere than carbon dioxide. There is actually an American-made technology that will reduce emissions from those diesel trucks by as much as 90 percent.

If we are serious about doing something about climate change and reducing the impacts of climate change—extreme weather and all kinds of things—and if we are interested in doing that, we can reduce black carbon. Again, unanimously, our committee supported bipartisan legislation to do just that.

We have been doing this since 2005—using American technology and creating American jobs to do good things for our climate and our atmosphere. Those are the kinds of things we can do and we ought to do. Those are the things we can do and we ought to do.

It shouldn't all be blaming one side or the other. Let's find things we can work on together. I think for me the Holy Grail in terms of public policy, as the senior Democratic Senator serving with Mr. WHITEHOUSE and JOHN BARRASSO, our chairman, is this: How do we clean up our air? How do we clean up our water? How do we do good things for climate change and reduce the extreme weather?

How do we do those things and create jobs? By doing those three things, we do create jobs. Today in this country about 157 million people went to work. Three or four million of them went to work on jobs that have something to do with sustainable energy, clean energy, climate change, and holes in the ozone—prohibiting them and fixing

them. Three to four million people went to work on those kinds of jobs. That is a good thing.

The point I am trying to make is, Is it possible to do good things for our planet? Well, President Macron of France, down the hall about 1 year ago, spoke to a joint session of Congress and he said these words: We only get one planet. There is no planet B.

He was right. This is our planet, and it is going to belong to these young people—these pages sitting down in front of me this afternoon. It is your planet. It is already. We want to make sure that we turn it over to you in better shape than we found it.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, now let me talk a little bit about climate change and why it might be of some interest to us in Delaware. Delaware is the First State—the first State to ratify in the Nation, on September 7, 1787. Before any other State had ratified the Constitution, we did. For 1 week, Delaware was the entire United States of America. We let in Maryland, and we let in Pennsylvania and about 47 others. I think it has turned out all right, until now. We will see. Hopefully, it will turn out for a much longer period of time.

But the First State is also the lowest lying State in America. Think about that. It sits right on the Atlantic ocean, halfway between Maine and Florida. Our State is sinking and the oceans are rising. That is not a good combination, especially if you are as small as we are. So we have a personal interest in climate change, global warming, and sea level rise.

We don't believe it is esoteric. We don't believe it is scientific dogma. We think it is real, and it faces—maybe not my generation so much, although we are seeing bad things happen because of sea level rise and climate change—my kids and their kids someday. The chickens will come home to roost.

The question is, Can we do anything about it? And the answer is yes, we can do a lot.

Where should we start?

Well, we should start on a lot of places where carbon comes from. For me, one of the things we do is to make sure that we protect, if you will, the carbon-free sources of electricity generation to the extent that we can. As it turns out, 60 percent to 70 percent of the electricity in this country that is generated without creating carbon is from nuclear powerplants.

There is technology and research going on—advanced technology and advanced nuclear reactors—to see if there are ways we can build on nuclear power and reduce the amount of spent fuel. Some people call it waste. I call it spent fuel rods.

What can we do through new technology? There is actually reason to be encouraged. There is a lot we can do and we need to do.

What else can we do? Well, we can pass our Diesel Emissions Reduction

Act and build on the legacy of the last 13 or 14 years. I am encouraged that we are going to do that.

We have nascent technology. I think that Europe is a little further ahead on this than we are, but we have the ability to not just take carbon dioxide out of a smokestack—say, out of a coal-fired plant generating electricity—but to literally pull carbon dioxide out of the air. It is ambient carbon dioxide, out of the air—to pull it out of the air and turn it into something useful.

While those are, I think, promising technologies, there is something else that is right before us that is a lot more effective, and that is our cars, trucks, and vans. Why do I mention them? The greatest sources of carbon dioxide emissions come from our mobile sources—our cars, trucks, and vans. It wasn't always that way. It used to be coal-fired plants, utility plants. It could have been cement plants or other manufacturing plants that emitted emissions, including carbon dioxide.

Today the largest source of CO₂ emissions on our planet are mobile sources—cars, trucks and vans. That is the bad news. The good news is that we can actually reduce that.

I was at the Detroit Auto Show. I have been going to the Detroit Auto Show for a long time. There was a time not that many years ago—a decade ago—when Delaware actually built more cars, trucks, and vans per capita than any other State. We had a huge interest in making sure our GM plant stayed in business and a huge interest in making sure that our Chrysler plant stayed in business.

As the Governor of Delaware, I worked hard to make sure that those plants stayed in business. We had 3,000, 4,000 employees in each of those plants. For a little State like Delaware, that is a lot. At the bottom of the great recession, GM went into bankruptcy. We lost them both. Thousands of jobs were gone just like that.

In any event, I still have a huge interest in automobiles. One of the reasons I have a huge interest in the automobile industry is because of carbon dioxide emissions, and the largest source is in our cars, trucks, and vans—the automotive industry.

I went to the Detroit Auto Show again this past January and the January before, and I was there 11 years ago. Eleven years ago at the Detroit Auto Show, the Car of the Year was a car called the Chevrolet Volt, a hybrid. The first 30, 40 miles ran on battery, and after that, it was a gasoline engine.

It was the Car of the Year. It got only about 38 miles on a charge of electricity—a fully charged battery. Fast forward 10 years, and about a year ago, at the Detroit Auto Show, the Car of the Year was a Chevrolet Bolt. It got 140 miles on a charge. It was all electric, not a hybrid. The Chevrolet Volt went from 38 miles on a charge 11 years ago, and 10 years later, the Chevrolet

Bolt goes 140 miles. That is pretty good progress.

I was at the Detroit Auto Show this year, and I saw close to a dozen different vehicles and manufacturers from this country and around the world that have all-electric car vehicles, and they are getting about 240 to 250 miles on a charge. Think about that. Eleven years ago, the Chevrolet Volt was getting 38 miles on a charge; a year and a half ago, the Chevrolet Bolt was getting 140 miles on a charge. This year, there are a number of cars getting 250 miles on a charge—off their battery. It is only going to get better.

We have the ability to create propulsion for our vehicles by using hydrogen in conjunction with fuel cells to create electricity to power our vehicles. What is the waste product? Let me see—water. The waste product of the hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicles is H₂O. It is so clean, you can drink it. That is where the future is for automotive transportation in this country—battery-powered vehicles and those that are powered by hydrogen in conjunction with fuel cells.

In our committee, Senator BARASSO, some of our colleagues, and I are getting to work on the highway bill. It is not just the highway bill; it is roads, highways, bridges, transit. We do this about every 5 years. We are starting to work on the next follow-on reauthorization of the transportation bill. The current bill expires on September 30 of next year.

We are getting a head start on it this year. We want to make sure, as we prepare for the next 5 years in transportation, that we build roads, highways, bridges, and transit systems in ways in which we realize we have a real challenge on this planet with too much carbon in the air and make sure we build into our roads, highways, and bridges the ability to recharge batteries.

Come 2030, half of the vehicles that are expected to be built and sold in this country will be battery-powered electric vehicles or they will be hydrogen-powered fuel cell vehicles. If we are smart about it, when we take up and legislate and build on past legislation to build roads, highways, bridges, and transit going forward, we will do it in a way that creates corridors where people traveling major roads in our country can easily stop and recharge their vehicle's battery or refuel hydrogen. That has to be part of our legislation.

Since much of our carbon dioxide is coming from mobile sources, we want to make sure that, when we build roads, highways, and bridges, we do it in a way in which we reduce emissions in smart ways, if you will, and the infrastructure is more sustainable. These are some of the things we need to do.

The other thing I want to say is that, for me, the Holy Grail of public policy right now, given the threat we face from climate change, extreme weather—I will give you a hint. We had too much rain in Delaware. We raise a lot of soybeans, a lot of corn, a lot of lima

beans, and a lot of chickens. If you asked a lot of farmers in Southern Delaware last year how things went, they will tell you that they got a whole lot of rain. We got a whole lot of rain last spring. You don't want to have too little rain, but you don't want too much. A lot of our farmers planted their crops last spring, and it rained, and it rained, and it rained. The crops did not come up. They plowed under and replanted, and it rained, and it rained, and it rained. Too many of our farmers didn't get a crop.

The folks in the Midwest—Nebraska, South Dakota, and other places—right now are going through even more extreme weather than that because they are getting a lot of rain all at once. I talked to one of our colleagues here in the Senate about his State this morning, and this is happening again, I think, maybe this week. That extreme weather is caused by too much carbon in the air. There is a great need to do something about it.

The good news is this. We can do something about it and create jobs. How would that work in the automotive area? Right now, our friends in the automotive industry would like to build a lot more fuel cell-powered vehicles and a lot of electric-powered vehicles. They plan to. They want to make sure that, when they do that and they are on the roads and highways across the country, people get their electric vehicles recharged and their hydrogen vehicles refueled.

We need to put into our transportation legislation provisions that make those charging stations and those fueling stations a reality. Our auto industry needs certain predictability. Most businesses will tell you that, of all things, they need certainty and predictability. It is at the top of the list. Right now, the current administration is not interested, unfortunately, in providing the certainty and predictability that folks need in the auto industry.

There is a 50-State deal to be made in terms of fuel efficiency standards going forward. It looks something like this: The Trump administration wants to have almost no increase in fuel efficiency standards between 2021 and 2025—almost nothing, almost flatline, and absolutely nothing beyond 2025. The current regulation in place by the last administration—the Obama administration—calls for, between 2021 and 2025, annual increases in fuel efficiency standards by roughly 5 percent. That is pretty steep. That doesn't sound like much, but after 5 years in a row, it is a big increase.

The auto industry is saying that they would like to have some near-term flexibility between 2021 and 2025 in fuel efficiency standards. They are ready to ramp it up going forward.

I think the current administration might be willing to agree on a compromise of fuel efficiency standards going up 1 percent a year between 2021 and 2025, but they don't want to do anything more after 2025. We will be

making a bunch of vehicles that get maybe 300, maybe 400 miles on a charge. I think there might be a number between a 1-percent increase in fuel efficiency standards between 2021 and 2025 and a 5-percent increase. There may be some middle ground between a 1-percent-a-year and a 5-percent increase in what the Obama rules call for. Maybe it is 3 percent. So rather than making no progress in fuel efficiency standards, you have a 3-percent increase. The auto industry may not be crazy about it, but they can live with it. They can live with a good deal more than 3 percent after 2025. We ought to do that.

If we do that kind of thing, we will make sure we don't spend the next 5, 6 years with the auto industry in legal battles in California and 13 other States, including Delaware and Rhode Island. The auto industry has a certain predictability that they need. If they build these vehicles, we will be competitive on the world stage and have a strong economy as a result, and we will have done good things for our planet. Why wouldn't we do that? Really, why wouldn't we do that?

My dad was a big "common sense" guy. We can all probably remember things our parents said to us from time to time. Among other things, after my sister and I had done some bone-headed stunt, my dad would say: Just use common sense. He was an old chief petty officer in the Navy—tough as nails. He didn't say it that nicely, but he said "just use common sense" a lot.

We need to use some common sense. In doing that, we will create a great bunch of jobs and make ours a competitive nation on the world stage in one of the most important industries we have; that is, the building, design, and development of vehicles. We will do good things for our planet and for those who are going to inherit this planet from us.

That is pretty much what I wanted to say today.

I want to take a minute to say something as a bigger State talking to another big State—I like to tell people Delaware is the 49th largest State. We are about a couple of acres larger than Rhode Island. These are two States that I think the Senator from Rhode Island will agree with—I will say this to our pages here. I don't know if you have heard the term used in boxing when you have a smaller fighter fighting against a bigger fighter. When the little boxer wins over the much bigger boxer, you say the smaller boxer "punches above his weight." When it comes to climate change and trying to figure out the right thing to do for our planet, our country, our people, I would like to say that in Rhode Island and Delaware, we punch above our weight. This may not be a heavyweight title bout, but this is a big one. Where they have world championships, in terms of issues, this is a world championship issue. This is one we can win.

I want to thank my friend Senator WHITEHOUSE for taking a great leader-

ship role in all of this, including today. He knows, as most of us on this floor and I think on our planet know, that it is time to wake up, or as my friend Congresswoman LISA ROCHESTER likes to say: Stay woke.

Thank you, sir.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you very much. It is not often that the distinguished ranking member on the EPW Committee gets to say he is from a bigger State and give his advice in those terms. I appreciate that we from Rhode Island were able to give him this moment.

I also want to thank him for his leadership in trying to fight for strong fuel economy and greenhouse gas emission standards for our automobiles.

The story of what is going on cannot be properly understood without understanding the oil industry's role in all of this. They are up to their usual mischief.

Our offices obtained a draft letter to the Deputy Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, urging her to weaken the auto emission standards. Well, we were able to look at the metadata on this document, and guess who wrote it. It was written by one of Marathon Petroleum's in-house lobbyists.

Marathon shopped this letter, which their lobbyist wrote, around to Members of Congress, convincing several to send similar letters in favor of weakening the standards. We took those letters, and we ran them through plagiarism software, and this is what we got. The red text is the text that is identical to the language of the Marathon lobbyist's letter. The black is where, in this case, Members of the Pennsylvania delegation added a little local information about Pennsylvania. It is an 80-percent match in the plagiarism software to the letter written by the Marathon Oil company lobbyist.

Marathon and the oil industry weren't just recruiting Members of Congress to copy their lobbyist language into letters to the Trump administration; they got their trade associations involved as well. The American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers Association lobbied, for instance, to weaken the standards, according to their lobbying disclosure reports. It is always better to have your trade association do your dirty work. What company really wants the public to know it lobbied to lower fuel economy standards so that consumers could pay more at the pump? It is not a good look.

In addition to cranking up its trade associations, the fossil fuel industry also cranked up its constellation of front groups that it has developed and funded over the years to kill laws and regulations that would reduce the carbon pollution that is driving climate change. The industry launched those front groups against the fuel economy and greenhouse gas emission auto standards. These front groups provide a veneer of fake public support for the oil industry's anti-climate campaign.

Take Americans for Prosperity, for instance. It is a lovely, benign-sounding name. Who could possibly be against prosperity? Yet, in reality, Americans for Prosperity is a front group that is funded by the fossil fuel billionaire Koch brothers, whose company, by the way, also lobbied against the standards. Americans for Prosperity doesn't disclose its donors. It is a secretive organization. So what little we know about its funders comes thanks to the hard work of a few muckraking, investigative journalists.

We do know that both ExxonMobil and the fossil fuel industry's flagship trade association, the American Petroleum Institute, give the AFP money, and they give them big money. Since the Citizens United decision, the AFP has spent about \$70 million on Federal elections. It is throwing its weight around.

To oppose the auto standards, the AFP created an elaborate online deception campaign that was centered on this petition against the standards. Unfortunately, for them, the public was not buying its nonsense. Despite an onslaught of online advertising, only 231 people signed up. It looks like no one wanted to spend more on gas and that no amount of fossil fuel lies could convince them otherwise.

FreedomWorks is yet another front group that has received millions in funding from the Koch brothers and fossil fuel interests like the American Petroleum Institute. It also started an online campaign against the standards, and that, too, bombed. There is a word for this stuff. It is called astroturf. It is fake grassroots. Real grassroots organizations don't need tens of millions of dollars from fossil fuel front groups. Real grassroots organizations thrive on the engagement and the passion of citizens, not on millions in special interest, dark money.

In having flopped at astroturfing, the oil industry organized its front groups to write directly to Trump administration officials and lobby them to repeal the standards. Here is one of these letters, and a dozen phony front groups signed it. Like I said, they built a constellation of these phony front groups, and a dozen signed this letter. These groups together have received—like I said, mostly of secret money—a minimum of \$196 million from fossil fuel industry interests, including from the Koch brothers, API, ExxonMobil, and Chevron.

This \$196 million did a lot of talking, for this letter found its way to an eager audience in the Trump administration, which is stuffed with fossil fuel lobbyists and flunkies. So they gave the oil industry exactly what it wanted—a proposal to freeze the auto emission standards and to challenge California and other States, like mine, our authority to set our own standards.

What is strange about this is that this proposal isn't what the auto industry says it wanted. Once the oil industry jumped into the fray, the auto in-

dustry let Big Oil take over, or it got shoved aside by Big Oil. Big Oil barged in and got exactly what it wanted—weakened standards that would allow it to sell—hold your breath here—up to \$1 trillion in extra gasoline. For a mere expenditure of \$196 million through these 12 phony front groups, they got to sell \$1 trillion in extra gasoline. That is how you make big money—by renting out the U.S. Government. That, by the way, is \$1 trillion that comes out of consumers' pockets and goes into Big Oil's. No wonder Big Oil is hiding behind front groups.

In the press, unnamed auto industry lobbyists have complained that the proposed freeze isn't what they asked for. Well, that is not good enough. Auto industry executives need to step up and tell President Trump and Secretary Chao and Administrator Wheeler that their oily proposal is not acceptable.

This car rule saga that we have seen play out is a microcosm of the climate change problem that we face. The fossil fuel industry, through its armada of phony front groups, fights to defend its own massive sales and massive, massive taxpayer subsidies for its product. The IMF has estimated that the fossil fuel industry receives a \$700 billion—with a "b"—annual subsidy in the United States alone. So it has every incentive to spend whatever it takes to control things in Washington, like giving \$196 million to these front groups. Meanwhile, the rest of corporate America, including car companies that claim to support reducing carbon pollution, just don't show up.

One side lobbies Congress against climate action, and the other side doesn't show up. One side spends tens of millions on attack ads against candidates who support climate action, and the other side doesn't show up. One side pours hundreds of millions of dollars into trade associations and phony front groups, and the other side doesn't show up. The result is entirely predictable—money talks, unfortunately, around here, and big money commands.

Things would change a bit if the rest of corporate America would challenge the fossil fuel industry's money and influence to help our colleagues on the other side get something done on climate change.

I close by pointing out that democracy and the free market are the twin pillars of our American example. What does it say for them as institutions when one industry—the fossil fuel industry—can simultaneously capture our democracy and pervert the free market with its massive subsidies? It is not a good story.

America's strength has always been our example. Our inaction on climate change—one of the foremost challenges of the world—sullies our American example. For the good of our country, for the good of those institutions, for the good of our American example, it is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Brady nomination?

Mr. MORAN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Perdue
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	Lankford	Sinema
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McConnell	Tillis
Daines	McSally	Toomey
Enzi	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Hassan	Rosen
Bennet	Heinrich	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Booker
Harris

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

Mitch McConnell, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, John Cornyn, Mike Crapo, Shelley Moore Capito, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Deb Fischer, David Perdue, Todd Young, John Thune, Mike Rounds, John Hoeven, Thom Tillis, Lindsey Graham.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of David Steven Morales, 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.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or to change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 74 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Perdue
Blackburn	Grassley	Portman
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Roberts
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Burr	Inhofe	Rounds
Capito	Isakson	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Sasse
Collins	Jones	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sinema
Crapo	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Manchin	Thune
Daines	McConnell	Tillis
Enzi	McSally	Toomey
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Peters	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden
Gillibrand	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—2

Booker Harris

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of David Steven Morales, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, 2 years ago, I exposed the Democrats' plan for socialized medicine and allowed every Senator here to take a clear stand and reject this disastrous idea once and for all. Unfortunately, very few Senate Democrats were willing to oppose socialized medicine then. Well, they are back at it again today. So now I am here again to shed some much needed light on what seems to be a never-ending game to score political points and, even worse, to set the stage for terrible policy—a continuing call for socialized medicine.

We are seeing this false narrative of “free socialized medicine” making headlines, but you see, it is not actually free; somebody has to pay for it. In fact, every single one of us and our kids and our grandkids will be paying for it for a long time if this nonsensical plan becomes reality.

Montanans face enough hardships with rising prescription drug costs and rising premiums. The Democrats' socialized medical scheme will cost the American taxpayer \$32 trillion over 10 years—\$32 trillion—not to mention that this scheme would kick millions off their healthcare plan and eliminate private health insurance.

In combination with the left's absurd Green New Deal, what we are seeing here today is a pattern when it comes to the Democrats' very liberal and leftist agenda. They don't blink an eye when their liberal policies cost the taxpayers trillions of dollars, and they aren't coming up with feasible solutions.

In fact, too many Montanans are faced with the very tough choice of choosing between health and putting food on the table. Prescription drug prices are out of control. Montanans are sick and tired of being sick and tired. They want Congress to do something. They want results. They want outcomes. That is why I have been fighting for a commonsense solution like my bill, the CREATES Act, which addresses high prescription drug costs and improves access to care in our rural communities.

The left's pie-in-the-sky proposal promises a great deal, but we all know the extent of empty promises in this town. These proposals do nothing but throw hard-working Montanans under the bus, foot the massive tax bill to the taxpayers, and prop up failed policies just to appease a radicalizing base across this country in the Democratic Party. The people of Montana want better than this. They deserve better than this.

To my colleagues who are attempting to make a hard run to the left to score some points within your base, I simply ask this: Will you please put your country over your party? Will you put the interests of the people over your own self-political interests, or will you continue to peddle the lie of socialized medicine to the American people?

I think it is time we get to work, hunker down and roll up our sleeves and produce real results that the people of Montana and across our Nation deserve. They deserve serious answers, and they deserve serious solutions, and it is long overdue that we give them that.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

NOMINATION OF JOHN P. ABIZAID

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise to speak today about the vote we cast earlier confirming GEN John Abizaid, Retired, to be U.S. Ambassador to Saudi Arabia.

I was proud to vote for him. I think he is very well qualified for that position. The position has been vacant since 2017. Other critical countries in this most important region are without Ambassadors—Egypt, Jordan, and Pakistan.

General Abizaid has his work cut out for him, and I want to speak specifically about some of the challenges in Saudi Arabia now.

I believe there is a great day of reckoning that is now pending in the U.S.-Saudi relationship.

Last week, the House of Representatives passed a Senate resolution ordering the President to stop U.S. military action in support of Saudi Arabia's intervention in Yemen's civil war. The Senate had earlier acted on that bill in 2018. It went to the House and died. The Senate took up the bill again recently, and the House passed it. The bill is now on its way to the President's desk.

The President has indicated that he is likely to veto the bill, to continue U.S. support for Saudi military activity in Yemen. If that happens, the bill will come back to the Senate, and the Senate will then have the opportunity to vote on whether that veto should be overridden.

The House vote to withdraw U.S. support for this military activity was 247 to 175. The Senate vote was 54 to 46.

The Yemen civil war has been a humanitarian disaster. Many of my colleagues have spoken at length about this, so I will not speak at length. Just to underline key points, it has been a humanitarian disaster, and the United States should not be involved. Saudi intervention has made it worse.

As of November 2018, nearly 7,000 civilians have been killed, nearly 11,000 had been wounded—the majority by Saudi Arabia-led coalition airstrikes, many of which are targeted and prosecuted in amateurish ways. Those statistics are according to the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for

Human Rights. The actual human casualties are actually much higher because the war has led to famine and disease outbreaks that have killed many more. Thousands have been displaced by fighting, and millions are suffering from shortages of food and medical care, with the country on the brink of famine. There are 12 to 13 million civilians at risk of starvation largely because of the effects of this civil war.

In addition to the poor prosecution of this military activity by Saudi Arabia, there are other issues we have to grapple with.

A Virginia resident who is a Saudi citizen, Jamal Khashoggi, who was a journalist for the Washington Post, criticized the Saudi policy in Yemen. For his advocacy against the war, the Government of Saudi Arabia lured him into their consulate in Istanbul and then tortured and assassinated him, dismembering his body with a bone saw. Then the Saudi Government engaged in a massive misinformation and disinformation campaign, lying to the United States and to the world about what had happened, saying that he had left the Embassy on his own, saying that it had been an accident, coming up with all manner of excuses before the even cursory investigation demonstrated that he had been assassinated.

The U.S. intelligence community is unified in their assessment of what happened to this Virginia resident—a gross violation of human rights to assassinate a journalist, especially in a safe haven, which is what a consulate is supposed to be.

In addition to the brutal murder of Jamal Khashoggi, Saudi Arabia has been arresting civil rights activists for years, including, recently, two Virginia residents—Aziza al-Youssef, who is a Saudi citizen who studied at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond and then went to back to Saudi Arabia to teach women computer science. Her son, Salah al-Haidar, also has been arrested for advocating for women's rights. What rights are they advocating for? The right of women to drive. The right of women to make some of their own decisions under Saudi law. Decisions by women cannot be made independently but must generally be agreed to by a father or a husband. Simply for advocating that women be treated as equal, with equal rights, these Virginia residents and many others have been jailed and tortured.

One would think that the United States would be up in arms about the assassination of a U.S. resident journalist, about the arrest of U.S. residents, including U.S. citizens advocating for women's rights, but that is not the case. The President refuses to submit a report determining whether Jamal Khashoggi's murder was a human rights violation.

The Magnitsky Act was designed to promote cooperation between the legis-

lative and the executive branches. When Congress has information that suggests there is a significant human rights violation by a foreign government, we write a letter to the President. The President has 120 days to investigate and then offer a determination as to whether there was a human rights violation. It is a cooperative dialogue. We wrote the letter, 120 days passed, and President Trump and the administration will not answer it. They will not say there was a human rights violation. They will not say there wasn't a human rights violation.

I am not aware of their doing this for any other nation. For Saudi Arabia, they are ignoring the clear requirements of the Magnitsky Act. President Trump said: "It could very well be that the Crown Prince had knowledge of this event—maybe he did and maybe he didn't." That comment is at odds with the assessment of the U.S. intelligence community that this assassination was an official act of the Saudi Arabian Government that would not have happened without the knowledge of the Crown Prince, M.B.S.

The relationship following these arrests and this assassination has not been downgraded or suffered repercussions within this administration—in fact, to the contrary. Two weeks ago, right before an Armed Services Committee hearing where Secretary of Energy Rick Perry was testifying, we learned that the Trump administration has approved secret transfers of nuclear technical information from American companies to Saudi Arabia on seven occasions since 2017. These transfers are called Part 810 authorizations. They require an approval of the Department of Energy. Under my cross-examination, Secretary Perry was forced to confirm that, yes, the administration has authorized on seven occasions transfers of this nuclear know-how to Saudi Arabia.

In the past, when these transfers were approved, they were made public so that the American public and Congress could exercise oversight on which nations in the world are being given nuclear technology, but in this instance and possibly others in this administration, the approvals were kept secret.

Why are they secret now? We know that Saudi Arabia is intent on building a nuclear program. That is well covered. But they haven't agreed to the nonproliferation rules that would prevent the development of nuclear weapons. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty is a bedrock principle of international law that the United States has supported for a very long time.

The principle is simple. We would not want countries to get nuclear technology unless they give us guarantees that technology is only for peaceful use, medical research, power production but not to produce nuclear weapons.

We are transferring this technical know-how to the Saudi Arabian Gov-

ernment secretly, without yet requiring that they sign on to the important safety protections in the NPT. It is only logical that Congress would want to know more about these approvals to make sure they don't spark a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

In the recent hearing, I asked Secretary Perry about whether the secret approvals of nuclear information transfer occurred before or after the October 2018 murder of Jamal Khashoggi. He claimed not to know. He has indicated he would provide that information in response to written questions. I submitted the written questions. He has still not provided the information. It is wrong to do these transfers without letting Congress know; it is wrong to do these transfers when Saudi Arabia has not yet agreed to the principles that would disallow nuclear proliferation; and it would certainly be wrong to agree to transfers of this kind of information after the assassination of Jamal Khashoggi, but as of yet the administration hasn't given us the data.

Beyond just the timing, who is getting these secret approvals? Secretary Perry said the approvals were secret because there is proprietary information. Companies might not want to have information that they have developed through their own research available to all, but that doesn't explain it. You don't have to give the proprietary information to indicate what company has gotten an approval on what day to do the transfer.

Who is getting these secret approvals? One major nuclear firm, Westinghouse, has been reported as a frontrunner in the competitive effort to do nuclear reactor construction in Saudi Arabia. Westinghouse is owned by the same investors who bailed White House adviser Jared Kushner out of a bad real estate deal. Remember, Jared Kushner was originally denied a security clearance in the White House due to concerns about foreign influence and personal financial conflicts. Additional reporting connects disgraced National Security Advisor Michael Flynn—who has been convicted for lying about his ties to and communication with foreign governments—to the push for the Saudi nuclear deal.

Finally, earlier today, I asked Secretary Pompeo in a Foreign Relations Committee hearing about public reports in *The National Interest*, in September of 2018, that say the Saudis have a robust anti-ballistic missile program that has been largely built on Chinese missiles—missiles from China that were constructed originally to carry nuclear warheads—but that the Saudis have apparently used with non-nuclear payloads or outfitted with non-nuclear payloads.

The *National Interest* article that I entered into the RECORD, dated September 21, 2018, indicated that, in Saudi Arabia, these missiles have been arranged so some of them would be directed toward Tehran and others would be directed toward Israel. All of these

issues are on the table: poor prosecution of a civil war leading to humanitarian disaster, the murder of a U.S. resident journalist, the arrest of U.S. residents for women's rights activism, secret transfers of nuclear technology without letting Congress know, and then the story I asked Secretary Pompeo about today. The buildup of an anti-ballistic missile program based significantly on Chinese missiles leads me to ask: Why would we help Saudi Arabia in a disastrous war in Yemen? Why would we turn a blind eye to Saudi human rights abuses? Why would we transfer nuclear know-how and plan for a nuclear deal with Saudi Arabia when they haven't agreed to non-proliferation rules that we expect other Nations to agree to in a way that would possibly spark an arms race in the Middle East? My final question is, who in the United States is benefiting from this?

When I asked the Secretary of State this morning, again, on the dates of the nuclear approvals and did they occur before or after the assassination of Jamal Khashoggi, I am sure he knew I was going to ask him that question. I asked Secretary Perry the question 2 weeks ago. I submitted that question for the record. He knew I was going to ask him that question, and he said he couldn't give me any information about the approvals; he would have to get back to me about them.

Congress is not a student government. Congress is supposed to, as the article I branch, exercise oversight over important matters. There is hardly anything more important than the spread of nuclear technologies that could be used to proliferate weapons of mass destruction anywhere in the world, especially in a region as dangerous as the Middle East.

These are the items that Ambassador Abizaid will need to deal with in his new role, but we need to exercise proper congressional oversight of this relationship because there are so many problems with it right now that are not being addressed by this administration. I think only Congress can address them. I hope my colleagues will join me with that oversight.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF DAVID BERNHARDT

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, the Senate is just hours away from voting on whether to confirm David Bernhardt to head the Interior Department. He would replace Ryan Zinke, who was forced from office in the eye of an ethical hurricane. I am here tonight to put the Senate on notice that I believe, if David Bernhardt is confirmed as Interior Secretary, another ethical storm will be on us in the very near future. The Zinke ethics hurricane was bad enough. America should not be harmed again if it is followed by a Bernhardt ethical typhoon.

I believe the Bernhardt nomination ought to be stopped in its tracks right

here, right now. At a minimum, the Senate ought to put on hold this whole matter until we can gather more information so an informed decision can be based on all the facts.

At this moment, with the debate hurtling possibly toward an end, there are four pending requests by a dozen Senators, including myself, for inspector general investigations of the issues involving Mr. Bernhardt. In the other body, there are a host of requests for investigations as well. There has been a lot of speculation about how all of these issues have been aired.

This is old news, say some. The fact is, that is not right. This doesn't go back months. My concerns aren't information that has been sitting out in public view for years. The prospect of an investigation is developing in real time right now. I am going to run through some of the basic facts before getting into deeper details.

First, according to the Office of Government Ethics, Mr. Bernhardt has 27 different former clients who are posing a potential of unlimited numbers of conflicts of interests—oil clients, coal clients, water clients, major ag and resources clients. All of them have business before the Department that the Interior Secretary is supposed to be running for the benefit of the public, not for special interests.

My sense is, with all of these conflicts, Mr. Bernhardt would have basically two choices; one, he could comply with the ethics pledge and pretty much recuse himself from everything. Lord knows what he would be doing all day because he would have to recuse himself; or two, he would basically do business and just violate the ethical principles.

Lately, he seems to have been on what seems like a victory parade on Capitol Hill, touting what he says is a record of being a champion of ethics, but if you take a look at that record and take a look at what was said during his confirmation hearing, as my son William Peter Wyden, age 11—pictures available on my iPhone after my presentation—would say, that Bernhardt statement was one big whopper.

Mr. Bernhardt served as Deputy Secretary to Ryan Zinke. All through this parade of environmental horrors that were visited upon us, Mr. Bernhardt was the key man in that office. There is not one shred of evidence that Mr. Bernhardt objected to Ryan Zinke's corruption. There is no evidence of it. Just think about it. He is always described as the guy who made the Interior Department run and that he was the key to all of these pieces. Ryan Zinke is out there with flagrant conflicts of interest and the like. Yet there is no evidence that Mr. Bernhardt—the self-styled expert on ethics—ever objected to anything.

Second, not even 2 weeks ago, Mr. Bernhardt came before the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for his nomination. He admitted that he had a role in blocking a landmark scientific

report on toxic pesticides—the kind of report that career, nonpartisan scientists and staff spend years developing in close consultation with Department lawyers. Mr. Bernhardt's excuse for blocking the report was that it needed to be “read by the lawyers,” and he gave the impression to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and the country—people were following it on C-SPAN—he gave the impression, when he said it needed to be read by the lawyers, as though that was not already the routine. His claim doesn't pass the smell test. I believe he lied to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee.

Third, let's talk about his lobbying. Mr. Bernhardt deregistered as a lobbyist to join the Trump transition team before the President's inauguration. There is evidence he kept right on lobbying, nonetheless, in violation of the law. There is a whole lot of talk about mislabeled invoices and simple errors that attempted to explain it all the way. The fact is, there were multiple cases in which Mr. Bernhardt was engaged in activities that made him the de facto lobbyist, carrying on with the same job he had been doing all along.

So you have a pattern of unethical behavior right in front of our eyes. He said he had to do this lawyering. There hadn't been any lawyering. Then we go back and look at the rules, and they say that in these situations, there is lawyering all the way through the process. That is why I am very troubled about his trustworthiness.

After Ryan Zinke's departure, every Senator ought to be interested in restoring integrity and honor to the Interior Department. Yet the Trump administration has double downed on its commitment to graft by nominating David Bernhardt for this job. As I mentioned, there are pending requests for inspector general investigations. I have also called for an investigation by the U.S. attorney. Neither of those has had adequate time to respond, but the majority leader has rushed this nomination to the floor.

To indicate how fast the nomination is moving, the President obviously nominated Mr. Bernhardt to lead the Interior Department less than a month ago. Less than 2 weeks ago, the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee held the confirmation hearing on his nomination. Exactly a week later, the committee voted to approve it. One week after that, the Senate may choose to vote on his final confirmation. I just think it is a grave mistake to be moving forward with so many serious unanswered questions, and let me go through the history about why.

The Interior Department is still reeling from Ryan Zinke and what I call this self-generated ethical hurricane. In addition to overseeing the largest rollback of Federal land protections in American history, Ryan Zinke triggered so many Federal inquiries and investigations before he resigned in

shame that you can't even easily track them. By most public reporting, he triggered at least 17 different Federal inquiries before he officially left office at the start of the year: the inappropriate censorship of scientific reports, the wasting of tens of thousands—if not hundreds of thousands—of dollars on office doors and chartered flights, and of cutting potentially illegal land deals with oil industry executives. His rap sheet basically goes on and on. It is as long as the Columbia River. In his brief tenure, Ryan Zinke demonstrated that he was better at corrupt self-dealing than he was at protecting our treasured public lands.

I mentioned David Bernhardt was Mr. Zinke's Deputy, and he was the Solicitor for the Interior Department during the Bush administration. He knows a lot about how the Department works.

I want to say this to my colleagues: If this is a guy who is hands on and if he really understands the Department of the Interior, I think you have to wonder why Mr. Bernhardt never seems to have objected to any of Mr. Zinke's corrupt activities.

The Interior Department, unfortunately, isn't new to scandal, and I am going to take a brief moment to look back at one particular scandal that relates to these matters—Julie MacDonald, a notoriously corrupt Interior official during the George W. Bush administration who was forced to resign.

In December of 2006, after an anonymous complaint sparked an investigation, the inspector general released a report showing that Ms. MacDonald had given internal Department documents to industry lobbyists and that she had run roughshod over career Department staff who tried to stand in her way.

I had serious concerns about the report and what was happening at the Department. So, literally, more than a decade ago, I placed a hold on a nominee to the Interior Department, pending some accountability for these flagrant abuses by Ms. MacDonald. The next day, which was months after the original report became public, she finally resigned. Later that year, I requested an expanded probe into Interior decisions related to the Endangered Species Act that Ms. MacDonald had been involved in.

There was evidence of her meddling having directly affected species in the Pacific Northwest. The Interior's inspector general released a report. According to the New York Times, it found "Ms. MacDonald's zeal to advance her agenda has caused considerable harm to the integrity of the Endangered Species Act program and to the morale and reputation of the Fish and Wildlife Service, as well as potential harm to individual species."

I bring this up because here is where David Bernhardt figures into the story.

A few weeks ago, I was surprised that Mr. Bernhardt requested to meet with me in my office. I said I would be glad to do it. When nominees come by, I

usually just start with the questions: Why should I vote for you? Why should I be supportive? It is kind of an easy way for the nominee to get into it. That is why I do it.

What Mr. Bernhardt said was that he was a big ethics champion.

He said: Hey, do you remember Julie MacDonald? I am captain ethics. I advised Julie MacDonald to clean up her act.

I didn't ask Mr. Bernhardt about Julie MacDonald. He brought it up.

I have met with a lot of nominees, and I have heard a lot of reasons as to why they deserve my vote, but this meeting was certainly a head-scratcher. A nominee who had been present for Ryan Zinke's reign of corruption and conflict and who had seemed not to do anything about it had shown up, at his request, to tout his own ethics.

A few hours after the meeting in my office with Mr. Bernhardt, I decided I would look at his record for myself. Interior Department documents that had been obtained through a Freedom of Information Act request showed he had recently blocked the release of a Fish and Wildlife report about the effects of dangerous, toxic pesticides.

Career staff at the Fish and Wildlife Service, an Interior Department Agency, were on the brink of completing a comprehensive report on the impact of three pesticides on, potentially, hundreds of endangered species. This was a report by career staff. It was not put together by people who were political appointees. It defined pesticides that were so dangerous and so toxic that they jeopardized the continued existence of more than 1,000 species. This report, had it been made public, would have had profound consequences for pesticide manufacturers in the businesses that had used them.

The dedicated team of career staff at the Fish and Wildlife Service that had worked so long on this in order to make sure they really dug into the science—and they took years to be fastidious about it—wanted to make it public. The team was working rapidly to submit its findings to the Environmental Protection Agency for its review.

The documents show that before this landmark report could make it into public view, Mr. Bernhardt came along and pushed himself into the middle of the process. The documents show his emails on the pesticide report. He demanded briefings from these career scientists. They show meetings with White House officials and others about the specific section of the law that governs the role of Fish and Wildlife in these types of assessments. There is even included an email in which Mr. Bernhardt edited the letter that Interior officials used to block the release of the pesticide report. There were digital fingerprints everywhere.

I have to say that I looked at this, and I said: This sure sounds like Julie MacDonald all over again. The guy who said: "Hey, I was the one who pushed

Julie MacDonald to clean up her act," looked like he was meddling with the science just the way Julie MacDonald was. Ms. MacDonald was found by the inspector general to have meddled with the scientific conclusions, and now there is David Bernhardt, who has been alleged to have manipulated the process and blocked the release of an Endangered Species Act report.

So Mr. Bernhardt came to say that his ethics were unimpeachable and that he was above reproach. Yet I will tell you, for my colleagues who are thinking about this, if you read the documents I read from the Freedom of Information Act, they make him sound like another Julie MacDonald. I worked through all of these documents, and they left me with the impression that Mr. Bernhardt had lied to me about his ethics during our one-on-one meeting as well. It left me wondering why he would go out of his way to talk up his ethics when he must have known the truth was going to come out eventually.

During his confirmation hearing, he claimed he would strive to bring a culture of ethical compliance. He said he hoped to overhaul the ethics of the Ryan Zinke period and the Julie MacDonald experience. Senators called his qualifications unparalleled and claimed that the allegations of ethical misconduct against him were false. I respect those colleagues who have their opinions. I have my own, and my opinions are going to be based on the documents.

The document I entered into the record at his confirmation hearing showed that the pesticide industry repeatedly asked political appointees at the Interior Department and at the Environmental Protection Agency to intervene in the scientific analysis. It showed that Mr. Bernhardt eventually did so.

According to documents that had been made public by the Freedom of Information Act, a pesticide industry attorney wrote to then-Secretary Zinke and then-Administrator Scott Pruitt on April 13 of 2017. The pesticide industry was asking for changes to the Endangered Species Act. The industry followed it up very shortly with a request to meet with the Environmental Protection Agency's staff. At that time, a pesticide industry executive called an attorney of the Interior Department for a meeting as well. Another official from a pesticide trade association reached out to the same Interior Department attorney to discuss the Endangered Species Act.

Other supporting documentation consisted of an email that was dated October 5, 2017, from Mr. Bernhardt to Gary Frazer, the Fish and Wildlife Service's Assistant Director, who handles these endangered species. He "was the top official overseeing the assessment of the impact," according to the press, while looking at the implications of these pesticides. In this email, Mr. Bernhardt asked Mr. Frazer for a briefing the following week. Additional documents

show that Mr. Bernhardt held a series of meetings with Mr. Frazer over the next 3 weeks.

On October 30, according to the calendar released by the Freedom of Information Act, Mr. Bernhardt met with White House officials to discuss Endangered Species Act provisions. It is called section 7. That is the section that pertains to the role that the Fish and Wildlife plays in ensuring other Agencies aren't jeopardizing species.

An email from November of 2017 shows Mr. Bernhardt edited the draft of a letter from career Fish and Wildlife Service staff to the EPA. It announced the Interior Department wouldn't be delivering the Fish and Wildlife's assessment to the Agency as planned. This, colleagues, is where Mr. Bernhardt put the brakes on this important Fish and Wildlife report about the pesticides.

According to a New York Times report, the pesticide analysis was blocked in conjunction with a "radical shift" in how the Fish and Wildlife analyzes the effects of these pesticides. The change greatly increased the burden of proof the Agency is required to meet to demonstrate pesticide effects on species. According to that article in the Times, it would likely result in fewer new restrictions on pesticide use. CropLife and RISE—two trade associations that represent the pesticide companies—were very much in favor of this. They were praising it.

Based on the documents, at the hearing, I asked Mr. Bernhardt why he would come to my office and sell me on ethics when the reports and the documents I just read showed otherwise. He had no response.

At the hearing, I asked Mr. Bernhardt specifically why he would come to the office and make these claims. He had no response at the hearing but took a long sip of water as though he had meant to go on awhile. Mr. Bernhardt made the claim that career Fish and Wildlife staff "clearly" didn't complete any legal review on the pesticide report, which is why he stepped in.

During the hearing and while under oath, I believe Mr. Bernhardt confirmed allegations that he interfered with the release of an Endangered Species Act report. He didn't, however, acknowledge that his involvement was inappropriate political meddling.

Following the hearing and with serious questions remaining about whether he had lied under oath to the committee, I wrote the Interior Department's inspector general for her help in getting to the bottom of the matter. Here are the facts I included:

On March 28, 2019, Mr. Bernhardt appeared before the U.S. Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources for his confirmation hearing to become Secretary of the Department of the Interior. I questioned him about these documents and his role in blocking the Fish and Wildlife's analyses. He confirmed to me that he had reviewed the analyses. He claimed he believed

the analyses had not been subject to legal review and made the determination to delay the report.

Second, Mr. Bernhardt's response:

You're dealing with some of the most difficult consultations on the planet, and when I read the document, my reaction to it was this is really an interesting draft. But it clearly didn't have any legal review, and in our world you can't ignore the law and come up with a scheme.

He continued:

And so what we decided is that the approach needed to be readressed.

Mr. Bernhardt's answer is totally off base with respect to the way legal analyses work.

Under standard procedure, there would be legal analysis through the development of this kind of fish and wildlife report. It would involve lawyers at Fish and Wildlife, Interior Department, or both.

So I am especially troubled by what appears to be a political appointee meddling in the scientific process with respect to a report that revealed the extraordinary danger of toxic pesticides.

I am the senior member on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, a former chairman of the committee. I cannot recall ever having this kind of exchange with a nominee.

That is why I had to request that the Office of Inspector General investigate the following: What role did Mr. Bernhardt and other political appointees at the Interior Department play in delaying or obstructing the Fish and Wildlife Service pesticide report? What role did he play in changing Fish and Wildlife policy with regard to this key section in the Endangered Species Act? What role did other political appointees—Agriculture Senior Advisor, former CropLife lobbyist, Ms. Adcock—play in the Interior Department and Fish and Wildlife Service's decision making? Whether, as Mr. Bernhardt alleged to me under oath on March 28, 2019, the Fish and Wildlife draft analysis "clearly didn't have any legal review" and whether, as Mr. Bernhardt alleged to me, career lawyers at the Interior Department agreed with his analysis—these are all questions that haven't been answered.

I would just say to the Senate, if you need more evidence that there are too many questions to allow this nomination to move forward, the story just gets more complicated.

After Mr. Bernhardt demonstrated that he simply was going to dance around the truth, the Senate has to question his basic understanding of the law.

So on Monday, I asked the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia to thoroughly investigate potential civil and criminal violations of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 by Mr. Bernhardt, as well as his former lobbying firm.

By the way, again, a newspaper reports—this time the Washington Post—that Mr. Bernhardt's ex-firm has quad-

rupled its business, earning nearly \$5 million to lobby the Interior Department since he has taken his most recent spin through the Interior Department revolving door.

So here is what I said to the U.S. attorney: Lobbying Disclosure Act filings show Mr. Bernhardt registered to lobby for his law firm on behalf of the Westlands Water District on March 30, 2011. Westlands is the largest agricultural water district in the United States, in central California. Public reporting indicates Mr. Bernhardt ran his former lobby firm's natural resources department.

That lobby firm filed its 2016 fourth quarter report on November 18, 2016—one week after the 2016 Presidential election—terminating Mr. Bernhardt's lobbying status as of that day.

Public reporting at the time indicates Mr. Bernhardt "delisted himself as a lobbyist in November after Trump won the election to avoid running afoul of the new President's ban on lobbyists joining his administration."

Public reporting and documents obtained via public records show that Mr. Bernhardt maintained his relationship with Westlands after his lobbyist deregistration on November 18, 2016. Furthermore, he may have repeatedly engaged in activity that would require him to continue registering as a Federal lobbyist. So he claimed he was no longer a lobbyist, but it sure looks as though he went right on lobbying.

The Lobbying Disclosure Act is pretty clear. I will read from public guidance provided by the U.S. House of Representatives. A lobbyist can terminate their registration "only when the individual's lobbying activities on behalf of that client did not constitute at the end of the quarter . . . 20 percent of the time that such employee is engaged in total activities for that client; or that individual doesn't reasonably expect to make further lobbying contacts."

What does the law mean by "lobbying contacts?" That is pretty clear too. The same guidance says it is "any oral, written, or electronic communication to a covered Federal official that is made on behalf of a client" with regard to Federal legislation, rule-making, executive orders and the like. "Covered Federal officials" include all Members of Congress and their staff.

The evidence I included in my request to the U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia included several emails showing Mr. Bernhardt may have engaged in repeated, regulated lobbying contacts with covered Federal legislative branch officials.

The first time, according to the information that is already public, appears to be on November 22, 2016, just a few days after he deregistered as a lobbyist. Mr. Bernhardt agreed to join a conference call with Westlands and the offices of Representative DEVIN NUNES and former Representative Valadao to discuss upcoming legislation.

The second and third times are covered in a complaint filed with the U.S.

attorney's office in 2017. That complaint included copies of emails documenting Mr. Bernhardt's role in 2016 and 2017 as an intermediary for congressional staff and Westlands. It also appeared to include a trip to California for Mr. Bernhardt, paid for by Westlands.

So here is what it appears happened: Mr. Bernhardt provided his client, Westlands, with information about legislative efforts in 2016 and 2017. His old lobbying firm also disclosed lobbying on behalf of Westlands on those same legislative efforts over the same time-frame.

Another new report shows that Mr. Bernhardt was also in contact in December 2016 with a Senate employee covered by lobbying regulations.

On March 8, 2017, his old lobby firm sent Westlands an invoice for more than \$27,000 for "Federal lobbying." It included an itemized list of expenses related to Mr. Bernhardt's January 2017 travel to California for a "Westlands" trip.

On April 20, 2017, the lobbying firm filed its 2017 first quarter disclosure that is required by the Lobbying Disclosure Act. It showed Westlands paid the firm \$70,000 for lobbying services related to H.R. 1769, a bill involving the San Luis unit drainage district, among other measures. It was a longstanding priority for Westlands—a money-making opportunity. It was sponsored by then-Representative Valadao, one of the Congressmen Mr. Bernhardt appears to have been in contact with on November 22, 2016, and January 2, 2017.

The lobby firm's 2017 first quarter disclosure was filed shortly after the firm sent Westlands the March invoice for Mr. Bernhardt's February 2017 "Federal lobbying" activity.

According to a media report in July of 2017, a Westlands representative claimed Bernhardt ceased all lobbying activity "the moment he deregistered as a lobbyist." In May of 2017, during his confirmation process to be Deputy Secretary, Mr. Bernhardt also claimed in writing to the committee he had "not engaged in regulated lobbying on behalf of Westlands Water District after November 18, 2016."

These Bernhardt claims simply do not line up with the documents. Perhaps that is why he refused when one of my colleagues requested he provide complete records relating to any communications he had with covered legislative branch officials after the date of his deregistration.

Let me repeat that.

When one of the Senators on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee asked Mr. Bernhardt to provide documents that would help the committee get to the bottom of this issue, he just stonewalled. He just refused.

The Lobbying Disclosure Act isn't that burdensome. The firm and Mr. Bernhardt could have chosen to disclose his lobbying activity on behalf of Westlands. They chose not to do so, so everybody is going to ask why.

The U.S. attorney's office is responsible for enforcement of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995. So this week I wrote to the U.S. attorney, requesting a thorough investigation.

I have spent this time highlighting some of the major reasons that make me feel strongly that Mr. Bernhardt's nomination should not move forward at this time. Chief among them are that I have two pending requests for investigations at this time, neither of which have been responded to because it has been a short time and the majority leader is interested in steamrolling this flawed nominee by the American people.

I am just going to conclude my remarks by summarizing a couple of Mr. Bernhardt's greatest hits with respect to why he is thoroughly unqualified to be Secretary of the Department of Interior.

The first is the matter of the conflicts. He is a former oil lobbyist. In fact, at one point, I was going to say that he was the oil industry's guy, but the oil industry lobbyists beat me to it. A secret tape came out, and they were quoted as saying: We are glad he is our guy. Dozens of his ex-clients have business before Interior. According to his ethics pledge, he should be conflicted out of working on those issues. If he remains involved, he will be flagrantly violating his ethics pledge. So if he follows the rules and stays out of all of these issues his clients have before the Department, I will tell you, for the life of me, I can't figure out what he is going to do all day because he is going to be conflicted out of all of these matters that are going to be before the Department.

Just last week, Mr. Bernhardt's previously unrevealed calendars were partially made public. To nobody's surprise, many of those secret meetings have been with industry. This is yet another item that Congress, including the other body, has asked for more information about.

So the damage has been done. The conflicts are clear. He has already taken actions that benefit his former clients and former employers.

He has taken steps specifically to weaken the Endangered Species Act—worked to weaken wildlife protections for a California fish species, according to another investigation. This weakening of protections for the California fish species is a policy change that one of Mr. Bernhardt's former clients—Westlands Water District—had been pushing for for years.

Mr. Bernhardt's Interior announced that the Agency is basically going to stop holding oil companies accountable for oil spills by ending enforcement of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. This move has been long supported by yet another energy lobby, another one of Mr. Bernhardt's former clients.

Mr. Bernhardt's Interior Department increased drilling and mining access on millions of acres of sage-grouse habitat across five Western States. That drill-

ing will be conducted by companies, again, linked to Mr. Bernhardt. It could make the sage-grouse an endangered species, and it could endanger the livelihoods of ranching families on the rural frontier who are just hoping to preserve their traditional way of life.

Mr. Bernhardt continues delivering for the oil and gas industry. A CNN report found the Agency has advanced at least 15 policies supported by his former clients during his time at Interior Department—everything from the elimination of BLM's methane reduction rules and gutting safety rules for natural gas drilling on public lands, to risking the lives of workers by reducing safety standards for offshore drilling. I don't think it is any big surprise why those oil executives were cheering about Mr. Bernhardt's nomination and calling him, literally, their guy.

During the longest government shutdown on record, when national parks were understaffed and overflowing with human waste, Mr. Bernhardt even recalled Interior employees to specifically approve hundreds of drilling permits. Certainly, the oil and gas giants are getting their money's worth.

To cap off my list, Mr. Bernhardt's Interior Department even proposed opening up the entire U.S. coastline for offshore oil drilling.

I am heading home. I am sure my colleague from North Dakota and other Senators are also. I am having town meetings and listening to people. There isn't going to be anybody who comes to my town meetings starting in the next couple of days who wants to see the Oregon coastline up for offshore drilling or who wants to see the oil derricks at Haystack Rock, and they don't want to be standing on our beaches holding oil-soaked sponges.

The entire time Mr. Bernhardt has been at the Interior Department, his former lobbying firm has just been raking in the cash. So the question really becomes: Has he already broken the law? My bottom line is that the Senate ought to take the time to actually look into that issue. It isn't some trivial matter after the self-generated Zinke ethical hurricane.

Shouldn't we say, after that ethics horror show, that it is the job of every Member in the Senate—every Democrat and every Republican—to work for policies that bring honor and credibility back to the Interior Department? I just don't think that is going to be the case if this body confirms David Bernhardt.

We will be voting, at least tonight, on the procedure, and depending on how that goes, we may be voting on final passage.

I will just tell you that I don't want to be back on this floor in a matter of months talking about yet another Interior leader, like Ryan Zinke, forced from office as the result of a grotesque scandal. The Senate doesn't have to leave the door of the Interior Department wide open for more conflicted individuals to waltz into positions of

power where they can work against the interests of the American people. I believe that is exactly what America will get from David Bernhardt.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this nomination.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I rise today to oppose this rush to confirm David Bernhardt to serve as the 53rd Secretary of the Interior.

The Secretary of the Interior is the chief steward of nearly 500 million acres of public lands and 1.7 billion acres of the Outer Continental Shelf. The Interior Secretary is charged with managing the public's natural resources and protecting our Nation's most iconic spaces for now and for generations to come, and the Secretary has the duty of making sure that our trust and treaty responsibilities to American Indians and Alaska Natives are met. It is essential to have the right individual serving in this position—someone who has a record of honoring these critical responsibilities and someone who will approach the solemn duties with only the interests of the American people at the top of his or her agenda.

After considering the whole of Mr. Bernhardt's record, especially the open questions about his actions that have benefited his former clients, I cannot vote to confirm this nominee. His policies are too slanted toward private interests, and as a former lobbyist for many of these interests, his conflicts are too many. Any discussion of this nomination must begin there—by addressing the serious conflicts of interest that Mr. Bernhardt brings to this role and by addressing the ethical cloud that is plainly hanging over this nomination.

I am rising today to call on the Republican leadership to put a halt to this nomination until that ethical cloud can be cleared, and if that cloud cannot be cleared, then, Mr. Bernhardt should be withdrawn.

The concerns that have been raised are serious. Let's talk about a few of them.

Much has been made of Mr. Bernhardt's ethics pledge and whether he has complied with the letter of the law, but we all know that he certainly has not complied with the spirit of the law. The Interior Department has begun or completed at least 19 policy actions requested or supported by at least 16 of Mr. Bernhardt's former clients since he came to Interior, according to just 1 analysis.

Mr. Bernhardt's ethics pledge didn't stop him from trying to divert water to

his former client, Westlands Water District in California's Central Valley, one of the largest agricultural water users in the county. On their behalf, Mr. Bernhardt sought to weaken protections for endangered fish species so that his client could pump more water. While an Interior official "verbally" ruled that he could participate in the matter, outside ethics experts disagreed. Mr. Bernhardt is clearly making a decision that directly benefits one of his former clients.

Last month, I wrote to the DOI inspector general requesting an investigation into this matter. The Senate should know the outcome of such reviews before considering a Cabinet nominee. Otherwise, we are flying blind when it comes to a nominee's fitness for office.

Just last week, it came to light that Mr. Bernhardt continued to work with Westlands after he filed notice that he was no longer lobbying on its behalf. He filed his notice on November 2016, but invoices from Mr. Bernhardt's firm show that he worked with his client all the way up to his nomination for Deputy Secretary.

A spokeswoman claims that the work was not technically "lobbying," but the fact is that Mr. Bernhardt's actions are benefiting his former clients. Westlands is getting the relief from the Endangered Species Act that they have sought for years.

Once again, we need to know the full truth before we can vote on a nominee of such consequence.

Americans deserve to have confidence in the impartiality of public officials, but how can they when the Trump administration has become a revolving door of lobbyists and industry advocates?

As an attorney and lobbyist, Mr. Bernhardt built a profitable career trying to open public lands for development for his clients, and he spent years attacking the foundation of the Endangered Species Act. The problem is that since assuming his role as Deputy Secretary, he has continued to advocate for policies that benefit these same special interests.

He helped to open millions of acres of public lands to oil and gas drilling, while looking to limit public input, and helped to gut protections that would mitigate the environmental harm of such development.

He has tried to manipulate and bury the science of toxic pesticides that threaten endangered species. He has largely ignored the science of climate change. None of this is a personal attack on the Deputy Secretary, but we simply should not install private industry's representatives to run the Department of the Interior, because when we do, the American people pay the price.

Just look at the policy outcomes. Climate change, for instance, is an existential issue—the most pressing issue facing our planet. The Department of the Interior oversees 20 percent of the

lands in our Nation. These lands and their ecosystems and wildlife are threatened by a changing climate: drought and wildfires in the Southwest, wildfires and flooding in California, and hurricanes in the Southeast.

Mr. Bernhardt has been clear that climate science will take a backseat to the President's politics. Under Mr. Bernhardt's guidance, the Department is blatantly ignoring the science of climate change. The Department took down its climate change web page, rescinded orders and policies aimed at addressing the impacts of climate change, and gutted the methane emission control rule at the behest of the worst performers in the oil and gas industry.

Mr. Bernhardt now has the audacity to claim that there are no laws on the books that require Interior to act on climate change, all because his administration has attempted to dismantle every rule or regulation that requires the Department to take action.

Very concerning is Mr. Bernhardt's role as the Trump administration's architect of opening public lands for unfettered energy development. In the last 2 years, Interior has auctioned off more than 16.8 million acres of public land for oil and gas drilling. In the first quarter of 2019, nearly 2.3 million more acres were put on the auction block. That includes potential lease sales within striking distance of the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, a UNESCO world heritage site sacred to the Tribes. That is why I just introduced legislation to permanently establish a 10-mile buffer surrounding Chaco so that we can enjoy this culturally significant area for generations to come without the constant threat of development.

The Department has tried to open up nearly all coastal waters for offshore drilling and is speeding toward selling leases to drill in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge—home to Native American Tribes and an area that supports a diversity of wildlife in a wild and untamed setting unlike any other on this planet. There are nearly 250 species, from caribou and grizzly bears to wolves and migratory birds. Yet this administration, under Mr. Bernhardt, is racing toward an outcome that could decimate this unique, grand, and biologically rich place.

The Endangered Species Act stands as the Nation's commitment to protect wildlife from extinction. Protecting biodiversity is more important now than ever, as we see animal and plant species dying off in record numbers due to the loss of habitat and climate change.

Mr. Bernhardt has had the ESA in his sights for a long time. Under his leadership, Interior has now proposed allowing economic considerations to override wildlife protections. Extinction is becoming just another cost of doing business.

As I mentioned, on behalf of his former client Westlands, Mr. Bernhardt

sought to weaken protections for endangered fish species, the delta smelt, and the Chinook salmon so that Westlands could pump more water. Mr. Bernhardt has looked to implement the very same policies he lobbied for, from within the walls of the Department. As Deputy Secretary, Mr. Bernhardt also dismantled a landmark agreement among bipartisan western Governors to protect the greater sage-grouse, opening up millions of acres of its habitat to oil and gas drilling without protections.

The Endangered Species Act should be classified as “endangered” under Mr. Bernhardt’s client-friendly Interior Department.

Let’s talk about another extinction risk: chlorpyrifos. Chlorpyrifos is not yet a household name like DDT, but it will be. It is a dangerous neurotoxin used in agriculture throughout the United States. It is linked to brain damage in children and can cause serious harm to human health and wildlife.

In 2016, scientists from the EPA recommended a ban on all uses of this toxic pesticide. One of Scott Pruitt’s first actions as EPA Administrator was to rescind that proposed ban. One of Mr. Bernhardt’s early actions as Deputy Secretary was to bury a scientific study concluding that chlorpyrifos and another pesticide could “jeopardize the continued existence” of more than 1,200 endangered birds, fish, and other animals and plants. Let me repeat. More than 1,200 birds, fish, and other species are at risk of extinction from two toxic pesticides. Mr. Bernhardt reportedly ordered the staff to go back to the drawing board to block the release of this report.

I have been working to get chlorpyrifos off the market with legislation, and the Federal courts have ordered EPA to move forward with the ban. There is no good reason chlorpyrifos is still in use except that it is manufactured by a powerful DowDuPont company. Mr. Bernhardt’s withdrawal of the scientific study serves Big Chemical’s interests, not the public’s.

One of the most egregious anti-conservation actions of this administration is the unprecedented attacks on the Antiquities Act, which has stood since President Theodore Roosevelt. The President reduced Bears Ears National Monument by 85 percent and Grand Staircase-Escalante by over 45 percent—the largest rollback of protections for our collective Federal lands in history and an unlawful Presidential action, in my view.

Each of these monuments is home to ruggedly beautiful lands that are at risk. The Bears Ears designation was the result of many years of hard work and collaboration by five Tribes who trace their ancestry to this remarkable area. Now the Department is pushing to open up the land outside their boundaries for coal and mineral mining corporations.

Last month, I led 16 Democratic Senators in a letter to Mr. Bernhardt seek-

ing his commitment to leave existing boundaries of other national monuments intact. So far, we have received no assurance from Mr. Bernhardt that any other monuments won’t meet the same fate as Bears Ears and Grand Staircase.

The pattern is clear: From the Arctic Refuge to California’s Central Valley, from the Atlantic coast to Bears Ears, Mr. Bernhardt’s Interior Department places profits over people.

The American public deserves an Interior Secretary they can trust to look out for their interests—protecting public land, species, the air, and the water—but Mr. Bernhardt has not demonstrated that he has the necessary independence from his former clients. He has made them very happy. He has shut out scientists, Native Americans, conservationists, and the American people. He is tangled with conflicts.

The Senate should stop the rush to confirm Deputy Secretary Bernhardt while these fundamental ethics and conflicts of interest questions are under review. If we move forward, I will vote no on this nomination.

Before I conclude, I would like to offer one final point. I made my concerns with Mr. Bernhardt clear, but if Mr. Bernhardt is confirmed, one of his most important duties will be honoring our trust responsibility to Native Americans. On this count, I hope he will do better than what the Trump Interior Department has shown us so far.

As the vice chair of the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs, I want to ensure that the Department respects Tribes’ sovereignty and self-determination and engages in meaningful consultation with Tribes. The Trump administration’s record with Tribes and Native communities is, to put it lightly, lacking. The Tribes in New Mexico do not believe they are being properly consulted as leasing pushes ahead close to Chaco Canyon.

For 3 years running, the administration has proposed budgets that would significantly cut BIA and BIE funding. Those are education budgets and budgets that help Native Americans on their reservations.

Congress has historically worked across party lines on Native issues. Congress rejected the administration’s proposed cuts for fiscal years 2018 and 2019, and I fully expect it to do so again for 2020.

If confirmed, I would like to see Mr. Bernhardt follow suit and commit to do better on Tribal issues, commit to meet with Tribal leaders to understand their priorities and demonstrate in action that he respects Tribal sovereignty and that he commits the Agency to consult with Tribes whenever their interests are affected.

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

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

LIVING WILLS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today on the other side of this building, the CEOs of the biggest Wall Street banks face tough questions about the way their banks have scammed and broken laws and gotten away with it, as every American knows. Our Banking Committee staff analyzed the data, and it is pretty clear that these banks are breaking the laws over and over and over.

Watchdogs will take enforcement actions against a bank only to find out the same bank is breaking the rules in an entirely different way in a different part of the bank at the same time. We need to hold these banks and the corporate executives who run them accountable for their actions, which we have simply not done. Trump regulators haven’t done it, and the Senate majority hasn’t done it. We simply haven’t done it. Hard-working Americans face real consequences when they break the law, and so should Wall Street banks.

The chair of the House Financial Services Committee, MAXINE WATERS, is doing the right thing in the House calling in these CEOs. We need to be doing the same thing in the Senate. I have called on my counterpart on the Banking Committee, Chairman CRAPO, to hold a hearing so we can question big bank executives about their law-breaking.

There are plenty of actions the President and his administration could take on their own to punish these banks when they break the rules, but instead this administration and this majority leader do exactly the opposite. Last year, Congress passed and President Trump signed legislation rolling back laws protecting working families from Wall Street greed. The big banks, of course, ask for weaker rules. They have forgotten what happened. Well, they haven’t forgotten, but they hope the public has. Certainly, the Senate Republicans have forgotten what happened 10 years ago to this country. So Congress passed and the President signed legislation rolling back laws protecting working families from Wall Street greed. As I said, the big banks wanted weaker rules and they got them, even though that puts millions of families at risk of losing their jobs and losing their homes again. President Trump said: OK, let’s do what the big banks want.

We know that the White House looks like a retreat half the time for Wall Street executives, and we know the President of the United States does the bidding of Wall Street over and over.

The year before weakening these rules, Congress passed and President Trump signed a \$1.5 trillion—that is 1,000 billion, \$1.5 trillion—tax cut for corporations, big banks, and the richest Americans. Since the Republican tax bill passed, corporations have bought back \$900 billion of their own stock.

I was in the White House one day with a group of Senators, meeting with the President of the United States, and he said that this tax bill they were about to pass—that he hoped would pass—would mean that the corporations would invest all these dollars into higher wages for workers and new factories and growing the economy. Well, what happened with a lot of this money was they used this money for stock buybacks.

Of the eight companies with the most stock buybacks—with billion dollars of stock buybacks—half of them were Wall Street banks. We know Wall Street can never get enough—never enough power, never enough money. They always want more. One bank lobbyist said: We don't want a seat at the table; we want the whole table.

And this Congress and this President think that is just fine.

The tax giveaways, letting banks haggle over their stress test results, and taking away customers' rights to have their day in court when the banks scam them, apparently, just wasn't enough for Wall Street. Two days ago, the Fed announced that they are going to roll back more rules on foreign megabanks. These are not just U.S. banks with U.S. employees. These are foreign megabanks. We are talking about banks that have broken U.S. law over and over and over. I am not going to document all of those. But there are many, many cases of these foreign megabanks breaking U.S. law—banks like Santander, which illegally repossess servicemen's cars. So when men and women are overseas protecting our country, Santander, a Spanish-owned bank doing business in the United States, actually repossessed these servicemen's cars.

Deutsche Bank has laundered money. We know Deutsche Bank is about the only big bank in the world that will finance the President because he has a history and a habit of cheating banks and not paying back loans. So because of the relationship that Deutsche Bank and President Trump have, Deutsche Bank is doing just fine. We also know that Deutsche Bank laundered money, breaking U.S. law. Not even counting the President's insidious activities with them, Deutsche Bank broke U.S. law by laundering money. But do you know what? The Fed gives them roll-back rules because we don't want to be too tough on the foreign megabanks.

Last year, when the President signed his big bank bill, I warned that it would mean looser rules on those big, foreign banks. They all said: No, that is not going to happen. Federal Reserve Chairman J. Powell himself said it wouldn't happen; they are not going to weaken the rules on the foreign banks. Well, either they were naive at the time—I think J. Powell is an honest man. I guess I didn't know he was this naive. But he and others would say: They are not going to weaken foreign bank rules.

Well, now they have.

When the Fed made the announcement of its plan to go easy on foreign banks, they said—I am not kidding; this is a quote: "This proposal should look familiar because it shares the same basic framework as the domestic proposal." It is as if that is a good thing, as if they are bragging that we are treating the foreign banks the same way as domestic banks, but these foreign banks happen to break the law over and over—Deutsche Bank, Santander, and other banks.

That is not even the only good news for megabanks this week. We got word that the Fed and President Trump's appointees are going to let the biggest Wall Street banks off the hook on another rule, but one that requires something called living wills. Now, living wills doesn't sound like much. It doesn't mean much to Members of this Senate and to the general public, unless they are in the Banking Committee and they spend a lot of time on this.

Living wills are blueprints from banks that are supposed to prove they will not wreck the economy and cost taxpayers billions of dollars if they go bankrupt. Now, pretty much the way it works is like this. The Federal Reserve goes to these banks and they require these banks to show what would happen if there were a significant downturn in the economy like there was a decade-plus ago.

When the economy went south in 2007, 2008, and 2009, for these banks—because they weren't strong enough, because they hadn't had these stress tests, and because they hadn't gone through these rules because it wasn't Federal law at the time—it wasn't clear that these banks would be able to withstand that kind of plummeting of the economy when demand shrinks and all the things that happen in a recession. They weren't. So that is why government bailed them out. That is why the lobbyists lined up in Leader McConnell's office—then, I guess, it was Leader Fritz's office or Leader Lott's office—and got so much of what they wanted from Senate Republicans in those days.

The whole point of these living wills is that banks can show, through a series of complicated tests, that even if the economy goes bad, these banks aren't going to tank, these banks aren't going to go out of business, and these banks aren't going to need a Federal bailout. That is the whole purpose—a big part of the purpose—of Dodd-Frank, the Wall Street reform bill.

Again, these living wills are blueprints from banks that would prove they will not wreck the economy and cost taxpayers billions if they go bankrupt. Under the bill that passed a decade ago to fix this, they had to go through a stress test every year. Well, this bill the President signed said that, well, they will not have to go through it quite every year. The debate was—I said I didn't think we should do it. My

Republican colleagues said: Well, it will probably be every other year. Maybe that is not so bad.

I said: Well, probably it is. It ought to be every year.

Now the Federal Reserve has said it is just going to be once for every Presidential 4-year term—once every 4 years. Nobody saw that coming. I guess the banks saw it coming because the banks had a lot of influence with them.

So the Wall Street reform law required them to file these plans every year, and now they require them only every 4 years. It is said that if those plans didn't look credible and if the banks failed their stress tests—in other words, they weren't strong enough to withstand a recession—then, the Federal Reserve and others would have the power to go in and make these problem banks simpler and smaller. In other words, if the banks couldn't withstand a bad economy and if these banks were too fragile and caused too much damage to the economy if they didn't pass the stress tests, these banks, then, could be broken up into smaller units, making them stronger. But now financial watchdogs only have to check into those plans just once a Presidential term, every 4 years. A lot can change and a lot can go wrong in 4 years. Just ask any family or anyone how their income or rent or savings change. They may not be the same month-to-month let alone every 4 years.

The people in this town, especially Republicans on the Senate Banking Committee, have this collective amnesia. They may have forgotten what the financial crisis and the housing crisis meant. The families who lost their homes, lost their jobs, lost their retirement savings and their college funds haven't forgotten. They haven't recovered from the financial crisis. They haven't recovered from decades of bad trade policy and bad tax policy that make it harder and harder for their work to pay off.

I don't think Members of this body—there is a wonderful quote from President Lincoln when he said to his staff: I need to go out and get my public opinion back. I need to go out and listen to what people are saying and look at how they are living and talk about their lives.

It is not something people around here do much of, especially when it is people who might be vulnerable to losing their homes.

I live in Cleveland, OH, Connie and I. We live in ZIP Code 44105. There were more foreclosures in my ZIP Code than in any ZIP Code in the United States of America. You can still see the urban blight and the residue in what is left—the remains of those foreclosures.

Think about what it means to a family personally. The first thing they have to do is get rid of their pet. Their pet costs too much money, no matter how close their son or daughter or they themselves may be to their dog or cat.

Then they have to make all kinds of decisions: We are going to have to

move. We are going to have to go to a new school district—all the kinds of heartache when your life has been turned upside down because you are foreclosed on.

I am not an alarmist or predicting anything in the next few months, but if we keep going down this path, weakening Federal banking law, doing the bidding of Wall Street, if the lobbyists continue to go in and out of the office of Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader's office, and the bank lobbyists who go in and out of there and get their way—if that happens and continues to happen, who knows what will happen again in the next 2, 3, 5, 10 years.

The more we roll back these rules on Wall Street, the more we give breaks to foreign megabanks, the greedier the big banks get, the more risk they take on, and the higher the chance that one of their big risks doesn't pay off.

Mr. President, you know who is paying the price when Wall Street bets don't pay off. It is you, it is the workers, families, and taxpayers. It is your money, the American people's money they are gambling with. So instead of making it easier for Wall Street to make big bets and break the law without reaping consequences, why don't we make it easier for families to afford healthcare? Why don't we make it easier for working parents to afford childcare? Why don't we make it easier for workers to save for retirement? Why don't we make it easier for students to pay for college? Why don't we honor the dignity of work and make sure hard work pays off for everyone, whether you swipe a badge or punch a clock or work for tips or work for a salary or whether you are taking care of children or an aging parent? Why don't we make it easier for them with a tax code and trade policy that works? Instead, all our efforts and all of the administration's efforts—as I said, the White House looks like a retreat for Wall Street executives. So much of their efforts are to make it easier for corporations and to make it easier for the big banks.

It is time we listened a little more to the Americans we serve, a little less to the biggest Wall Street banks that have gotten enough handouts already.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. 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. LEE. Mr. President, we have no further debate on the nominee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

If not, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Morales nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote or to change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 75 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Hoeven	Romney
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Burr	Inhofe	Rubio
Capito	Isakson	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Jones	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kaine	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sinema
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	McSally	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markley	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Peters	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden
Gillibrand	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Harris	Perdue
--------	--------	--------

The nomination was confirmed.

The Senator from Tennessee.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

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

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 David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Interior.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, John Thune, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Pat Roberts, John Cornyn, Lindsey Graham, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt, John Boozman, James E. Risch, Roger F. Wicker, John Hoeven, Mike Rounds, Steve Daines, Shelley Moore Capito.

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 David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Interior, 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from California (Ms. HARRIS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 76 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Gardner	Paul
Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Roberts
Boozman	Heinrich	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott (FL)
Collins	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Shelby
Cotton	King	Sinema
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Manchin	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Enzi	McSally	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Murkowski	

NAYS—41

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Hirono	Schatz
Blumenthal	Jones	Schumer
Brown	Kaine	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Leahy	Stabenow
Carper	Markley	Tester
Casey	Menendez	Udall
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Peters	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Reed	Wyden
Gillibrand	Rosen	

NOT VOTING—3

Booker	Harris	Perdue
--------	--------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 41.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of David Bernhardt, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for April 2019. The report compares current-law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts the Senate agreed to in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, BBA18. This information is necessary for the Senate Budget Committee to determine whether budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation. The Republican staff of the Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, prepared this report pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act, CBA.

This is my third scorekeeping report this year. My last filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for February 27, 2019. The information included in this report is current through April 8, 2019.

Since my last filing, three bills with significant budgetary effects cleared Congress, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018, P.L. 116-8; the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act, P.L. 116-9; and the Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019, H.R. 1839.

Budget Committee Republican staff prepared Tables 1-3.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee exceeds or is below its allocation for budget authority and outlays under the fiscal year 2019 enforceable levels filing required by BBA18. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the CBA. Over the current 10-year enforceable window, authorizing committees have increased outlays by a combined \$3.4 billion. For this reporting period, as in my last report, 8 of the 16 authorizing committees are not in compliance with their allocations. One of these committees, Finance, further exacerbated its violations this work period with the passage of the Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act. CBO estimates that this measure will increase mandatory spending for all enforceable periods, including an increase in outlays of \$27 million over the Fiscal Year 2019-2028 period. The Agriculture Committee reduced the size of its violations with the passage

of the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act, which CBO scores as reducing outlays by \$5 million in Fiscal Year 2019 and by \$23 million over the Fiscal Year 2019-2023 period. The Energy and Natural Resources Committee, which was not in breach of its allocation for the last reporting cycle, continued to reduce spending with the passage of the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act. CBO estimates that this measure will reduce spending by \$10 million over both the 5- and 10-year enforceable windows. This savings is credited to its allocation, as shown in the table.

Tables 2 provides the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in sections 312 and 314 of the CBA. Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2019, displayed in this table, show that the Appropriations Committee is compliant with spending limits for Fiscal Year 2019. Those limits for regular discretionary spending are \$647 billion for accounts in the defense category and \$597 billion for accounts in the nondefense category of spending.

The Fiscal Year 2018 budget resolution contained points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPs. Table 3, which tracks the CHIMP limit of \$15 billion for Fiscal Year 2019, shows the Appropriations Committee has enacted \$15 billion worth of full-year CHIMPs for Fiscal Year 2019.

In addition to the tables provided by Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting CBO tables, which I will use to enforce budget totals approved by Congress.

For Fiscal Year 2019, CBO estimates that current-law levels are \$2.9 billion above and \$3.3 billion below enforceable levels for budget authority and outlays, respectively. Revenues are \$426 million below the level assumed in the budget resolution. Further, Social Security revenues are at the levels assumed for Fiscal Year 2019, while Social Security outlays are \$4 million above assumed levels for the budget year.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate pay-as-you-go, PAYGO, rule. The PAYGO scorecard shows deficit increases in Fiscal Year 2019 of \$1,957 million—\$427 million revenue loss, \$1,530 million outlay increase; over the Fiscal Year 2018-2023 period of \$3,373 million—\$894 million revenue loss, \$2,479 million outlay increase; and over the Fiscal Year 2018-2028 period of \$442 million, \$634 million revenue loss, \$192 million outlay decrease.

This submission also includes a table tracking the Senate's budget enforcement activity on the floor since the enforcement filing on May 7, 2018. Since my last report, no new budgetary points of order were raised.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2019	2019–2023	2019–2028
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry			
Budget Authority	2,414	4,249	3,123
Outlays	1,401	1,797	70
Armed Services			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs			
Budget Authority	21	285	382
Outlays	20	285	382
Commerce, Science, and Transportation			
Budget Authority	41	77	91
Outlays	11	74	90
Energy and Natural Resources			
Budget Authority	0	–10	–24
Outlays	0	–10	–24
Environment and Public Works			
Budget Authority	2	4	–333
Outlays	2	4	–333
Finance			
Budget Authority	378	1,128	–889
Outlays	159	1,120	–892
Foreign Relations			
Budget Authority	0	–5	–20
Outlays	0	–5	–20
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	2	4
Outlays	43	48	49
Judiciary			
Budget Authority	13	209	497
Outlays	13	205	492
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions			
Budget Authority	0	–36	–84
Outlays	0	–36	–84
Rules and Administration			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs			
Budget Authority	4	3	–729
Outlays	4,402	4,400	3,668
Indian Affairs			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Total			
Budget Authority	2,873	5,906	2,018
Outlays	6,051	7,882	3,398

TABLE 2.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS¹

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

	2019	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	647,000	597,000
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	23,042
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	5,499	58,619
Defense	606,340	129
Energy and Water Development	22,440	22,200
Financial Services and General Government	31	23,392
Homeland Security	2,058	47,353
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	35,552
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	178,076
Legislative Branch	0	4,836
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	10,332	86,804
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	46,218
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	300	70,779
Current Level Total	647,000	597,000
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	0	0

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.

² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3.—SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)

[Budget authority, millions of dollars]	
	2019
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2019	15,000
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	7,285
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	7,715
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	15,000
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	0

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF APRIL 8, 2019

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^{a,b,c}			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,590,496
Permanents and other spending legislation	2,271,360	2,169,258	n.a.
Authorizing and Appropriation legislation	1,886,507	1,949,120	– 302
Offsetting receipts	– 890,012	– 890,015	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	3,267,855	3,228,363	2,590,194
Enacted Legislation:			
Authorizing Legislation:			
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (P.L. 116–3)	120	8	0
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–6, Division H) ^d	2	2	1
Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (P.L. 116–8)	0	– 5	0
Subtotal, Authorizing Legislation	122	5	1
Appropriation Legislation: ^b			
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (Divisions A–G, P.L. 116–6) ^{b,c}	480,297	311,586	– 125
Passed, Pending Signature:			
Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (H.R. 1839)	52	32	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	480,471	311,623	– 124
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Total Current Level ^c	– 106,128	6,756	0
Total Senate Resolution ^c	3,642,198	3,546,742	2,590,070
	3,639,324	3,550,009	2,590,496
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	2,874	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	3,267	426
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2019–2028:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	33,272,518
Senate Resolution ^c	n.a.	n.a.	33,273,213
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	695

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the budgetary effects of legislation enacted by Congress during the 115th Congress.

^b Sections 1001–1004 of the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255) require that certain funding provided for 2017 through 2026 to the Department of Health and Human Services—in particular the Food and Drug Administration and the National Institutes of Health—be excluded from estimates for the purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (Deficit Control Act) or the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Congressional Budget Act). Therefore, the amounts shown in this report do not include \$771 million in budget authority, and \$767 million in estimated outlays.

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include those items.

^d The Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (P.L. 116–5), as amended, extended several immigration programs through February 15, 2019, that would otherwise have expired at the end of fiscal year 2018. The estimated budgetary effects of those previously enacted extensions are charged to the Committee on Appropriations, and are included in the budgetary effects of P.L. 116–6 shown in the “Appropriation Legislation” portion of this report. In addition, division H of P.L. 116–6 further extended those same programs through the end of fiscal year 2019. Consistent with the language in title III of division H of P.L. 116–6, and at the direction of the Senate Committee on the Budget, the budgetary effects of extending those immigration programs for the remainder of the fiscal year are charged to the relevant authorizing committees, and are shown in the “Authorizing Legislation” portion of this report.

^e Section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 requires the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget publish the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2019; those aggregate levels were first published in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018. The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 also allows the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget to revise the budgetary aggregates:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates Printed on May 7, 2018:	3,547,094	3,508,052	2,590,496
Revisions:			
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	921	0	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	69,464	38,556	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	0	– 214	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	1,680	25	0
Pursuant to sections 311 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974	20,165	3,590	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,639,324	3,550,009	2,590,496

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 10, 2019.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2019 budget and is current through April 8, 2019. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 7, 2018, pursuant to section 30103 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018 (Public Law 115–123).

Since our last letter dated February 27, 2019, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (Public Law 116–8). The Congress has also cleared the Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (H.R. 1839) for the Presi-

dent's signature. Those acts would have significant effects on outlays in fiscal year 2019. Sincerely,

KEITH HALL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019, AS OF APRIL 8, 2019

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority	3,639.3	3,642.2	2.9
Outlays	3,550.0	3,546.7	– 3.3
Revenues	2,590.5	2,590.1	– 0.4
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays ^a	908.8	908.8	0.0
Social Security Revenues	899.2	899.2	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF APRIL 8, 2019

(In millions of dollars)				
	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b,c}				
A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to “Incident Auto Lending and Compliance with the Equal Credit Opportunity Act” (S.J. Res. 57, P.L. 115–172)	*	*	*	*
Economic Growth, Regulatory Relief, and Consumer Protections Act (S. 2155, P.L. 115–174) ^d	*	22	329	490
Trickett Wendler, Frank Mongiello, Jordan McLinn, and Matthew Bellina Right to Try Act of 2017 (S. 204, P.L. 115–176)	*	*	*	*
An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to furnish assistance for adaptations of residences of veterans in rehabilitation programs under chapter 31 of such title, and for other purposes (H.R. 3562, P.L. 115–177)	*	*	*	*
VA MISSION Act of 2018 (S. 2372, P.L. 115–182) ^e	*	*	*	*
Whistleblower Protection Coordination Act (S. 1869, P.L. 115–192)	*	*	*	*
All Circuit Review Act (H.R. 2229, P.L. 115–195)	*	*	*	*
American Innovation \$1 Coin Act (H.R. 770, P.L. 115–197)	0	3	3	0
Small Business 7(a) Lending Oversight Reform Act of 2018 (H.R. 4743, P.L. 115–189)	*	*	*	*
Northern Mariana Islands U.S. Workforce Act of 2018 (H.R. 5956, P.L. 115–218)	0	0	0	–3
KIWI Act (S. 2245, P.L. 115–226)	*	*	*	*
To make technical amendments to certain marine fish conservation statutes, and for other purposes (H.R. 4528, P.L. 115–228)	*	*	*	*
John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (H.R. 5515, P.L. 115–232)	*	*	*	*
Miscellaneous Tariff Bill Act of 2018 (H.R. 4318, P.L. 115–239)	0	304	690	–118
Tribal Social Security Fairness Act of 2018 (H.R. 6124, P.L. 115–243)	0	*	–1	–3
Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.R. 6157, Division B, P.L. 115–245, Division B)	0	0	18	18
Nuclear Energy Innovation Capabilities Act of 2017 (S. 97, P.L. 115–248)	*	*	*	*
Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2018 (S. 3479, P.L. 115–251)	*	2	*	–3
Elkhorn Ranch and White River National Forest Conveyance Act of 2017 (H.R. 698, P.L. 115–252)	*	*	*	*
FAA Reauthorization Act of 2018 (H.R. 302, P.L. 115–54) ^f	*	44	42	26

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF APRIL 8, 2019—Continued

(In millions of dollars)				
	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Patient Right To Know Drug Act of 2018 (S. 2554, P.L. 115–263)	*	*	–11	–52
Orrin G. Hatch-Bob Goodlatte Music Modernization Act (H.R. 1551, P.L. 115–264)	0	0	13	–24
Congressional Award Program Reauthorization Act of 2018 (S. 3509, P.L. 115–268)	0	*	2	4
America’s Water Infrastructure Act of 2018 (S. 3021, P.L. 115–270)	0	2	16	–230
SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (H.R. 6, P.L. 115–271) ^g	0	*	*	*
Hizballah International Financing Prevention Amendments Act of 2017 (S. 1595, P.L. 115–272)	0	*	*	*
To authorize the National Emergency Medical Services Memorial Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes (H.R. 1037, P.L. 115–275)	0	*	*	*
Gulf Islands National Seashore Land Exchange Act (H.R. 2615, P.L. 115–279)	0	*	*	*
Frank LoBiondo Coast Guard Authorization Act of 2018 (S. 140, P.L. 115–282)	0	10	34	0
Making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes (H.J. Res. 143, P.L. 115–298)	0	*	*	*
Amy, Vicky, and Andy Child Pornography Victim Assistance Act of 2018 (S. 2152, P.L. 115–299)	0	*	*	*
A bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Dickinson Reservoir in the State of North Dakota (S. 440, P.L. 115–306)	0	0	0	–4
A bill to establish a procedure for the conveyance of certain Federal property around the Jamestown Reservoir in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes (S. 2074, P.L. 115–308)	0	0	0	–7
Anwar Sadat Centennial Celebration Act (H.R. 754, P.L. 115–310)	0	*	*	*
Larry Doby Congressional Gold Medal Act (H.R. 1861, P.L. 115–322)	0	*	*	*
Reciprocal Access to Tibet Act of 2018 (H.R. 1872, P.L. 115–330)	0	*	*	*
Protecting Access to the Courts for Taxpayers Act (H.R. 3996, P.L. 115–332)	0	*	*	*
Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (H.R. 2, P.L. 115–334)	0	1,399	1,785	0
Nicaragua Human Rights and Anticorruption Act of 2018 (H.R. 1918, P.L. 115–335)	0	*	*	*
21st Century Integrated Digital Experience Act (H.R. 5759, P.L. 115–336)	0	*	*	*
Chinese-American World War II Veteran Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 1050, P.L. 115–337)	0	*	*	*
USS Indianapolis Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 2101, P.L. 115–338)	0	*	*	*

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF APRIL 8, 2019—Continued

(In millions of dollars)				
	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Naismith Memorial Basketball Hall of Fame Commemorative Coin Act (H. R. 1235, P.L. 115–343)	0	0	0	0
Sanctioning the Use of Civilians as Defenseless Shields Act (H.R. 3342, P.L. 115–348)	0	*	*	*
Correcting Miscalculations in Veterans’ Pensions Act (H.R. 4431, P.L. 115–352)	0	*	*	*
Strengthening Coastal Communities Act of 2018 (H.R. 5787, P.L. 115–358)	0	*	*	*
Walnut Grove Land Exchange Act (H.R. 5923, P.L. 115–361)	0	*	*	*
To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend through 2023 the authority of the Federal Election Commission to impose civil money penalties on the basis of a schedule of penalties established and published by the Commission (H.R. 7120, P.L. 115–386)	0	*	*	*
First Step Act of 2018 (S. 756, P.L. 115–391)	0	11	120	317
Abolish Human Trafficking Act of 2017 (S. 1311, P.L. 115–392)	0	*	*	*
CENOTE Act of 2018 (S. 2511, P.L. 115–394)	0	*	*	*
NASA Enhanced Use Leasing Extension Act of 2018 (S. 7, P.L. 115–403)	0	0	5	5
Veterans Benefits and Transition Act of 2018 (S. 2248, P.L. 115–407)	0	*	*	*
Stephen Michael Gleason Congressional Gold Medal Act (S. 2652, P.L. 115–415)	0	*	*	*
Veterans Small Business Enhancement Act of 2018 (S. 2679, P.L. 115–416)	0	*	*	*
Forever GI Bill Housing Payment Fulfillment Act of 2018 (S. 3777, P.L. 115–422)	0	*	*	*
National Integrated Drought Information System Reauthorization Act of 2018 (S. 2200, P.L. 115–423)	0	*	*	*
To authorize early repayment of obligations to the Bureau of Reclamation within the Northport Irrigation District in the State of Nebraska (H.R. 4689, P.L. 115–429)	0	*	*	*
75th Anniversary of World War II Commemoration Act (S. 3661, P.L. 115–433)	0	*	*	*
Chemical Facility Anti-Terrorism Standards Program Extension Act (H.R. 251, P.L. 116–2)	0	*	*	*
Medicaid Extenders Act of 2019 (H.R. 259, P.L. 116–3)	0	8	63	*
Further Additional Continuing Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.J. Res. 28, P.L. 116–5)	0	*	*	*
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2019 (H.J. Res. 31, P.L. 116–6) ^h	0	125	229	9
Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2018 (S. 483, P.L. 116–8)	0	–5	–23	0
John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act (S. 47, P.L. 116–9)	0	0	–10	–10
Medicaid Services Investment and Accountability Act of 2019 (H.R. 1839)	0	32	69	27

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF APRIL 8, 2019—Continued

(In millions of dollars)				
	2018	2019	2018–2023	2018–2028
Impact on Deficit	*	1,957	3,373	442
Total Change in Outlays	*	1,530	2,479	–192
Total Change in Revenues	*	–427	–894	–634

Source: Congressional Budget Office

Notes: P.L. = Public Law, * = between –\$500,000 and \$500,000.

*On May 7, 2018, the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget reset the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.

*The amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws on the deficit.

*Excludes off-budget amounts.

*Pursuant to section 232(b) of H.C. Res. 290 (106th Congress), the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001, the budgetary effects related to the Federal Reserve's surplus funds are excluded. As a result, the amounts shown do not include estimated increases in revenues of \$655 million in fiscal year 2019, \$570 million over the 2019–2023 period, and \$454 million over the 2019–2028 period.

*The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 512 of the Act.

*Division I of P.L. 115–254 contains the Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Act, 2018, which provided \$1,680 million in supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 2019, and designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251 of the Deficit Control Act. At the direction of the Committees on the Budget, and consistent with the language in section 1701, those amounts are shown as discretionary spending.

*The budgetary effects of this Act are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to section 8231 of the Act.

*The budgetary effects of title I of division H are excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard, pursuant to title III of division H of the Act.

ENFORCEMENT REPORT OF POINTS OF ORDER RAISED SINCE THE FY 2019 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Vote	Date	Measure	Violation	Motion to Waive	Result
127	June 18, 2018	H.R. 5515—John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019.	4106(a)-Senate-Pay-As-You-Go Violation ¹	Sen. McConnell (R-KY) ²	81–14, waived
192	August 23, 2018	S. Amdt. #3695 to H.R. 6157, the Defense, Labor, HHS, and Education Appropriations Act ³ .	314(a) CHIMP with Net-Costs	Sen. Leahy (D-VT)	68–24, waived

¹ Senator Sanders raised a section 4106(a) of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress) point of order against the bill because the bill would increase the on-budget deficit.² By unanimous consent the Senate proceeded to a roll call vote to waive the point of order.³ This surgical point of order would have struck lines 7–8 of page 270 in Division B (Title III) of the substitute amendment, which was related to the Pell Grant program. This provision was a Change in Mandatory Program (CHIMP) estimated to increase spending by \$390 million over 10 years.

NOMINATION OF DAVID BERNHARDT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, President Trump has nominated David Bernhardt to be Secretary of the Interior.

The Department of the Interior has broad management responsibilities over our public lands and waters, wildlife, and is also responsible for maintaining the trust responsibilities on behalf of the United States with Indian Country. They also have over 70,000 Federal employees.

There have been significant questions raised about Mr. Bernhardt's decisions and priorities in his position as Deputy Secretary and Acting Secretary that have directly benefitted his former clients, while harming our public lands and wildlife.

There are a number of troubling issues with Mr. Bernhardt's record on the critical issues before the Department of the Interior, but there are two that are of particular concern to me.

First, I am particularly concerned about Mr. Bernhardt's role in the Solicitor's Opinion, M-37050, on the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, MBTA. The Solicitor's Opinion, or M-Opinion, on the MBTA was released on December 22, 2017, without any public or scientific input or environmental analysis, abruptly removing longstanding protections for migratory birds. These protections have been implemented in a bipartisan manner from every administration since the early 1970s. It is likely that millions of birds have been saved thanks to this law and the leadership of the Department. The MBTA has significantly reduced the number of birds killed from oil waste pits and other threats, and it has provided accountability and recovery funds after oil spills such as Deepwater Horizon. This change has been opposed by 17 former Interior officials from every Republican and Democratic administration since the early 1970s, as well as Flyway Councils representing nearly every State wildlife agency in the country.

In letters exchanged between me and the Department of the Interior, they have admitted that due to the M-Opin-

ion on the MBTA, they will no longer be able to secure fines or penalties for violations of the MBTA from companies responsible for an oil spill that non-intentionally kills migratory birds similar to the British Petroleum (BP) Deepwater Horizon disaster of 2010, which killed an estimated 1,000,000 migratory birds.

Furthermore, despite the MBTA's strong record in saving birds through reasonable enforcement, one of Mr. Bernhardt's former clients, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, IPAA, urged the Department of the Interior to gut the MBTA and remove protections for birds and any requirements to take actions to minimize impacts to birds from their activities.

Just this week, we learned that there have been at least three oil spills recently that appear to have killed migratory birds, in which the Department of the Interior admitted in internal emails they can't respond to due to the MBTA M-Opinion.

So in the case of the MBTA, we see a dramatic change in the Department of the Interior's legal interpretation of a key wildlife law that appears to have benefitted a former client of Mr. Bernhardt.

The second issue of critical concern to me is offshore drilling. I hail from a coastal State and a State that is firmly opposed to any oil and gas drilling off of our coastline. Mr. Bernhardt has overseen the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management's, BOEM, development of an oil and gas leasing plan that dramatically expands risky offshore drilling and that has prompted bipartisan criticism at all levels of government. The Department of the Interior, under Mr. Bernhardt's leadership, has simultaneously been working to weaken offshore drilling safety standards put in place in response to the Deepwater Horizon oil spill and at the recommendation of a bipartisan commission that investigated the disaster.

I have serious questions about whether Mr. Bernhardt can do his job without confronting conflicts of interest at every turn, and I fear that he will put powerful special interests before the public interest.

For these reasons, I opposed David Bernhardt's nomination as Secretary of the Interior.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. HARRIS. Mr. President, I was absent for vote No. 76 the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 200, the nomination of David Bernhardt to be Secretary of the Interior. Had I been present, I would have voted no on the motion to invoke cloture.

COLORADO RIVER DROUGHT CONTINGENCY PLAN AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. President, on Monday, the Senate passed my bill, and yesterday, we passed identical House legislation to ensure this went to the President as quickly as possible. I would like to take a few minutes to thank those involved with these agreements and again highlight the importance of this historic achievement.

The Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan, also known as the DCP, was negotiated between the seven Colorado River Basin States to respond to this prolonged drought. It is designed to protect Lakes Mead and Powell from reaching certain critical water elevations that would trigger severe water supply and hydropower impacts, including the risk of reaching crisis levels where operational control of the Colorado River System is lost.

The set of five agreements that makes up the DCP builds off of the tools and water saving commitments made by the basin States in the 2007 Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin Shortages and Coordinated Operations for Lakes Powell and Mead to further address water security and respond to actual water conditions as demanded by responsible water resource management. These added savings bring the risk of the Mead hitting 1,000 feet over the next 7 years to near zero.

I am especially proud of the work done on these agreements in Arizona, which takes the biggest and most immediate reduction in water supply under the DCP. Through inclusive,

good-faith negotiations, cities, farmers, tribes, and conservation groups came together to make the tough decisions required to improve long-term water security and avert the looming water supply crisis.

I would like to thank and congratulate Governor Doug Ducey and his staff, the Arizona State legislature, Tom Buschatzke and his team at the Department of Water Resources, the CAWCD board, Ted Cooke and the CAP staff, Gila River Indian Community Governor Stephen Lewis and the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Council, Colorado River Indian Tribes Chairman Dennis Patch and the CRIT Tribal Council, and the dozens and dozens of ag, water, municipal, NGO, and other stakeholders, including the entire Arizona DCP Steering Committee, involved on this outstanding achievement that will improve Arizona's water security for years to come.

Work on the DCP has been underway for nearly 6 years. It has spanned the terms of two Presidents, three Interior Secretaries, and 13 Governors. The effort has seamlessly transitioned between Republican and Democrat administrations, both here in DC and out in the States, and I am proud of the swift action taken by Congress to authorize this agreement.

The Colorado River DCP Authorization Act was developed in a bipartisan and bicameral manner, and involved the Governors' representatives for each of the seven basin States. Responding to concerns of some in the House and Senate about potential unintended consequences of the legislative language proposed as part of the DCP agreements, several changes were made to provide assurances that the National Environmental Policy Act applies to future Federal actions outside the scope of existing environmental analysis and compliance done in the Upper and Lower Basins.

I would like to thank Senators CORTEZ MASTO, GARDNER, and BARRASSO, along with House Natural Resources Chairman RAÚL GRIJALVA and Ranking Member ROB BISHOP for working with me to reach this compromise legislation.

This exact statutory language is crafted to ensure water conservation activities in the Colorado River Basin can begin in 2019 and be built in to the Annual Operations Plans for 2020. Once the Colorado River Drought Contingency Plan Authorization Act is enacted, execution and implementation of the DCP can and should begin immediately, as all of the actions in the agreements authorized by this bill are well within the scope of existing NEPA and Endangered Species Act compliance in the Upper and Lower Basins. Specifically, the actions to be undertaken are within the analyses and range of effects reviewed in the 2007 final environmental impact statement on Colorado River Interim Guidelines for Lower Basin Shortages and Coordinated Operations for Lakes Powell and

Mead, and the EISs and ESA documents prepared for operation of the Colorado River Storage Project Act initial storage unit reservoirs. Additional environmental compliance is only applicable should future Federal actions be undertaken that are outside the range of effects analyzed in those documents or the applicable Records of Decision.

In closing, I am proud to have led my colleagues from the seven basin States to get this DCP Authorization Act passed through Congress as quickly as possible, and I thank them for their hard work and support. The Colorado River DCP Act chooses the path of water conservation, compromise, and proactive water management over and litigation, conflict, and creation of a zero sum game on the River. I understand that there will be more work to be done after we have authorized the DCP, but we have made important progress in passing this critical legislation.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my opening statement at the Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development's budget hearing for the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation's fiscal year 2020 budget request be printed in the RECORD.

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

CORPS OF ENGINEERS FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST

Mr. ALEXANDER. First, I would like to thank our witnesses for being here today, and also Senator Feinstein, with whom I have the pleasure to work with again this year to draft the Energy and Water Appropriations bill.

Our witnesses today include: R.D. James, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; Lieutenant General Todd Semonite, Chief of Engineers for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Brenda Burman, Commissioner for the Bureau of Reclamation at the Department of the Interior; and Timothy R. Petty, Ph.D., Assistant Secretary for Water and Science at the Department of the Interior.

Based on the number of appropriations requests we receive each year, the Corps of Engineers is the federal government's most popular agency. Because this is so important to many Senators, Senator Feinstein and I have provided record level funding in a regular appropriations bill for the last four years.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers touches the lives of almost every American. The Corps maintains our inland waterways, it deepens and keeps our ports open, and its dams provide emission-free, renewable hydroelectric energy. The Corps also manages river levels to help prevent flooding. This year record rainfall caused the Missouri River to experience historic flooding, devastating parts of Iowa, Nebraska and Missouri.

I can recall when, after the Missouri and Mississippi rivers flooded in 2011, a room full of Senators showed up at a Senate Environment and Public Works Committee hearing to ask what went wrong and what went right

with disaster relief efforts. So, there's a real interest in what the Corps does.

So, last year, Senator Feinstein and I worked together to provide record funding for the Corps of Engineers—a total of \$7 billion. However, this year, the president's budget request only includes \$4.8 billion for the Corps—a dramatic reduction in spending. In my opinion, we should spend more, not less, on our nation's water infrastructure.

Today I will focus my questions on four main areas:

1. Making our nation's water infrastructure a priority and properly funding our inland waterways system;
2. Adequately funding our nation's ports and harbors;
3. Making sure the Corps has the resources it needs to respond to flooding and make repairs so they can continue to manage river levels, and;
4. Using a more common-sense approach to making decisions about which projects receive funding by looking at the "remaining benefit to cost ratio" of an ongoing project. Today, because of Office of Management and Budget rules, the Corps has to pretend a project is not already under construction when the Corps decides which projects will receive funding each year. This does not make any sense, and makes it harder to complete projects on time and on budget.

In 2012, Senator Graham, Senator Feinstein, and I said, "Let's ask what would a great country, the United States, want from its ports, locks, dams, and waterways in order to fully maximize them for our economic growth."

We asked everyone to focus first on what needed to be done and not get bogged down in the difficulties of how to pay for it. From these discussions, Congress took three important steps, focusing on properly funding our inland waterways system.

First, Congress passed a law that reduced the amount of money that comes from the Inland Waterways Trust Fund to replace Olmsted Lock, a project in Illinois and Kentucky that was soaking up almost all of the money that was available for inland waterway projects.

Second, we worked with the commercial waterways industry to establish a priority list for projects that needed to be funded, on which Chickamauga ranks near the top, in fourth place.

And third, we enacted a user fee increase that commercial barge owners asked to pay in order to provide additional funds to replace locks and dams across the country, including Chickamauga Lock.

These steps increased the amount of funding that was available for inland waterways projects from about \$85 million in fiscal year 2014 to \$105 million in fiscal year 2020. And Congress has followed through by appropriating all of the user fees that have been collected in the last five years. The user fees that are paid into the Inland Waterways Trust Fund by waterway users are matched with federal dollars, which allow the Corps of Engineers to make significant progress to address the backlog of work on our inland waterways.

But despite knowing the Inland Waterways Trust Fund would have \$105 million available for fiscal year 2020, the Administration's budget is only proposing to spend \$55.5 million—which leaves 47% of these funds sitting unspent in a Treasury account. Then we would not be spending the money for the intended purpose. And despite not spending the entire \$105 million in user fees from commercial barges, the administration's budget also includes a new user fee for inland waterways that would raise another \$1.8 billion over a 10-year window.

I do not think this is a responsible approach. It makes no sense to ask barge owners to pay more in fees when the administration is not even proposing to spend all the fees we are collecting today. The budget also only proposes to fund a single project using Inland Waterways Trust Fund revenues, the Lower Monongahela, and eliminates funding for the other two projects that have been funded for construction for the last five years—Kentucky Lock and Chickamauga Lock.

I can't count the number of times that the head of the Corps—including General Semonite—has told me that it makes no sense to start and stop construction. It's not an efficient way to build projects and it is a waste of taxpayer money. Replacing Chickamauga Lock is important to all of Tennessee and if Chickamauga Lock closes, it will throw 150,000 more trucks onto I-75. Funding for construction of the new Chickamauga Lock has been provided for the past five years so it does not make sense for the administration to not include the project in the budget request. This year's budget proposal is a huge step backwards for our nation's inland waterways.

We have done a good job providing record level funding over the last five years to adequately fund our nation's harbors, including Mobile Harbor in Alabama; Savannah Harbor in Georgia; and Long Beach Harbor in California; and many others across the country. Six years ago, Congress took a look at the need to provide more funding for our nation's ports and harbors to ensure we can compete with other harbors around the world. We realized that the government was spending only a fraction of the taxes each year that were collected in the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for our ports and harbors, resulting in billions of dollars of unspent funds just sitting in a bank account that got bigger and bigger each year.

In fact, unlike the Inland Waterways Trust Fund—which has virtually no balance in the trust fund—the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund has an unspent balance of over \$9 billion today. To provide more funding for our ports and harbors, Congress enacted spending targets for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund in the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014 that were meant to make us spend a little more each year on harbor maintenance projects.

We have met these targets for the last five years in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill. The target for fiscal year 2020 is about \$1.595 billion. However, the administration's budget only proposes to spend \$965 million, \$585 million less than what Congress appropriated last year and \$630 million below the target. So I will ask the witnesses how they plan to sufficiently fund our ports and harbors without requesting adequate resources to do it.

Several members of this subcommittee are interested in making sure the Corps has the resources it needs to deal with the recent flooding in the Midwest and along the Missouri and Mississippi Rivers. I look forward to hearing from the witnesses about what resources they need so that we can make sure they are included in the disaster supplemental appropriation bill.

I'd also like to recognize Brenda Burman, Commissioner from the Bureau of Reclamation and Dr. Timothy Petty, Assistant Secretary for Water and Science at the Department of the Interior. The Bureau of Reclamation delivers water to one of every five farmers in the West, irrigating more than 10 million acres of some of the most productive agricultural land in the country. Although Reclamation doesn't manage water resources in Tennessee, I know of its deep importance to Senator Feinstein and other Senators on

this subcommittee, and we look forward to hearing your testimony.

STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY TO PROTECT STUDENTS AND TAXPAYERS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my opening statement at the Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee be printed in the RECORD.

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

STRENGTHENING ACCOUNTABILITY TO PROTECT STUDENTS AND TAXPAYERS

Mr. ALEXANDER. When I was president of the University of Tennessee, I asked David Gardner, who was then president of the University of California, why his university was considered one of the best in the world. He told me: First, autonomy. We basically have four branches of government, he said, and one of them is the University of California. Second, competition and choice—large amounts of state and federal money following students to the campus of their choice. Third, a commitment to excellence by institutional leaders and faculty.

As a former university president, I am very much aware that despite that autonomy, our country's 6,000 colleges and universities report to a lot of bosses—they are accountable to a great many individuals, boards, governments and other entities.

First, they are accountable to the students who may take their federal and state grants and loans to any accredited institution that will admit them; next, to 44 federally recognized accrediting agencies whose certification of quality is necessary before institutions are allowed to accept students who bring \$30 billion in new Pell grants and \$100 billion in federal student loans each year; to ensure that these billions of dollars are spent wisely, the federal government measures how many students default on their loans; for the 80 percent of students who attend public colleges and universities, states have governors, state legislators, laws, and state higher education authorities; every institution, public or private, also has its own board of trustees or directors; and in addition, there are specific federal rules for the for-profit institutions, which about five percent of students attend, in order to stop fraud against students and taxpayers; and when making a list of bosses, no former university president should leave out the faculty—most faculty members I have known take great pride in maintaining institutional excellence.

So any president of an American higher education institution has a lot of bosses and a lot of people to whom he or she is accountable. And that has been a mostly successful approach. Most surveys show that the United States has most of the best colleges and universities in the world. The dream of many of the best students from around the world is to attend American colleges and universities. Still, I hear often from students asking if college is worth their time and money.

I believe there are steps we can take to make our higher education institutions more accountable—to provide those students, and the taxpayers backing their loans, with a clear yes, college is worth it.

In March, at our first bipartisan hearing during this Congress on updating the Higher Education Act, we looked at how to simplify how 20 million families apply for federal student aid. Last week, we held a bipartisan hearing about how to create a safe environment for students attending college.

Today's hearing will be looking at ways to ensure that students are earning degrees worth their time and money and that taxpayers are paid back the hundreds of billions that they have loaned students to earn degrees.

To hold colleges accountable for the \$130 billion a year in grants and loans, in 1990, Congress created the Cohort Default Rate, which applies to all colleges and universities. This measure makes a college ineligible to receive federal student aid if, for three consecutive years, more than 30 percent of its borrowers are in default or over 40 percent in any one year. However this cohort default rate has proven to be a poor instrument of accountability, since it does not take into account the one third of borrowers who are not yet in default but don't make payments on time. Over the last decade, only 20 schools have become ineligible for federal student aid under the Cohort Default Rate, according to the Congressional Research Service.

And then there are two federal accountability rules that apply only to for-profit institutions. One, the 90-10 rule, which requires that at least ten percent of a for-profit's revenue come from nonfederal sources; and two, the Gainful Employment Rule, which looks at how much debt a graduate has compared to his or her salary. This comparison of debt to salary has proved to be a confusing and ineffective measure of accountability because it is too complex and does not account for students who take out loans but do not complete their degrees. So we need a more effective measure of accountability.

But I do not want the federal government acting as a sort of National School Board for Colleges—telling states and accreditors and boards of directors at institutions how to manage the 6,000 colleges and universities. Four years ago, this Committee passed the Every Student Succeeds Act, which reversed the trend towards a national school board for elementary and secondary education. For the same reasons, Washington should resist the urge to send thousands of federal bureaucrats to evaluate our colleges and universities, which would, in effect, create a national school board for colleges.

Instead, Congress should create a new measure of accountability that looks at whether students are actually repaying their loans. This would be a more effective and simpler way to ensure that taxpayers aren't financing degrees that are priced so high and worth so little that students are never able to pay back their loans. This proposal is much like the Gainful Employment Rule—but it would apply to every program at every college—public, private, and for-profit and would include students who took out loans but dropped out before graduating. For some programs, this new measure should provide colleges with an incentive to lower tuition and help their students stay in school to finish their degrees and find a job so they can repay their loans.

A second step to improve accountability would be for the federal government to make the data it collects from colleges more useful to students and families. The Department has struggled for years under all administrations to make such information easily accessible to students and families. As we work on updating the Higher Education Act, we first need to identify what information schools actually need to report, and second to provide direction to the Department on how to make that information accessible and useful to students.

And third, we should strengthen the 44 federally recognized accrediting agencies upon which we rely for certifying that students are receiving a quality education. For example, instead of requiring that accreditors

have a standard of “student achievement,” Congress could more clearly require that accreditors measure whether students are both learning and succeeding, but leave the specific ways of measuring those to accreditors and institutions.

Our goal needs to be to help students know that their degrees are going to be worth their time and money and to help taxpayers know that the federal government isn’t financing programs that do not provide students with a valuable education.

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, 30 years ago today, the Whistleblower Protection Act was signed into law. To call it a triumph doesn’t do justice to the sheer number of years and people it took on both sides of the aisle to overcome numerous obstacles and enact Federal protections for Federal Government employees who step forward and do what we all should do: expose wrongdoings in order to hold government officials and agencies accountable.

Congressional efforts to protect whistleblowers date back to at least 1912 with the enactment of the Lloyd-La Follette Act. This act guaranteed the right of Federal employees to communicate with Members of Congress without the oversight of their employer and prohibited compensation to managers who retaliated against employees attempting to disclose whistleblower matters.

However, empowering Federal employees to speak up and speak the truth was and continues to be an ongoing struggle, one that has often pitted Congress against the executive branch. When President George H.W. Bush signed the Whistleblower Protection Act into law that April morning in 1989, it came after his predecessor President Ronald Reagan had vetoed a similar bill despite the fact that it had been unanimously adopted by both the Senate and the House.

The Whistleblower Protection Act, itself, was first introduced by Representative Pat Schroeder of Colorado as an amendment to the Civil Service Reform Act of 1978 and then as a standalone bill in 1982. The principal purpose of the bill was to block retaliation against employees who came forward, a never-ending problem. The bill would have allowed “a person claiming to be aggrieved by a prohibited personnel practice to: (1) bring a civil action in a U.S. district court against the employee or agency involved (respondent); or (2) seek corrective action through the (Merit Systems Protection) Board.”

While that particular bill ultimately died after receiving unfavorable comments from the U.S. Government Accountability Office—GAO—and the Merit Systems Protection Board, which adjudicates whistleblower complaints, its failure didn’t deter our colleagues.

By the time 1989 rolled around, Members of both the House and the Senate,

including Senator Carl Levin of Michigan, who spearheaded efforts in the Senate, had worked together for years to find a compromise and pass legislation that protected those employees whose disclosures revealed waste, fraud, or abuse. Between May of 1982 and September of 1989, 28 bills and resolutions with whistleblower protections built into them were introduced, many of them with dozens and dozens of co-sponsors.

Since the passage of the Whistleblower Protection Act 30 years ago, Congress has continued to improve protections for whistleblowers, notably with the passage of the Intelligence Community Whistleblower Protection Act of 1998; the Whistleblower Protection Enhancement Act of 2012; the Department of Veterans Affairs Accountability and Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017; and more recently the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act of 2017.

Unfortunately, despite all of these efforts, becoming a whistleblower is still a perilous path. In its latest budget justification, the Office of Special Counsel, the agency that investigates retaliation against Federal whistleblowers, reported that, in fiscal year 2018, that agency received over 4,100 complaints of retaliation, otherwise known as prohibited personnel practices. This, according to OSC, is a new agency record. That is not a record that anyone should be proud of.

As much as today is a celebration of the Whistleblower Protection Act and the work of the many people it took to make those protections law, it is a greater celebration of the courage whistleblowers embody when they step forward to shine a light on waste, fraud, abuse, and mismanagement in the government. Their bravery and sacrifice is invaluable, and for that, we thank them. Unfortunately, coming forward to do what is right still requires too much of both.

Consequently, Congress still has more work to do to protect whistleblowers, and I call on my colleagues to remember the value of citizens being able to blow the whistle. As Representative Schroeder said early on in her efforts to help whistleblowers: “If we in Congress are going to act as effective checks on excesses in the executive branch, we have to hear about such matters.”

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

ROTARY CLUB OF CASPER CENTENNIA CELEBRATION

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, today I wish to celebrate the Centennial of the Rotary Club of Casper, Wyoming, a club which holds special importance for my wife, Bobbi and me.

On Saturday, May 4, 2019, the Rotary Club of Casper will recognize their 100th anniversary at a special celebration. Rotary organized in Casper, WY

on March 12, 1919, just 14 years after the first Rotary club was formed in Chicago, and 28 years after Wyoming’s admission to the Union.

At a luncheon on March 12, 1919, 15 businessmen, representing all walks of Casper life, met and elected their leadership—President James T. Gratiot, Directors Loui McMahon, Steve Starrett, George Nelson, Billy Johnson, Carl Shumaker, and Otis Walker. With a shared mission and sense of duty, these charter members laid the groundwork for a century to come.

The Casper Daily Tribune noted Rotary’s founding in an article the following day, March 13, 1919, “The purpose of the club is to encourage business and social relations and its by-laws define the policies of the club in a way that marks various departures from other clubs or societies.” With this in mind, the club hit the ground running, impacting the Casper community in positive and distinct ways.

Within their first years of forming, Casper Rotary’s commitment to the community was proven and acknowledged. As early as 1920–21, with memories of WWI fresh in their minds, they voted to support and donate funds to the construction of an air base near Casper. This air base, established in 1942, would come to fruition as the Casper Army Air Field. Governor Bryant B. Brooks, who would join the club and become president, noticed their initiative and addressed the club early on. This began a pattern with the club hosting a great number of Wyoming Governors, U.S. Senators and Congressmen, and local officials.

The Rotary Club of Casper always realized the importance of the youth of their community. From the beginning, the club sponsored the Boy and Girl Scouts. They established a student loan fund for students wishing to further their education and engaged with high school students to encourage their ambition. They were part of the effort to bring a junior college to Casper, lobbying the State legislature in Cheyenne. Their efforts were rewarded in 1945, when Casper College was established as Wyoming’s first junior college.

Countless dollars and volunteer hours were donated and continue to be given to the creation of parks, camps, playgrounds, and swimming pools for the community. The most well-known is Rotary Park on Casper Mountain. Popular since the early 1940s, Rotary Park contains the picturesque Garden Creek Falls and Bridle Trail. Additionally, each August, Rotary helps host Casper’s Riverfest and the Great Duck Derby. Rubber ducks fill the North Platte River with the proceeds going to the area’s trail systems. The club’s continuing engagement and investment in future projects ensure these areas are enjoyed for generations to come.

The history of Casper’s Rotary Club is a microcosm of the history of Casper. Professionals encompassing the

entire Casper community worked together throughout the years to promote good will, service, and character. For the club's 40th anniversary celebration in 1959, Rotarian M. E. "Monte" Robertson wrote, "We can all be justly proud of our Casper Rotary Club, of the pioneers who constituted its membership in the beginning, and the character and quality of those members who have carried on until the present day." These words hold true today with the leadership of President Dick Jay, President Elect John Griffith, President Elect Nominee Lisa Scroggins, and Centennial Committee Chair Barry Johnson.

It is a high honor for me to rise in recognition of this significant milestone for the Rotary Club of Casper. I have seen firsthand the important work the club does, as Bobbi and I have been fortunate to call ourselves Rotarians. Since my days as an orthopedic surgeon in Casper, I have been involved with Casper Rotary for 36 years. We made countless lifelong friendships along the way and continue to appreciate the dedication of our fellow members.

It is a great privilege to recognize this incredible service organization and their dedication to the betterment of their Wyoming community. Bobbi joins me in extending our congratulations and deep gratitude to the Rotary Club of Casper on their centennial celebration.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13536 ON APRIL 12, 2010 WITH RESPECT TO SOMALIA—PM 9

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides

for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13536 of April 12, 2010, with respect to Somalia is to continue in effect beyond April 12, 2019.

The United States is strongly committed to Somalia's stabilization, and it is important to maintain sanctions against persons undermining its stability. The situation with respect to Somalia continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13536 with respect to Somalia.

DONALD J. TRUMP.
THE WHITE HOUSE, April 10, 2019.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 9:56 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1759. An act to amend title III of the Social Security Act to extend reemployment services and eligibility assessments to all claimants for unemployment benefits, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1957. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the 26th edition of the pocket version of the Constitution of the United States.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 31. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall for a ceremony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holocaust.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 1:29 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 1839. An act to amend title XIX to extend protection for Medicaid recipients of home and community-based services against spousal impoverishment, establish a State Medicaid option to provide coordinated care to children with complex medical conditions through health homes, prevent the misclassification of drugs for purposes of the

Medicaid drug rebate program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2030. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to execute and carry out agreements concerning Colorado River Drought Contingency Management and Operations, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY) announced that on today, April 10, 2019, he has signed the following enrolled joint resolution, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S.J. Res. 7. Joint resolution to direct the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 1585. An act to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-920. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2-Hydroxypropyl Starch; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9991-13-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-921. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Flonicamid; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9990-52-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-922. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Financial Surveillance Examination Program Requirements for Self-Regulatory Organizations" (RIN3038-AE73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-923. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Segregation of Assets Held as Collateral in Uncleared Swap Transactions" (RIN3038-AE78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2019; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-924. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals relative to the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-925. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals relative to the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2020”; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-926. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the mobilizations of selected reserve units, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-927. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of three (3) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-928. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-929. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-930. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the threat of foreign interference in United States elections that was declared in Executive Order 13848 of September 12, 2018; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-931. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-932. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s fiscal year 2018 Annual Performance Report and fiscal year 2020 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-933. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of Administrator, Federal Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-934. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Loans to Members and Lines of Credit to Members” (RIN3133-AE88) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-935. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Depart-

ment of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Department’s Alternative Fuel Vehicle (AFV) program for fiscal year 2018; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-936. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Interlocking Officers and Directors; Requirements for Applicants and Holders” ((RIN1902-AF53) (Docket No. RM15-18-000)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2019; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-937. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Navigational Improvement Project for the Port of Seattle, Washington; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-938. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-939. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Florida; 2008 8-hour Ozone Interstate Transport” (FRL No. 9991-96-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-940. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Kentucky: Jefferson County Prevention of Significant Deterioration” (FRL No. 9991-95-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-941. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; Kentucky: Regional Haze Plan and Prong 4 (Visibility) for the 1997 Ozone, 2010 NO₂, 2010 SO₂, and 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS” (FRL No. 9991-82-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-942. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Miscellaneous Rules” (FRL No. 9991-94-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-943. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Air Plan Approval; OR; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9990-80-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-944. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wyoming; Interstate Transport for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard” (FRL No. 9991-74-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-945. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Clean Data Determination; Provo, Utah 2006 Fine Particulate Matter Standards Nonattainment Area” (FRL No. 9991-76-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-946. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Significant New Use Rules on Certain Chemical Substances” (FRL No. 9991-19-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-947. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicaid; Revisions to State Medicaid Fraud Control Unit Rules” (RIN0936-AA07) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-948. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Medicaid Program; Covered Outpatient Drug; Line Extension Definition; and Change to the Rebate Calculation for Line Extension Drugs” (RIN 0938-AT09) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-949. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports relative to the Treaty Between the United States of America and the Russian Federation on Measures for the Further Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms (the New START Treaty); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-950. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Turkey, Poland, and the United Kingdom for the manufacture, inspection, test, delivery, and repair of machined parts, machined assemblies, and components for the H-60/S-70, H-53, and H-92 model helicopters in the amount of \$100,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-021); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-951. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data and defense services, to Qatar to support the manufacture of the fusion rifle

scope/target illuminator system in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-067); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-952. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, the certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms abroad controlled under Category I of the U.S. Munitions Lists of 7.62mm rifles and suppressors to the Philippines for end use by the Department of National Defense in the amount of \$1,000,000 or more (Transmittal No. DDTC 18-092); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-953. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Compliance with Statutory Program Integrity Requirements" (RIN0937-AA07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-954. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Reinstatement of Color Additive Listing for Lead Acetate" (Docket No. FDA-2017-C-1951) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-955. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Orthopedic Devices; Classification of Posterior Cervical Screw Systems" ((RIN0910-AI00) (Docket No. FDA-2015-N-3785)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-956. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Microbiology Devices; Classification of In Vitro Diagnostic Devices for Bacillus Species Detection" ((RIN0910-AH98) (Docket No. FDA-2011-N-0103)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-957. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Devices; Technical Amendment" (Docket No. FDA-2019-N-1345) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-958. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Certain Time of Inspection and Duties of Inspector Regulations for Biological Products" ((RIN0910-AH49) (Docket No. FDA-2017-N-7007)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-959. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Competition, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 7A of the Clayton Act" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-960. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Competition, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 8 of the Clayton Act" received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2019; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-961. A communication from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to vacancies in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-962. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy for the position of Assistant Secretary for Research & Technology, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 5, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-963. A communication from the Acting Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Deceptive Advertising as to Sizes of Viewable Pictures Shown by Television Receiving Sets" (16 CFR Part 410) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 8, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-964. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; 2018 Sector Operations Plans and Allocation of Northeast Multispecies Annual Catch Entitlements" (RIN0648-XG051) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-965. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species' Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits in Longline Fisheries for 2017" (RIN0648-BG78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-966. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Modifications to the Number of Unrigged Hooks Carried on Board Bottom Longline Vessels" (RIN0648-BG92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-967. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Electronic Reporting Requirements" (RIN0648-AP66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-968. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Framework for Treaty Tribe Harvest of Pacific Groundfish and 1996 Makah Whiting Allocation" (RIN0648-AH84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 9, 2019; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 195. A bill to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain a website accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-31).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 196. A bill to save taxpayer money and improve the efficiency and speed of intragovernmental correspondence, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-32).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 387. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-33).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 383. A bill to support carbon dioxide utilization and direct air capture research, to facilitate the permitting and development of carbon capture, utilization, and sequestration projects and carbon dioxide pipelines, and for other purposes.

S. 747. A bill to reauthorize the diesel emissions reduction program, and for other purposes.

S. 1061. A bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize appropriations for the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, and for other purposes.

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. RUBIO (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 1101. A bill to ensure that only licensed health care providers furnish disability examinations under a certain Department of Veterans Affairs pilot program for use contract physicians for disability examinations,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 1102. A bill to promote security and energy partnerships in the Eastern Mediterranean, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. HAWLEY):

S. 1103. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a skills-based immigration points system, to focus on family-sponsored immigration on spouses and minor children, to eliminate the Diversity Visa Program, to set a limit on the number of refugees admitted annually to the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 1104. A bill to prohibit the General Services Administration from awarding contracts to certain insured depository institutions that avoid doing business with certain companies that are engaged in lawful commerce based solely on social policy considerations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 1105. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish and maintain a registry for certain individuals who may have been exposed to per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances due to the environmental release of aqueous film-forming foam on military installations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 1106. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit against tax for rent paid on the personal residence of the taxpayer; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. CAPITO, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 1107. A bill to require a review of women and lung cancer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1108. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to require entities that use, store, or share personal information to conduct automated decision system impact assessments and data protection impact assessments; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1109. A bill to establish as a unit of the National Park System the San Gabriel National Recreation Area in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1110. A bill to provide for restoration, economic development, recreation, and conservation on Federal lands in Northern California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1111. A bill to designate certain Federal land in the State of California as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 1112. A bill to improve the safety of the air supply on commercial aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 1113. A bill to protect and enhance core diplomatic capabilities at the Department of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 1114. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate a provision under the Medicare Advantage program that inadvertently penalizes Medicare Advantage plans for providing high quality care to Medicare beneficiaries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. ENZI):

S. 1115. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service from rehiring any employee of the Internal Revenue Service who was involuntarily separated from service for misconduct; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

S. 1116. A bill to require providers of broadband internet access service and edge services to clearly and conspicuously notify users of the privacy policies of those providers, to give users opt-in or opt-out approval rights with respect to the use of, disclosure of, and access to user information collected by those providers based on the level of sensitivity of the information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1117. A bill to establish a career pathway grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. REED):

S. 1118. A bill to amend the Servicemembers Civil Relief Act to authorize spouses of servicemembers who incur a catastrophic injury or illness or die while in military service to terminate leases of premises and motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1119. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for meals; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 1120. A bill to amend chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the "Regulatory Flexibility Act"), to ensure complete analysis of potential impacts on small entities of rules, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Mr. KING):

S. 1121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code 1986 to exclude major professional sports leagues from qualifying as tax-exempt organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1122. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend projects relating to children and to provide access to school-based comprehensive mental health programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CARPER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1123. A bill to transfer and limit Executive Branch authority to suspend or restrict the entry of a class of aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 1124. A bill to require the establishment of a working group to evaluate the food safety threat posed by beef and poultry imported from Brazil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PERDUE, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BURR, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COTTON, and Ms. MCSALLY):

S. 1125. A bill to amend the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1126. A bill to provide better care for Americans living with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias and their caregivers, while accelerating progress toward prevention strategies, disease modifying treatments, and, ultimately, a cure; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1127. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to require the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress regarding applications for authorizations to engage or participate in the development or production of special nuclear material outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 1128. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emission fees, provide tax credits to workers, deliver additional benefits to retired and disabled Americans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1129. A bill to establish a Medicare-for-all national health insurance program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. JONES):

S. 1130. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the health of children and help better understand and enhance awareness about unexpected sudden death in early life; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 1131. A bill to establish family and medical leave banks to provide paid leave for employees of the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1132. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and to provide for Social Security benefit protection; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. SASSE, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1133. A bill to provide disaster tax relief for certain disasters occurring in 2019; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1134. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for an investment tax credit related to the production of electricity from nuclear energy; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 1135. A bill to protect Federal, State, and local public safety officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 1136. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize concurrent use of Department of Defense Tuition Assistance and Montgomery GI Bill-Selected Reserve benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. STABENOW:

S. 1137. A bill to prioritize education and training for current and future members of the environmental health workforce; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HARRIS, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. JONES, Mr. Kaine, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1138. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the earned income and child tax credits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CARPER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1139. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 153. A resolution reaffirming the unique collaboration among United States nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), including faith-based organizations, and the Israel Defense Forces to deliver humanitarian assistance to Syrians; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 154. A resolution recognizing the week of April 11 through April 17, 2019, as "Black Maternal Health Week" to bring national attention to the maternal health crisis in the Black community and the importance of reducing maternal mortality and morbidity among Black women; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. Res. 155. A resolution relative to the death of the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, former United States Senator for the State of South Carolina; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. Res. 156. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work Day; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Ms. STABENOW):

S. Res. 157. A resolution supporting the designation of April 2019 as "Parkinson's Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

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

S. Res. 158. A resolution authorizing the use of the atrium in the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building for the National Prescription Drug Take Back Day, a semiannual event of the Drug Enforcement Administration; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 64

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 64, a bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market, and to prohibit biological product manufacturers from compensating biosimilar and interchangeable companies to delay the entry of biosimilar biological products and interchangeable biological products.

S. 151

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) were added as cosponsors of S. 151, a bill to deter criminal robocall violations and improve enforcement of section 227(b) of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes.

S. 227

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were

added as cosponsors of S. 227, a bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 287

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 287, a bill to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to impose limitations on the authority of the President to adjust imports that are determined to threaten to impair national security, and for other purposes.

S. 362

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 362, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 371

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) were added as cosponsors of S. 371, a bill to provide regulatory relief to charitable organizations that provide housing assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 427, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to enhance activities of the National Institutes of Health with respect to research on autism spectrum disorder and enhance programs relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 460

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 460, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the exclusion for employer-provided education assistance to employer payments of student loans.

S. 504

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 504, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to authorize The American Legion to determine the requirements for membership in The American Legion, and for other purposes.

S. 518

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 518, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of certain lymphedema compression treatment items as items of durable medical equipment.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Montana

(Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase certain funeral benefits for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 599

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 599, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes.

S. 600

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 600, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a working group to study regulatory and legislative improvements for the livestock, insect, and agricultural commodities transport industries, and for other purposes.

S. 605

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 605, a bill to assist States in carrying out projects to expand the child care workforce and child care facilities in the States, and for other purposes.

S. 622

At the request of Mr. JONES, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) were added as cosponsors of S. 622, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 634

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 634, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish tax credits to encourage individual and corporate taxpayers to contribute to scholarships for students through eligible scholarship-granting organizations and eligible workforce training organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 651

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 651, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 665

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 665, a bill to reduce the number of preventable deaths and injuries caused by underride crashes, to improve motor carrier and passenger motor vehicle safety, and for other purposes.

S. 666

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms.

SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to require the Secretary of Labor to award grants to organizations for the provision of transition assistance to members and former members of the Armed Forces who are separated, retired, or discharged from the Armed Forces, and spouses of such members, and for other purposes.

S. 703

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 703, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to address health, safety, and environmental hazards at private military housing units, to prohibit the payment by members of the Armed Forces of deposits or other fees relating to such housing units, and for other purposes.

S. 726

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 726, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety of cosmetics.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to protect children through eliminating visa loopholes.

S. 758

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 758, a bill to ensure affordable abortion coverage and care for every woman, and for other purposes.

S. 800

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 820

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, a bill to strengthen programs authorized under the Debbie Smith Act of 2004.

S. 824

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 824, a bill to increase the number of States that may conduct Medicaid demonstration programs to improve access to community mental health services.

S. 880

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 880, a bill to provide outreach and reporting on comprehensive Alzheimer's disease care planning services furnished under the Medicare program.

S. 901

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to support individuals with younger onset Alzheimer's disease.

S. 903

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. JONES) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 903, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish advanced nuclear goals, provide for a versatile, reactor-based fast neutron source, make available high-assay, low-enriched uranium for research, development, and demonstration of advanced nuclear reactor concepts, and for other purposes.

S. 983

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 983, a bill to amend the Energy Conservation and Production Act to reauthorize the weatherization assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 998

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 998, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to expand support for police officer family services, stress reduction, and suicide prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 1033

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1033, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a public health insurance option, and for other purposes.

S. 1037

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1037, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize provisions relating to rural health clinics under Medicare.

S. 1068

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1068, a bill to secure the Federal voting rights of persons when released from incarceration.

S. RES. 85

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 85, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the founding of Easterseals, a leading advocate and service provider for children and adults with disabilities, including veterans and older

adults, and their caregivers and families.

S. RES. 128

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 128, a resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the National Parks Conservation Association.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1108. A bill to direct the Federal Trade Commission to require entities that use, store, or share personal information to conduct automated decision system impact assessments and data protection impact assessments; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I, along with my colleague Senator BOOKER of New Jersey, are introducing the Algorithmic Accountability Act. This bill is a critical first step to address the use of biased or discriminatory algorithmic decisions impacting American consumers. It is a bicameral effort, led in the House of Representatives by Congresswoman YVETTE CLARKE, vice chair of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Today's biggest companies are increasingly using algorithms to make decisions about consumers. The use by companies of algorithms can often benefit consumers, and these technologies have been critical in the creation of thousands of American companies. Alongside this beneficial proliferation, algorithms have become entrenched in the most life-changing of decisions. Algorithms can now determine whether Americans are hired for a dream job, are approved for a home mortgage, or even sent to jail.

But, as history has shown, a win for the corporation is not always a win for the consumer. And, in this case, when consumers lose, all too often they are a woman or an American of color. Though an innovation critical for future growth, algorithms can be as discriminatory as the humans they have begun to replace.

The issue is a simple one: While algorithms come to conclusions based on calculations, these calculations are created by humans or use data collected and supplied by humans. And, unfortunately, we humans can be biased, whether we know it or not, or we can create algorithms that, in time, create biases of their own.

Thanks to a flood of news reports and investigations detailing algorithms-gone-wrong, these issues are coming to light. Yet, American companies and the U.S. government are doing far too little to assess whether their own algorithms depend on biased assumptions, have created biases assumptions, and have the effect of increasing discrimination in the U.S.

Senator BOOKER and I intend to change that by ensuring that today's racial, social, and gender biases do not become entrenched in the automation of tomorrow.

Our bill has four main components.

First, it authorizes the Federal Trade Commission to create regulations requiring companies under its jurisdiction to conduct impact assessments of highly sensitive algorithms. This requirement would apply not only to new algorithmic systems, but also those that are both new and already in existence.

Second, it requires companies to assess their use of algorithms—including any relevant training data—for impacts on accuracy, fairness, bias, discrimination, privacy, and security.

Third, it requires companies to evaluate how their information systems protect the privacy and security of consumers' personal information.

And, finally, it requires companies to correct any issues they discover during the impact assessments.

This legislation is in no way intended to hinder the adoption by American companies of advanced technologies like algorithms. Automated decision systems are out there, and they are being adopted into commercial decision-making processes.

What we are seeking to do with this bill is to ensure that companies take a hard look at their own technologies to ensure that they address any unintended side effects.

Mr. President, it is time for Congress to get involved by requiring companies to address biases and unintended discriminatory effects in their automated decision systems.

I thank my colleague Senator BOOKER for his efforts on this bill, and I hope the Senate will promptly consider and pass this critical legislation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mrs. GILIBRAND, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1132. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make improvements in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, and to provide for Social Security benefit protection; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to express my support for the Protecting and Preserving Social Security Act, which I was proud to reintroduce earlier this afternoon with Senators SMITH, GILIBRAND and MERKLEY, and Congressman DEUTCH—who introduced the bill in the House.

Social Security serves as a critical lifeline for millions of individuals and families in Hawaii and throughout the United States. For seniors, the program is fundamental to retirement security, and for families, it provides economic security. Countless individuals rely on Social Security as a key source of income, so we must continue fighting to protect the program and make sure beneficiaries receive the

hard-earned benefits they deserve. The Protecting and Preserving Social Security Act does two things.

First, the bill restores fairness in Social Security payroll taxes by eliminating the contribution cap on taxable income—gradually, over seven years.

What does this mean? Currently, most Americans contribute 6.2 percent of their incomes toward Social Security payroll taxes. However, because of the contribution cap on taxable income, higher income earners will stop contributing to Social Security after their first \$132,900 of income for 2019. This means that many working and middle class families will contribute more of their income toward Social Security, while wealthy families will contribute less.

In fact, for the highest income earners, those in the "top 1 percent", this week marks the point in the year when they will stop contributing to the program altogether for 2019. That does not seem fair, so our bill makes sure that everyone contributes their fair share to Social Security for the entire year, and that the wealthiest individuals and families in our country do not receive a tax break at the expense of working and middle class families.

Second, the bill provides an updated measure of inflation to reflect what seniors and other beneficiaries actually pay for things like medical care, prescription drugs, and energy costs, and increases their benefits based on this measure. The Social Security Administration has indicated that these changes, taken together, would increase Social Security benefits and extend the life of the combined Social Security trust fund by another 19 years—from 2034 to 2053.

These are modest but important steps that we can take to improve the program for current and future beneficiaries.

Locally in Hawaii, we recognize that whatever hurts the most vulnerable in our communities, hurts all of us. We each have a role to play in supporting our communities. That is why my colleagues and I have reintroduced this legislation to strengthen Social Security. We will continue fighting for working and middle class families who rely on Social Security and similar programs, and we will continue to oppose cuts to Social Security—which would be devastating for millions of Americans. We will continue fighting to make sure everyone contributes their fair share so that Social Security can deliver on its promise to the American people.

I thank my colleagues for joining me in reintroducing this important legislation as we continue our work to strengthen Social Security. I yield the floor.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 153—RE-AFFIRMING THE UNIQUE COLLABORATION AMONG UNITED STATES NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS (NGOS), INCLUDING FAITH-BASED ORGANIZATIONS, AND THE ISRAEL DEFENSE FORCES TO DELIVER HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO SYRIANS

Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 153

Whereas the Syrian civil war, now in its eighth year, has forced 14,000,000 Syrians to flee, more than half of the country's pre-war population, with 6,500,000 internally displaced people (IDPs) still within the country;

Whereas "Operation Good Neighbor" is a program of the Israel Defense Forces to provide humanitarian relief to Syrians;

Whereas Operation Good Neighbor worked with United States nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) to help forge unprecedented partnerships between the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) and Syrian NGOs, which opened a new channel for the delivery of humanitarian assistance;

Whereas, as a result, food, fuel, medicine, ambulances, and medical supplies were flowing cross-border from Israel into southern Syria;

Whereas this new channel permitted these goods to arrive at Israeli ports, and be trucked by the IDF through Israel to the border with Syria;

Whereas, at the border, the IDF transferred these containers to Syrian NGOs for transport and distribution to IDPs and local residents in previously hard-to-reach locations in southern Syria;

Whereas United States NGOs, including faith-based organizations, facilitated the relationships between the Syrian NGOs and the IDF by providing overall coordination and support for this regional cooperation to help promote regional peace through a multifaceted humanitarian relief operation;

Whereas the program initially reached only villages along the border, but expanded to a broader area of southern Syria, and as deliveries continued on a sustained basis, the initiative ultimately reached an even greater population; and

Whereas, in addition to the value of the humanitarian relief itself, the Syrian/Israeli partnerships, created and reinforced through the success of the new channel, demonstrated the value of cooperation and continues to serve as a role model for strengthened positive relations between Syrians and Israelis: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby reaffirms the unique collaboration between United States nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), including faith-based organizations, and Syrian NGOs and the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) for having provided vital aid to internally displaced people and local residents in southern Syria while also countering generations of hostility, promoting dialogue between neighbors, and ultimately advancing long-term stability in the region.

SENATE RESOLUTION 154—RECOGNIZING THE WEEK OF APRIL 11 THROUGH APRIL 17, 2019, AS "BLACK MATERNAL HEALTH WEEK" TO BRING NATIONAL ATTENTION TO THE MATERNAL HEALTH CRISIS IN THE BLACK COMMUNITY AND THE IMPORTANCE OF REDUCING MATERNAL MORTALITY AND MORBIDITY AMONG BLACK WOMEN

Ms. HARRIS (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 154

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Black mothers in the United States are 3 to 4 times more likely than White mothers to die from pregnancy-related causes;

Whereas Black women in the United States suffer from life-threatening pregnancy complications, known as "maternal morbidities", twice as often as White women;

Whereas maternal mortality rates in the United States are—

- (1) among the highest in the developed world; and
- (2) increasing rapidly;

Whereas the United States has the highest maternal mortality rate among affluent countries, in part because of the disproportionate mortality rate of Black mothers;

Whereas Black women are 49 percent more likely than White women to deliver prematurely;

Whereas the high rates of maternal mortality among Black women span across—

- (1) income levels;
- (2) education levels; and
- (3) socioeconomic status;

Whereas structural racism, gender oppression, and the social determinants of health inequities experienced by Black women in the United States significantly contribute to the disproportionately high rates of maternal mortality and morbidity among Black women;

Whereas racism and discrimination play a consequential role in maternal health care, experiences, and outcomes;

Whereas a fair distribution of resources, especially with regard to reproductive health care services and maternal health programming, is critical to closing the maternal health racial disparity gap;

Whereas, even as there is growing concern about improving access to mental health services, Black women are least likely to have access to mental health screenings, treatment, and support before, during, and after pregnancy;

Whereas justice-informed, culturally congruent models of care are beneficial to Black women; and

Whereas an investment must be made in—

- (1) maternity care for Black women; and
- (2) policies that support and promote affordable, comprehensive, and holistic maternal health care that is free from gender and racial discrimination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes—

- (1) that Black women are experiencing high, disproportionate rates of maternal mortality and morbidity in the United States;

(2) that the alarmingly high rates of maternal mortality among Black women are unacceptable;

(3) that, in order to better mitigate the effects of systemic and structural racism, Congress must work toward ensuring that the Black community has—

- (A) adequate housing;
- (B) transportation equity;
- (C) nutritious food;
- (D) clean water;
- (E) environments free from toxins;
- (F) fair treatment within the criminal justice system;

- (G) safety and freedom from violence;
- (H) a living wage;
- (I) equal economic opportunity; and
- (J) comprehensive, affordable health care;

(4) that, in order to improve maternal health outcomes, Congress must fully support and encourage policies grounded in the human rights and reproductive justice frameworks that address Black maternal health inequity;

(5) that Black women must be active participants in the policy decisions that impact their lives;

(6) that "Black Maternal Health Week" is an opportunity—

(A) to raise national awareness of the state of Black maternal health in the United States;

(B) to amplify the voices of Black women, families, and communities;

(C) to serve as a national platform for—

- (i) entities led by Black women; and
- (ii) efforts on maternal health; and

(D) to enhance community organizing on Black maternal health; and

(7) the significance of April 11 through April 17, 2019, as "Black Maternal Health Week".

SENATE RESOLUTION 155—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 155

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings was born in Charleston, South Carolina, in 1922 and graduated from The Citadel and the University of South Carolina School of Law;

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings served his country during World War II as an artillery officer in the Army, earning a Bronze Star;

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings was elected to the South Carolina House of Representatives in 1949;

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings was elected Governor of South Carolina in 1959 and oversaw the establishment of the nationally recognized South Carolina Technical College System;

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings served South Carolina with devotion and dedication in the United States Senate for 38 years;

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings served the Senate as Chairman of the Committee on the Budget and Chairman of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation;

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings fought tirelessly to combat hunger in the United States and was a strong advocate for a robust national defense;

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings championed fiscal restraint throughout his

career and was the unheralded force behind the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.);

Whereas the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings was a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather;

Whereas the service of the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings on behalf of the people of South Carolina and all people of the United States earned him the respect and devotion of his colleagues; and

Whereas the death of the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings has deprived South Carolina and the United States of one of the most outstanding Senators: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, former Senator for the State of South Carolina; and

(2) the Secretary of the Senate communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings.

SENATE RESOLUTION 156—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF TAKE OUR DAUGHTERS AND SONS TO WORK DAY

Mr. BURR (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 156

Whereas the Take Our Daughters To Work program was created in New York City as a response to research that showed that, by the 8th grade, many girls were dropping out of school, had low self-esteem, and lacked confidence;

Whereas, in 2003, the name of the program was changed to “Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work” so that boys who face many of the same challenges as girls could also be involved in the program;

Whereas, in 2019, the mission of the program, to develop “innovative strategies that empower girls and boys to overcome societal barriers to reach their full potential”, fully reflects the addition of boys;

Whereas the Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work Foundation, a nonprofit organization, has grown to be one of the largest public awareness campaigns, with more than 40,000,000 participants annually in more than 3,500,000 organizations and workplaces representing each State;

Whereas, in 2007, the Take Our Daughters To Work program transitioned to Elizabeth City, North Carolina, became known as the Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work Foundation, and received national recognition for its dedication to future generations;

Whereas, every year, mayors, Governors, and other private and public officials sign proclamations and lend support to Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work Day;

Whereas the fame of the Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work program has spread overseas, with requests and inquiries being made from around the world on how to operate the program;

Whereas 2019 marks the 26th anniversary of the Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work program;

Whereas Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work Day will be observed on Thursday, April 25, 2019; and

Whereas, by offering opportunities for children to experience activities and events, Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work Day is intended to continue helping millions of girls and boys on an annual basis to examine

their opportunities and strive to reach their fullest potential: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the goals of introducing daughters and sons to the workplace; and

(2) commends all participants of Take Our Daughters And Sons To Work Day for—

(A) the ongoing contributions that the participants make to education; and

(B) the vital role that the participants play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 157—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF APRIL 2019 AS “PARKINSON’S AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Ms. STABENOW) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 157

Whereas Parkinson’s disease is a chronic, progressive neurological disease and the second most common neurodegenerative disease in the United States;

Whereas, although there is inadequate data on the incidence and prevalence of Parkinson’s disease, the disease is estimated to affect between 500,000 and 1,000,000 individuals in the United States, with that number expected to more than double by 2040;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Parkinson’s disease is the 14th leading cause of death in the United States;

Whereas millions of individuals in the United States are greatly impacted by Parkinson’s disease, including the caregivers, family members, and friends of individuals living with Parkinson’s disease;

Whereas research suggests that the cause of Parkinson’s disease is a combination of genetic and environmental factors, but the exact cause of the disease in most individuals is still unknown;

Whereas, as of March 2019, there is no objective test or biomarker with which to diagnose Parkinson’s disease;

Whereas there is no known cure or drug to slow or halt the progression of Parkinson’s disease, and available treatments are limited in their ability to address the medical needs of patients and remain effective over time;

Whereas the symptoms of Parkinson’s disease vary from person to person and may include—

- (1) tremors;
- (2) slowness of movement and rigidity;
- (3) problems with gait and balance;
- (4) disturbances in speech and swallowing;
- (5) cognitive impairment and dementia;
- (6) mood disorders; and
- (7) a variety of other nonmotor symptoms;

Whereas volunteers, researchers, caregivers, and medical professionals are working to improve the quality of life of—

(1) individuals living with Parkinson’s disease; and

(2) the families of those individuals; and

Whereas increased research, education, and community support services are needed—

(1) to find more effective treatments; and

(2) to provide access to quality care to individuals living with Parkinson’s disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2019 as “Parkinson’s Awareness Month”;;

(2) supports the goals and ideals of Parkinson’s Awareness Month;

(3) continues to support research to find better treatments and a cure for Parkinson’s disease;

(4) recognizes the individuals living with Parkinson’s disease who participate in vital

clinical trials to advance the knowledge of the disease; and

(5) commends the dedication of the organizations, volunteers, researchers, and millions of individuals across the United States who are working to improve the quality of life of—

(A) individuals living with Parkinson’s disease; and

(B) the families of those individuals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 158—AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE ATRIUM IN THE PHILIP A. HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING FOR THE NATIONAL PRESCRIPTION DRUG TAKE BACK DAY, A SEMI-ANNUAL EVENT OF THE DRUG ENFORCEMENT ADMINISTRATION

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

S. RES. 158

Resolved,

SECTION 1. USE OF THE ATRIUM IN THE HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING FOR TAKE BACK DAY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The atrium in the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building is authorized to be used on April 24, 2019, for the National Prescription Drug Take Back Day, a semiannual event of the Drug Enforcement Administration.

(b) PREPARATIONS.—Physical preparations for the conduct of the event described in subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as may be prescribed by the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I have 14 requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

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

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on child nutrition reauthorization.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on broadband.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 9:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Jeffrey A. Rosen, of Virginia, to be Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice; and Jeffrey Vincent Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Texas, Stephanie L. Haines, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Pennsylvania, and Brantley Starr, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Texas.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on SBA's international trade programs.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "VA Mission Act".

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND SAFETY

The Subcommittee on Transportation and Safety of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE CONSTITUTION

The Subcommittee on the Constitution of the Committee on the Judiciary

is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, April 10, 2019, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following individuals be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress: Elliot Eichen, Marisa Morin, Pamela Reed, Katherine Rudell, Jackson Shawn-Hays, Sarah Harvey, Stephanie Bell, Sarah Christ, Roberta Daghir, Mattie Wheeler, Alec Camhi, Ebony Smith, Kristen Lund, Briana Hauss, and Rachel Swindle.

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

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 155, submitted earlier today.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 155) relative to the death of the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, former United States Senator for the State of South Carolina.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 155) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 156, S. Res. 157, and S. Res. 158.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions (S. Res. 156 and S. Res. 157) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The resolution (S. Res. 158) was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS MEMORIAL SERVICE AND THE NATIONAL HONOR GUARD AND PIPE BAND EXHIBITION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 16, 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. 16) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service and the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

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

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. 16) was agreed to.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 19, 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. 19) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

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

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. 19) was agreed to.

TARGET PRACTICE AND MARKSMANSHIP TRAINING SUPPORT ACT

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 18, S. 94.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 94) to amend the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act to facilitate the establishment of additional or expanded public target ranges in certain States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to proceeding to the measure?

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 94) was passed, as follows:
S. 94

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Target Practice and Marksmanship Training Support Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the use of firearms and archery equipment for target practice and marksmanship training activities on Federal land is allowed, except to the extent specific portions of that land have been closed to those activities;

(2) in recent years preceding the date of enactment of this Act, portions of Federal land have been closed to target practice and marksmanship training for many reasons;

(3) the availability of public target ranges on non-Federal land has been declining for a variety of reasons, including continued population growth and development near former ranges;

(4) providing opportunities for target practice and marksmanship training at public target ranges on Federal and non-Federal land can help—

(A) to promote enjoyment of shooting, recreational, and hunting activities; and

(B) to ensure safe and convenient locations for those activities;

(5) Federal law in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, including the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), provides Federal support for construction and expansion of public target ranges by making available to States amounts that may be used for construction, operation, and maintenance of public target ranges; and

(6) it is in the public interest to provide increased Federal support to facilitate the construction or expansion of public target ranges.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to facilitate the construction and expansion of public target ranges, including ranges on Federal land managed by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

SEC. 3. DEFINITION OF PUBLIC TARGET RANGE.

In this Act, the term "public target range" means a specific location that—

(1) is identified by a governmental agency for recreational shooting;

(2) is open to the public;

(3) may be supervised; and

(4) may accommodate archery or rifle, pistol, or shotgun shooting.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO PITTMAN-ROBERTSON WILDLIFE RESTORATION ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (8) as paragraphs (3) through (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) the term 'public target range' means a specific location that—

"(A) is identified by a governmental agency for recreational shooting;

"(B) is open to the public;

"(C) may be supervised; and

"(D) may accommodate archery or rifle, pistol, or shotgun shooting;"

(b) EXPENDITURES FOR MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE AREAS AND RESOURCES.—Section 8(b) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669g(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking "(b) Each State" and inserting the following:

"(b) EXPENDITURES FOR MANAGEMENT OF WILDLIFE AREAS AND RESOURCES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), each State";

(2) in paragraph (1) (as so designated), by striking "construction, operation," and inserting "operation";

(3) in the second sentence, by striking "The non-Federal share" and inserting the following:

"(3) NON-FEDERAL SHARE.—The non-Federal share";

(4) in the third sentence, by striking "The Secretary" and inserting the following:

"(4) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary"; and

(5) by inserting after paragraph (1) (as designated by paragraph (1) of this subsection) the following:

"(2) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding the limitation described in paragraph (1), a State may pay up to 90 percent of the cost of acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range."

(c) FIREARM AND BOW HUNTER EDUCATION AND SAFETY PROGRAM GRANTS.—Section 10 of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669h-1) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

"(3) ALLOCATION OF ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—Of the amount apportioned to a State for any fiscal year under section 4(b), the State may elect to allocate not more than 10 percent, to be combined with the amount apportioned to the State under paragraph (1) for that fiscal year, for acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range."

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

"(b) COST SHARING.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal share of the cost of any activity carried out using a grant under this section shall not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of the activity.

"(2) PUBLIC TARGET RANGE CONSTRUCTION OR EXPANSION.—The Federal share of the cost of acquiring land for, expanding, or constructing a public target range in a State on Federal or non-Federal land pursuant to this section or section 8(b) shall not exceed 90 percent of the cost of the activity."; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1)—

(A) by striking "Amounts made" and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), amounts made"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) EXCEPTION.—Amounts provided for acquiring land for, constructing, or expanding a public target range shall remain available for expenditure and obligation during the 5-fiscal-year period beginning on October 1 of the first fiscal year for which the amounts are made available."

SEC. 5. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CO-OPERATION.

It is the sense of Congress that, consistent with applicable laws and regulations, the Chief of the Forest Service and the Director of the Bureau of Land Management should cooperate with State and local authorities and other entities to carry out waste removal and other activities on any Federal land used as a public target range to encourage continued use of that land for target practice or marksmanship training.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

SUPPORTING DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES AND STANDARDS IN BOLIVIA AND THROUGHOUT LATIN AMERICA

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 58, S. Res. 35.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 35) supporting democratic principles and standards in Bolivia and throughout Latin America.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment, and with an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

Whereas the nation of Bolivia proclaimed independence from Spain on August 6, 1825, with Simón Bolívar as its president;

Whereas Bolivia endured more than a century of fragile governance and instability, with more than 150 changes of leadership since it gained independence;

Whereas Bolivia experienced a succession of military coups that resulted in the irregular transfer of power between presidents and military juntas during the period of 1964 to 1982;

Whereas a transition to civilian democracy occurred in 1982, after the ruling military junta handed over power to a civilian government, which managed to maintain control despite major economic upheavals and painful market reforms;

Whereas elected President Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada and his successor Carlos Mesa both resigned in the face of destabilizing protests in 2003 and 2005, respectively;

Whereas, in 2005, Evo Morales won his first term as president, becoming Bolivia's first indigenous citizen elected to the office;

Whereas Bolivia's historically marginalized indigenous peoples represent approximately 41 percent of the country's population, according to the 2012 Bolivian census;

Whereas, in 2006, the people of Bolivia elected a constituent assembly to write a new constitution recognizing greater political and economic rights for the country's indigenous population, while key opposition parties boycotted the constituent assembly election;

Whereas, in 2008, a recall referendum on President Morales was rejected by 67 percent of voters in Bolivia;

Whereas, in 2008, amidst growing protests in the country and rising tensions between Bolivia and the United States, President Morales expelled the United States ambassador to Bolivia;

Whereas, in 2009, Bolivians approved, by a vote of more than 60 percent in a nationwide referendum, a new constitution that included a limit of two five-year presidential terms;

Whereas, in 2009, President Morales won reelection to a second term with more than 60 percent of the vote;

Whereas, in 2013, President Morales' loyalists in Bolivia's Legislative Assembly approved legislation allowing him to run for a third term—a law that President Morales' political allies in the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal affirmed, ruling that the two-term limit in the country's new constitution did not apply because President Morales' first term was under the old constitution;

Whereas, in 2013, President Morales expelled the United States Agency for International Development for trying to "conspire against Bolivia";

Whereas, in 2014, President Morales won his third term as president, with 60 percent of the vote;

Whereas, in 2016, the Government of Bolivia called a national referendum to modify the constitution in order to allow for an additional term for Morales;

Whereas, that same year, more than half of voters in Bolivia rejected the proposed lifting of presidential term limits that would have allowed President Morales to run for a fourth term and serve at least 19 years in office;

Whereas, after the referendum, the Morales Administration increased its troubling rhetoric against opposition media and advanced a narrative suggesting a plot to prevent President Morales from staying in power;

Whereas, in 2017, President Morales' loyalists on the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal lifted constitutional term limits arguing that they violated the candidates' human rights, citing the American Convention of Human Rights, adopted at San Jose November 22, 1969, the main human rights treaty in the Americas, as the legal foundation for its decision;

Whereas the Convention states that political rights can only be limited under very specific circumstances, a provision which, when drafted in 1969, was intended to prevent abusive governments from arbitrarily barring opposition candidates and not to impede constitutional reelection limits designed to reduce corruption and abuse of power given Latin America's long history of violent and prolonged dictatorship;

Whereas the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal's ruling rendered Bolivia one of a very small number of countries in the Western Hemisphere that does not place limits on presidential reelection;

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States said the cited clause "does not mean the right to perpetual power . . . Besides, presidential re-election was rejected by popular will in a referendum in 2016.";

Whereas, in March 2018, a report commissioned by the Organization of American States specifically related to this issue stated that—

(1) "There is no specific and distinct human right to re-election.";

(2) "Term limits . . . are a reasonable limit to the right to be elected because they prevent an

unlimited exercise of power in the hands of the President.";

(3) "The limits on a president's re-election do not therefore unduly restrict his/her human and political rights.";

Whereas the Morales era has seen many social and economic gains, but also a weakening and undermining of key democratic institutions in order to favor the ruling party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the important transitions to democracy and the regular peaceful transfers of power through elections that have taken place in the majority of Latin American and Caribbean countries in recent decades;

(2) recognizes the historic significance of Bolivia's 2005 election;

(3) expresses concern for efforts to circumvent presidential term limits in the Bolivian constitution;

(4) supports presidential term limits prevalent in Latin America as reasonable checks against a history of coups, corruption, and abuses of power;

(5) expresses the belief that the 2016 referendum vote to maintain presidential term limits reflected the legitimate will of the majority of voters in Bolivia;

(6) agrees with the Organization of American States Secretary General's interpretation of the American Convention of Human Rights as not applicable to presidential term limits;

(7) calls on the Government of Bolivia to respect, and where necessary restore, the independence of key electoral and governing bodies and administer the October 2019 election in adherence with international democratic norms and its own constitutional limits on presidential terms; and

(8) calls on Latin American democracies to continue to uphold democratic norms and standards among members states.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I know of no further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 35) was agreed to.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, 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 committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 35

Whereas the nation of Bolivia proclaimed independence from Spain on August 6, 1825, with Simón Bolívar as its president;

Whereas Bolivia endured more than a century of fragile governance and instability, with more than 150 changes of leadership since it gained independence;

Whereas Bolivia experienced a succession of military coups that resulted in the irregular transfer of power between presidents and military juntas during the period of 1964 to 1982;

Whereas a transition to civilian democracy occurred in 1982, after the ruling military junta handed over power to a civilian government, which managed to maintain con-

trol despite major economic upheavals and painful market reforms;

Whereas elected President Gonzalo Sanchez de Lozada and his successor Carlos Mesa both resigned in the face of destabilizing protests in 2003 and 2005, respectively;

Whereas, in 2005, Evo Morales won his first term as president, becoming Bolivia's first indigenous citizen elected to the office;

Whereas Bolivia's historically marginalized indigenous peoples represent approximately 41 percent of the country's population, according to the 2012 Bolivian census;

Whereas, in 2006, the people of Bolivia elected a constituent assembly to write a new constitution recognizing greater political and economic rights for the country's indigenous population, while key opposition parties boycotted the constituent assembly election;

Whereas, in 2008, a recall referendum on President Morales was rejected by 67 percent of voters in Bolivia;

Whereas, in 2008, amidst growing protests in the country and rising tensions between Bolivia and the United States, President Morales expelled the United States ambassador to Bolivia;

Whereas, in 2009, Bolivians approved, by a vote of more than 60 percent in a nationwide referendum, a new constitution that included a limit of two five-year presidential terms;

Whereas, in 2009, President Morales won reelection to a second term with more than 60 percent of the vote;

Whereas, in 2013, President Morales' loyalists in Bolivia's Legislative Assembly approved legislation allowing him to run for a third term—a law that President Morales' political allies in the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal affirmed, ruling that the two-term limit in the country's new constitution did not apply because President Morales' first term was under the old constitution;

Whereas, in 2013, President Morales expelled the United States Agency for International Development for trying to "conspire against Bolivia";

Whereas, in 2014, President Morales won his third term as president, with 60 percent of the vote;

Whereas, in 2016, the Government of Bolivia called a national referendum to modify the constitution in order to allow for an additional term for Morales;

Whereas, that same year, more than half of voters in Bolivia rejected the proposed lifting of presidential term limits that would have allowed President Morales to run for a fourth term and serve at least 19 years in office;

Whereas, after the referendum, the Morales Administration increased its troubling rhetoric against opposition media and advanced a narrative suggesting a plot to prevent President Morales from staying in power;

Whereas, in 2017, President Morales' loyalists on the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal lifted constitutional term limits arguing that they violated the candidates' human rights, citing the American Convention of Human Rights, adopted at San Jose November 22, 1969, the main human rights treaty in the Americas, as the legal foundation for its decision;

Whereas the Convention states that political rights can only be limited under very specific circumstances, a provision which, when drafted in 1969, was intended to prevent abusive governments from arbitrarily barring opposition candidates and not to impede constitutional reelection limits designed to reduce corruption and abuse of power given Latin America's long history of violent and prolonged dictatorship;

Whereas the Bolivian Constitutional Tribunal's ruling rendered Bolivia one of a very small number of countries in the Western Hemisphere that does not place limits on presidential reelection;

Whereas the Secretary General of the Organization of American States said the cited clause "does not mean the right to perpetual power . . . Besides, presidential re-election was rejected by popular will in a referendum in 2016.";

Whereas, in March 2018, a report commissioned by the Organization of American States specifically related to this issue stated that—

(1) "There is no specific and distinct human right to re-election.";

(2) "Term limits. . . are a reasonable limit to the right to be elected because they prevent an unlimited exercise of power in the hands of the President."; and

(3) "The limits on a president's re-election do not therefore unduly restrict his/her human and political rights."; and

Whereas the Morales era has seen many social and economic gains, but also a weakening and undermining of key democratic institutions in order to favor the ruling party: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the important transitions to democracy and the regular peaceful transfers of power through elections that have taken place in the majority of Latin American and Caribbean countries in recent decades;

(2) recognizes the historic significance of Bolivia's 2005 election;

(3) expresses concern for efforts to circumvent presidential term limits in the Bolivian constitution;

(4) supports presidential term limits prevalent in Latin America as reasonable checks against a history of coups, corruption, and abuses of power;

(5) expresses the belief that the 2016 referendum vote to maintain presidential term limits reflected the legitimate will of the majority of voters in Bolivia;

(6) agrees with the Organization of American States Secretary General's interpretation of the American Convention of Human Rights as not applicable to presidential term limits;

(7) calls on the Government of Bolivia to respect, and where necessary restore, the independence of key electoral and governing bodies and administer the October 2019 election in adherence with international democratic norms and its own constitutional limits on presidential terms; and

(8) calls on Latin American democracies to continue to uphold democratic norms and standards among member states.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE IMPORTANCE AND VITALITY OF THE UNITED STATES ALLIANCES WITH JAPAN AND THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 59, S. Res. 67.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 67) expressing the sense of the Senate on the importance and vitality of the United States alliances with Japan and the Republic of Korea, and our trilateral cooperation in the pursuit of shared interests.

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

which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment, and with an amendment to the preamble, as follows:

Whereas the governments and the people of the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea share comprehensive and dynamic partnerships and personal friendships rooted in shared interests and the common values of freedom, democracy, and free market economies;

Whereas the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea are all free societies committed to the principles of inclusive democracy, respect for human potential, and the belief that the peaceful spread of these principles will result in a safer and brighter future for all of mankind;

Whereas the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea are indispensable partners in tackling global challenges and have pledged significant support for efforts to counter violent extremism, combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, prevent piracy, improve global health and energy security, promote human rights, address climate change, contribute to economic development around the world, and assist the victims of conflict and disaster worldwide;

Whereas the governments and the people of the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea all share a commitment to free and open markets, high standards for the free flow of commerce and trade, and the establishment of an inclusive, transparent, and sustainable architecture for regional and global trade and development;

Whereas the United States-Japan and the United States-Republic of Korea alliances are the foundation of regional stability in Asia, including against the threat posed by the regime in Pyongyang;

Whereas cooperation between and among our nations spans economic, energy, diplomatic, security, and cultural spheres;

Whereas the United States and Japan established diplomatic relations on March 31, 1954, with the signing of the Treaty of Peace and Amity;

Whereas the relationship between the peoples of the United States and the Republic of Korea stretches back to Korea's Chosun Dynasty, when the United States and Korea established diplomatic relations under the 1882 Treaty of Peace, Amity, Commerce, and Navigation;

Whereas 2019 marks the 74th anniversary of the end of World War II, a conflict in which the United States and Japan were enemies, and the strength of the United States-Japan alliance is a testament to the ability of great countries to overcome the past and to work together to create a more secure and prosperous future;

Whereas the United States-Korea alliance was forged in blood, with United States military casualties during the Korean War of approximately 36,574 killed and more than 103,284 wounded, and with Republic of Korea casualties of more than 217,000 soldiers killed, more than 429,000 soldiers wounded, and 1,000,000 civilians killed or missing;

Whereas, for the past 70 years, the partnership between the United States and Japan has played a vital role, both in Asia and globally, in ensuring peace, stability, and economic development;

Whereas, approximately 54,000 United States military personnel serve in Japan, along with some of the United States most advanced defense assets, including the 7th Fleet and the USS Ronald Reagan, the only United States aircraft carrier to be homeported outside the United States;

Whereas, since the Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of Korea, signed in Washington on October 1, 1953, and ratified by the Senate on January 26, 1954, United States military personnel have maintained a continuous presence on the Korean Pe-

ninsula, and approximately 28,500 United States troops are stationed in the Republic of Korea in 2019;

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Korea have stood alongside each other in the four major wars the United States has fought outside Korea since World War II—in Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq;

Whereas Japan is the fourth-largest United States trading partner and together with the United States represents 30 percent of global Gross Domestic Product, and Japanese firms have invested approximately \$498,000,000,000 in the United States;

Whereas, the economic relationship between the United States and its sixth-largest trading partner, the Republic of Korea, has been facilitated by the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS), which entered into force on March 15, 2012, and was amended as of January 1, 2019, includes 358,000 jobs in the United States that are directly related to exports to the Republic of Korea, and has resulted in approximately \$51,800,000,000 in investments by Korean firms in the United States;

Whereas Japan and the Republic of Korea stand as strong partners of the United States in efforts to ensure maritime security and freedom of navigation, commerce, and overflight and to uphold respect for the rule of law and to oppose the use of coercion, intimidation, or force to change the regional or global status quo, including in the maritime domains of the Indo-Pacific, which are among the busiest waterways in the world;

Whereas the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea are committed to working together towards a world where the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (in this preamble referred to as the "DPRK") does not threaten global peace and security with its weapons of mass destruction, missile proliferation, and illicit activities, and where the DPRK respects human rights and its people can live in freedom;

Whereas section 211 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9231; Public Law 114-122) expresses the sense of Congress that the President "should seek to strengthen high-level trilateral mechanisms for discussion and coordination of policy toward North Korea between the Government of the United States, the Government of South Korea, and the Government of Japan";

Whereas the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409) underscores the importance of trilateral defense cooperation and enforcement of multilateral sanctions against North Korea and calls for regular consultation with Congress on the status of such efforts;

Whereas the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea have made great strides in promoting trilateral cooperation and defense partnership, including ministerial meetings, information sharing, and cooperation on ballistic missile defense exercises to counter North Korean provocations;

Whereas Japanese Americans and Korean Americans have made invaluable contributions to the security, prosperity, and diversity of our Nation, including service as our elected representatives in the Senate and in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the United States Government looks forward to continuing to deepen our enduring partnerships with Japan and the Republic of Korea on economic, security, and cultural issues, as well as embracing new opportunities for bilateral and trilateral partnerships and cooperation on emerging regional and global challenges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate reaffirms the importance of—

(1) the vital role of the alliances between the United States and Japan and the United States and the Republic of Korea in promoting peace, stability, and security in the Indo-Pacific region, including through United States extended deterrence, and reaffirms the commitment of the United States

to defend Japan, including all areas under the administration of Japan, under Article V of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan, and to defend the Republic of Korea under Article III of the Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of Korea;

(2) a constructive and forward-looking relationship between Japan and the Republic of Korea for United States diplomatic, economic, and security interests and for open and inclusive architecture to support the development of a secure, stable, and prosperous Indo-Pacific region;

(3) strengthening and broadening diplomatic, economic, security, and people-to-people ties between and among the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea;

(4) developing and implementing a strategy to deepen the trilateral diplomatic and security cooperation between the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, including through diplomatic engagement, regional development, energy security, scientific and health partnerships, educational and cultural exchanges, missile defense, intelligence-sharing, space, cyber, and other diplomatic and defense-related initiatives;

(5) trilateral cooperation with members of the United Nations Security Council and other Member States to fully and effectively enforce sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (in this resolution referred to as the "DPRK") and evaluate additional and meaningful new measures toward the DPRK under Article 41 of the United Nations Charter;

(6) trilateral cooperation to support and uphold a rules-based trade and economic order in the Indo-Pacific region, including the empowerment of women, which is vital for the prosperity of all our nations;

(7) supporting the expansion of academic and cultural exchanges among the three nations, especially efforts to encourage Japanese and Korean students to study at universities in the United States, and vice versa, to deepen people-to-people ties; and

(8) continued cooperation among the governments of the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea to promote human rights.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I know of no further debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 67) was agreed to.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I further ask that the committee-reported amendment to the preamble be agreed to, the preamble, as amended, 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 committee-reported amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 67

Whereas the governments and the people of the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea share comprehensive and dynamic partnerships and personal friendships rooted in shared interests and the common values of freedom, democracy, and free market economies;

Whereas the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea are all free societies committed to the principles of inclusive democracy, respect for human potential, and the belief that the peaceful spread of these principles will result in a safer and brighter future for all of mankind;

Whereas the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea are indispensable partners in tackling global challenges and have pledged significant support for efforts to counter violent extremism, combat the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, prevent piracy, improve global health and energy security, promote human rights, address climate change, contribute to economic development around the world, and assist the victims of conflict and disaster worldwide;

Whereas the governments and the people of the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea all share a commitment to free and open markets, high standards for the free flow of commerce and trade, and the establishment of an inclusive, transparent, and sustainable architecture for regional and global trade and development;

Whereas the United States-Japan and the United States-Republic of Korea alliances are the foundation of regional stability in Asia, including against the threat posed by the regime in Pyongyang;

Whereas cooperation between and among our nations spans economic, energy, diplomatic, security, and cultural spheres;

Whereas the United States and Japan established diplomatic relations on March 31, 1854, with the signing of the Treaty of Peace and Amity;

Whereas the relationship between the peoples of the United States and the Republic of Korea stretches back to Korea's Chosun Dynasty, when the United States and Korea established diplomatic relations under the 1882 Treaty of Peace, Amity, Commerce, and Navigation;

Whereas 2019 marks the 74th anniversary of the end of World War II, a conflict in which the United States and Japan were enemies, and the strength of the United States-Japan alliance is a testament to the ability of great countries to overcome the past and to work together to create a more secure and prosperous future;

Whereas the United States-Korea alliance was forged in blood, with United States military casualties during the Korean War of approximately 36,574 killed and more than 103,284 wounded, and with Republic of Korea casualties of more than 217,000 soldiers killed, more than 429,000 soldiers wounded, and 1,000,000 civilians killed or missing;

Whereas, for the past 70 years, the partnership between the United States and Japan has played a vital role, both in Asia and globally, in ensuring peace, stability, and economic development;

Whereas, approximately 54,000 United States military personnel serve in Japan, along with some of the United States most advanced defense assets, including the 7th Fleet and the USS Ronald Reagan, the only United States aircraft carrier to be homeported outside the United States;

Whereas, since the Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of Korea, signed in Washington on October 1, 1953, and ratified by the Senate on January 26, 1954, United States military personnel have maintained a continuous presence on the Korean Peninsula, and approximately 28,500 United States troops are stationed in the Republic of Korea in 2019;

Whereas the United States and the Republic of Korea have stood alongside each other in the four major wars the United States has fought outside Korea since World War II—in

Vietnam, the Persian Gulf, Afghanistan, and Iraq;

Whereas Japan is the fourth-largest United States trading partner and together with the United States represents 30 percent of global Gross Domestic Product, and Japanese firms have invested approximately \$498,000,000,000 in the United States;

Whereas, the economic relationship between the United States and its sixth-largest trading partner, the Republic of Korea, has been facilitated by the United States-Korea Free Trade Agreement (KORUS), which entered into force on March 15, 2012, and was amended as of January 1, 2019, includes 358,000 jobs in the United States that are directly related to exports to the Republic of Korea, and has resulted in approximately \$51,800,000,000 in investments by Korean firms in the United States;

Whereas Japan and the Republic of Korea stand as strong partners of the United States in efforts to ensure maritime security and freedom of navigation, commerce, and overflight and to uphold respect for the rule of law and to oppose the use of coercion, intimidation, or force to change the regional or global status quo, including in the maritime domains of the Indo-Pacific, which are among the busiest waterways in the world;

Whereas the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea are committed to working together towards a world where the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (in this preamble referred to as the "DPRK") does not threaten global peace and security with its weapons of mass destruction, missile proliferation, and illicit activities, and where the DPRK respects human rights and its people can live in freedom;

Whereas section 211 of the North Korea Sanctions and Policy Enhancement Act of 2016 (22 U.S.C. 9231; Public Law 114-122) expresses the sense of Congress that the President "should seek to strengthen high-level trilateral mechanisms for discussion and coordination of policy toward North Korea between the Government of the United States, the Government of South Korea, and the Government of Japan";

Whereas the Asia Reassurance Initiative Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-409) underscores the importance of trilateral defense cooperation and enforcement of multilateral sanctions against North Korea and calls for regular consultation with Congress on the status of such efforts;

Whereas the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea have made great strides in promoting trilateral cooperation and defense partnership, including ministerial meetings, information sharing, and cooperation on ballistic missile defense exercises to counter North Korean provocations;

Whereas Japanese Americans and Korean Americans have made invaluable contributions to the security, prosperity, and diversity of our Nation, including service as our elected representatives in the Senate and in the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the United States Government looks forward to continuing to deepen our enduring partnerships with Japan and the Republic of Korea on economic, security, and cultural issues, as well as embracing new opportunities for bilateral and trilateral partnerships and cooperation on emerging regional and global challenges: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate reaffirms the importance of—

(1) the vital role of the alliances between the United States and Japan and the United States and the Republic of Korea in promoting peace, stability, and security in the Indo-Pacific region, including through United States extended deterrence, and reaffirms the commitment of the United States

to defend Japan, including all areas under the administration of Japan, under Article V of the Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security Between the United States of America and Japan, and to defend the Republic of Korea under Article III of the Mutual Defense Treaty Between the United States and the Republic of Korea;

(2) a constructive and forward-looking relationship between Japan and the Republic of Korea for United States diplomatic, economic, and security interests and for open and inclusive architecture to support the development of a secure, stable, and prosperous Indo-Pacific region;

(3) strengthening and broadening diplomatic, economic, security, and people-to-people ties between and among the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea;

(4) developing and implementing a strategy to deepen the trilateral diplomatic and security cooperation between the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea, including through diplomatic engagement, regional development, energy security, scientific and health partnerships, educational and cultural exchanges, missile defense, intelligence-sharing, space, cyber, and other diplomatic and defense-related initiatives;

(5) trilateral cooperation with members of the United Nations Security Council and other Member States to fully and effectively enforce sanctions against the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (in this resolution referred to as the "DPRK") and evaluate additional and meaningful new measures toward the DPRK under Article 41 of the United Nations Charter;

(6) trilateral cooperation to support and uphold a rules-based trade and economic order in the Indo-Pacific region, including the empowerment of women, which is vital for the prosperity of all our nations;

(7) supporting the expansion of academic and cultural exchanges among the three nations, especially efforts to encourage Japanese and Korean students to study at universities in the United States, and vice versa, to deepen people-to-people ties; and

(8) continued cooperation among the governments of the United States, Japan, and the Republic of Korea to promote human rights.

RECOGNIZING THE 198TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 60, S. Res. 95.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. Res. 95) recognizing the 198th anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States

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

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, 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. 95) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 5, 2019, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, APRIL 11, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, April 11; 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, morning business be closed, and the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Bernhardt nomination; finally, that all time during recess, adjournment, morning business, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Bernhardt nomination.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BARRASSO. 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 HIRONO, and under the provisions of S. Res. 155, and do so as a further mark of respect for the late Fritz Hollings, former Senator from South Carolina.

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

The Senator from Hawaii.

NOMINATION OF DAVID BERNHARDT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, time and again over the past 2 years, we have seen a clear pattern in the types of people Donald Trump nominates to serve in his Cabinet.

They have extensive conflicts of interest. If confirmed, they work to advance the interest of former clients and special interests, and in doing so, they are often hostile to the very mission of the very Department they have been nominated to lead.

We have seen this time and again with the same disastrous results—from Scott Pruitt at the Environmental Protection Agency and Ryan Zinke at the Department of Interior to Andy Puzder at the Department of Labor and Tom Price at Health and Human Services.

Today, the majority leader and Senate Republicans are forcing through the nomination of David Bernhardt to serve as Secretary of the Interior—another person who fits Trump's pattern for conflicted, unethical Cabinet nominees.

Bernhardt brings so many conflicts of interest to the job that he has to carry a list around in his pocket to re-

mind himself of what they are. I am putting up this graphic poster that shows a card he carries around in his pocket to remind himself of the people he is not supposed to be interacting with or helping.

In normal times, a President would not nominate someone with David Bernhardt's background as a superlobbyist who represented interests before the Department he was nominated to lead. In normal times, the majority party would push back against a nominee who brings so many obvious conflicts of interest to the job. But these are not normal times, and the Senate is moving in an all-fired rush to confirm someone who shouldn't have been nominated in the first place.

During his tenure as Deputy Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Bernhardt was well-placed to deliver results for the special interests who paid his firm millions of dollars to lobby on their behalf over the past decade.

Mr. Bernhardt, for example, spent years lobbying on behalf of an organization with a misleading name—the Center for Environmental Science, Accuracy & Reliability, or CESAR. Far from being a nonpartisan group, CESAR is an industry front group dedicated to, among other things, attacking and weakening the Endangered Species Act, the ESA.

As a lobbyist at Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, Bernhardt spearheaded CESAR's efforts to gut the ESA through a disingenuous shell campaign to list the American eel as a threatened or endangered species.

Here is what they did. First, CESAR petitioned the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service to designate the American eel—a species whose habitat spans the entire east coast of the United States—as a threatened or endangered species. These Agencies are required to complete their review of such a position within 90 days. Both Agencies were unable to complete their review on such a short timeline, and CESAR filed a lawsuit in DC District Court.

CESAR did not undertake this campaign with the objective of protecting a threatened or endangered species. Instead, as an E&E News report made clear, CESAR tried to undermine the law by making it nearly impossible to enforce.

Why was this the case? Because the American eel has habitat all along the eastern seaboard and to make a listing and to conduct critical habitat designations would be a paralyzing undertaking that might force Congress to undergo a rewrite of the ESA.

Mr. Bernhardt did not just represent CESAR, but he has also served on their board for many years. It was reasonable to conclude, therefore, that his sustained personal advocacy on behalf of his client to undermine the ESA would carry over to his work at the Department of the Interior, and, indeed, it has.

Last summer, the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Fish and

Wildlife Service proposed some of the most drastic changes to the ESA in 30 years. These changes include allowing economic estimates during the listing process, changing the definition of “foreseeable future” to not allow for the consideration of climate change when determining whether to list a species and removing a blanket rule that protects threatened species.

It certainly doesn't seem like a coincidence that the Department is considering such radical changes to the ESA under the leadership of Mr. Bernhardt—someone who was paid by his clients to challenge it.

Over the past few weeks, we have also learned from reporting in the New York Times about Mr. Bernhardt's efforts to suppress a Fish and Wildlife Service report on the impacts of certain pesticides on endangered species. This report was due to be released more than 1½ years ago, and despite documents indicating that the Department had completed the report on time, it has yet to be released.

Last week, I, along with several of my colleagues, sent a letter to the Department's deputy inspector general, requesting that she open an investigation into these allegations. Based on Mr. Bernhardt's industry priorities and past attempts to weaken the ESA, I think it is prudent that we get to the bottom of what is going on at the Department before confirming him.

If the Department of the Interior's mission is to “provide scientific and other information about natural resources,” then isn't it Mr. Bernhardt's job to ensure that scientific reports on the impacts of chemicals on endangered species are released in a timely manner, especially knowing that these species are threatened or endangered? Yet this report has been kept back for over 1 year.

Unfortunately, I don't think he considers that a priority of his job. Instead, he seems to prioritize moving the levers within the Department that he was unsuccessful in moving while representing his clients as a lobbyist.

This pattern of activity also extends to his former clients in the oil and gas industry. During the government shutdown, for example, Mr. Bernhardt recalled furloughed DOI employees in order to have them process and approve 267 offshore oil drilling permits and 16 leases for drilling on public land. His decisive action on behalf of oil and gas interests came as thousands of employees went without pay and critical Federal services were shuttered for over 1 month.

Is it really any wonder that executives from the Independent Petroleum Association of America were caught on tape bragging about the unprecedented access they have to Mr. Bernhardt at the Department?

The American people deserve an Interior Secretary devoted to the mission of the Department, not the narrow special interests of his former lobbyist clients.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this nomination and await the IG report before voting on this nomination.

One would hope that with all of these conflicts he has to carry around in his pocket, surely we can come up with someone to lead this Department who actually has the mission of the Department as his calling. That is not the case with Mr. Bernhardt.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order and pursuant to S. Res. 155, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, April 11, and does so as a further mark of respect for Ernest “Fritz” Hollings, former Senator from South Carolina.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:14 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, April 11, 2019, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KATE MARIE BYRNES, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NORTH MACEDONIA.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be general

LT. GEN. ARNOLD W. BUNCH, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID A. HARRIS, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8033:

To be admiral

ADM. WILLIAM F. MORAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8035:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. ROBERT P. BURKE

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

LT. GEN. HERMAN S. CLARDY III

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE TO BE A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

LISA ANNE RIGOLI, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER:

JENNIFER M. ADAMS, OF VIRGINIA
JEFFREY N. BAKKEN, OF MINNESOTA
SUSAN F. FINE, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN KOSINSKI FRITZ, OF WASHINGTON
LAWRENCE HARDY II, OF WASHINGTON
SARAH-ANN LYNCH, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

DERRICK SCOTT BROWN, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL JOSEPH GREENE, OF MARYLAND
GARY C. JUSTE, OF VIRGINIA
MARK A. MEASSICK, OF FLORIDA
ELIZABETH B. WARFIELD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CLINTON D. WHITE, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

KAYA D. ADAMS, OF LOUISIANA
MAURA E. BARRY BOYLE, OF MARYLAND
IDRIS M. DIAZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BETH PENNOCK DUNFORD, OF MARYLAND
NATALIE J. FREEMAN, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN T. KAMIN, OF MARYLAND
LESLIE C. MARBURY, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL RICHARD MCCORD, OF CALIFORNIA
MIKAELA SAWTELLE MEREDITH, OF VIRGINIA
V. KATE SOMVONGSIRI, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

TIMOTHY RYAN HARRISON, OF CALIFORNIA
ELIZABETH VIVIAN LEONARDI, OF CALIFORNIA
LAZARO SANDOVAL, OF CALIFORNIA
J. BRET TATE, OF TEXAS
RACHEL LYNNE VANDERBERG, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR GLOBAL MEDIA, BROADCASTING BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

WILLIAM S. MARTIN, OF CALIFORNIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

CHRISTINE BYRNE, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, AS A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

ROBERT MASON, OF VIRGINIA

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 10, 2019:

THE JUDICIARY

DAVID STEVEN MORALES, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS.

HOLLY A. BRADY, OF INDIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

CHERYL MARIE STANTON, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN P. ABIZAID, OF NEVADA, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SAUDI ARABIA.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on April 10, 2019 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

KATE MARIE BYRNES, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 16, 2019.