United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2017 *No. 175*

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, October 31, 2017, at 12 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2017

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable TODD YOUNG, a Senator from the State of Indiana.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we are grateful for Your goodness. Your faithful love endures forever. We cannot list the miracles You have done throughout our lives and history.

Lord, establish our lawmakers with Your might. When they go through dry and barren places, become for them a stream of water in life's desert. Demonstrate Your mighty wisdom as they seek to solve the daunting problems of our time. May Your promises never fail, as Your will is done on Earth even as it is done in Heaven.

Eternal Spirit, You are the rock of our salvation, our help in ages past, and our hope for years to come.

We pray in Your mighty 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. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 30, 2017.

To the Senate:

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

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, for the past 8 years, we had a President who selected nominees for our Nation's judiciary based upon what became known as the ''empathy standard,'' an ideological litmus test designed to find judicial nominees who would favor certain groups or individuals over others. It is a great standard if you are the party in a case for whom the judge has empathy. It is not so great if you are the other person. Not only does this standard deny every litigant a fair shake, but it also disregards our Nation's bedrock legal tradition of dispensing equal justice under the law.

President Trump, on the other hand, selected nominees who would help ensure that the judiciary is true to its role in our democracy. Later today, the Senate will vote to confirm one of those nominees, Trevor McFadden, as a district court judge for the District of Columbia. His nomination was approved by the Judiciary Committee without a single vote in opposition. Democrats needlessly delayed his vote on the floor anyway.

We have seen many delay tactics from them already this year. We have pushed through every time. We are going to push through again today. We are going to confirm the impressive judicial nominee before us, and we are going to confirm more judicial nominees in the coming days as well.

Our effort to confirm qualified judicial nominees this year would not be possible without the tireless work and effective leadership of our Judiciary Committee chairman, CHUCK GRASSLEY. To build on the excellent work of his committee, I filed cloture last week on four well-qualified circuit court nominees. These nominees understand that their role as a judge is to put aside their personal preferences and instead decide cases based on what the law says. We will confirm all of them this week, no matter how long that takes.

The first of these four circuit court nominees that we will confirm this week is Professor Amy Barrett, who was nominated by the President to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. A mother of seven, Professor Barrett began her

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

legal career by clerking for Judge Laurence Silberman of the DC Circuit and then for Justice Antonin Scalia. These prestigious clerkships gave her the opportunity to work closely with two giants of the legal field. Today, she is a respected professor at the University of Notre Dame, where, by the way, she was honored as Distinguished Professor of the Year twice. Professor Barrett will bring a wealth of knowledge to the bench.

Professor Barrett happens to be a Catholic. Her faith is important to her. She has spoken freely about it and its impact on her life. But she also understands the role of a judge, which is not to let personal beliefs dictate how cases are decided.

Unbelievably, some on the political left, including some of our Democratic colleagues, are criticizing her because as a law student she cowrote a law journal article that argued just that. Her coauthor of the article, John Garvey, is now the president of Catholic University. He recently wrote the following:

Amy Barrett, a law professor at Notre Dame, was grilled on Wednesday by Democrats on the Senate Judiciary Committee about an article she and I wrote together in 1998 when I was a law professor and she was my student. In that article we argued that the death penalty was immoral, as the Catholic Church teaches (in common with Quakers, Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Methodists, and the 38 member communions in the National Council of Churches). We went on to say that a Catholic judge who held that view might, in rare cases, have to recuse herself under . . . [the] federal statute that asks a federal judge to step aside when she has conscientious scruples that prevent her from deciding a case in conformity with the facts and the law.

President Garvey went on to write:

Perhaps the Alliance for Justice, which has mounted a campaign to discredit Professor Barrett, didn't get that far in reading the article. Its website says this: ''Stunningly, Barrett has asserted that judges should not follow the law or the Constitution when it conflicts with their personal religious beliefs. In fact, [this group claimed] Barrett has said that judges should be free to put their personal views ahead of their judicial oath to faithfully follow the law.''

President Garvey noted, however:

Barrett (and I) said no such thing—

No such thing—

We said precisely the opposite.

This opposition to Professor Barrett is so upside down that it leaves people like President Garvey wondering whether there is something else going on here. President Garvey concluded:

The case against Prof. Barrett is so flimsy that you have to wonder whether there isn't some other, unspoken, cause for their objection.

The president of Notre Dame also weighed in about these criticisms of Professor Barrett. Here is some of what he said in his letter to the ranking member of the Judiciary Committee:

Your concern, as you expressed it, is that ''dogma lives loudly in [Professor Barrett], and that is a concern when you come to big issues that large numbers of people have fought for years in this country.''

I am one in whose heart ''dogma lives loudly,'' as it has for centuries in the lives of many Americans, some of whom have given their lives in service to this nation. . . . It is chilling to hear from a United States Senator that this might now disqualify someone from service as a federal judge. I ask you and your colleagues to respect those in whom ''dogma lives loudly''—which is a condition we call faith.

A condition we call faith.

For the attempt to live such faith while one upholds the law should command respect, not evoke concern.

Professor Barrett has made it clear that she would ''follow unflinchingly'' all legal precedent and, in rare cases in which her conscience would not allow her to do so, she would recuse herself.

I will say that again:

. . . in rare cases in which her conscience would not allow her to do so, she would recuse herself.

I can assure you that she is a person of integrity who acts in accord with the principles she articulates.

Let me remind colleagues that article VI of the Constitution provides that ''no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office.'' That is the U.S. Constitution. According to the Founders, this was done to ensure that ''the people may employ any wise or good citizen in the execution of the various duties of the government.''

Professor Barrett of Notre Dame is just such a wise and good person, and when the Senate confirms her to the Seventh Circuit, our judiciary and our Nation will be better off.

I strongly support her nomination and would urge my colleagues to do the same.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, good afternoon. This morning, the former chairman of the Trump campaign for President and a close associate turned themselves in to Federal authorities on a dozen charges, including acting as unregistered agents of a foreign power and conspiracy against the United States. The indictments of Mr. Manafort and Mr. Gates show that the special counsel's probe is progressing in a very serious way. Mueller is moving forward.

What we know now is that an alleged unregistered foreign agent, who is charged with laundering tens of millions of dollars from foreign governments on behalf of their agenda, was given a chairmanship of a campaign for the Presidency of the United States and, with it, untold influence on the future President and his party. We know that Mr. Manafort has had continuing contact with the President since his resignation from the campaign.

Just as shocking was the admission by a Trump campaign adviser that he met with a Kremlin contact to discuss so-called ''dirt'' on Secretary Clinton. While we know that Mr. Papadopolous had extensive email exchanges with other Trump officials regarding his outreach to Russian officials, his admission released today raises many more questions than it answers. Mr. Mueller and his team should be allowed to seek answers to those questions without interference from the President or anyone else.

The stakes could not be higher. We are talking about the pride and wellspring of our grand democracy—free and fair elections—which have been going on for more than two centuries and were disturbed and adulterated by a hostile, foreign power, with no good intent for the people of this country. It is critical that we need to get to the bottom of this. That is Special Counsel Mueller's job, and he must be allowed to perform it without interference.

The rule of law is paramount in America. We pride ourselves on it. The investigation must be allowed to proceed unimpeded. The President must not, under any circumstances, in any way, interfere with the special counsel's work. If he does, Congress must respond swiftly, unequivocally, and in a bipartisan way to ensure that the investigation continues and the truth—the whole truth comes out.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. SCHUMER. On judges, Mr. President, this week the majority leader has scheduled votes on four circuit court nominations. It is the first time, in my memory, that the Senate is being asked to process four circuit court judges in a single week. The circuit courts have an immense influence on our country, adjudicating some of the thorniest of legal issues. Only the rarest and most vexing circuit court decisions are appealed to and taken up by the Supreme Court. For this reason, we typically don't sandwich circuit court nominees back to back to back to back only a week—only a week—after they have emerged from committee because Members who are not on the Judiciary Committee usually need time—always need time to review these candidates for such important, powerful, and far-reaching positions.

Why has the majority leader departed from this practice? Well, one can argue it is because the Republican agenda has been such a failure in this Congress, the leader has chosen to try and accomplish through the courts what Republicans have been unable to achieve through the legislative process. The Republican agenda has been so unpopular with the American people that it has stalled at every juncture so now they have made a brazen move to pack the courts with activist judges and remake them in their conservative, ideological image.

Why has the majority leader done it? The hard right, frustrated by the failure of repeal and replace, has, for months, been pressuring Senator MCCONNELL to do something aggressive. Senator MCCONNELL, once again, despite his desire to make the Senate work—and I believe that is sincere—is bending to the hard right of his party by jamming through these judges, breaking the norms and traditions of the Senate in the process. I intend to oppose these extremist nominees.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, Mr. President, on taxes, the Republicans have promised to release the details of their tax plan this week. After months of talking about a plan with very few specifics, we will finally get to see how the Republican leadership plans to rewrite the Tax Code. From all indications so far, the details of the Republican tax plan will be cheered by those in the country clubs and corporate boardrooms. Working Americans, on the other hand, might not have very much to cheer about.

The top 1 percent, law firms, hedge fund managers, can celebrate a lower top rate and an enormous new tax loophole in the form of lower rates on passthroughs. People who will most take advantage of these passthroughs are not small businesses. They can't afford all the lawyers and stuff. It will be the biggest, the most powerful, the richest, the wealthiest 5,200 families in America—those with estates over $5 million—who can celebrate the absurd repeal of the estate tax. Corporate America can celebrate hundreds of billions in tax cuts, which large corporations usually spend, not on new jobs—it is not what the history shows—but on CEO bonuses, stock buybacks, dividends. So while the wealthy and well-off will be busy celebrating the new tax breaks they might get if the Republican plan passes, working America will be looking over their shoulder at some real tax hikes.

Republicans are debating how to eliminate or reduce State and local deductibility—a bedrock, middle-class deduction claimed by nearly one-third of all taxpayers, the vast majority of whom make less than $200,000 a year. The Republican framework says they are going to eliminate the deduction, which totals tens of thousands of dollars a year for many working families. That is why removing State and local raises $1.3 trillion in revenue, and the GOP plans to spend that tax increase they are getting from the middle class on tax cuts for big corporations and the superrich. To be clear, it is a $1.3 trillion hike on middle-class families.

Now, there is a compromise on State and local deductibility that has been floated in the press. It is hardly much better. The Republicans are talking about continuing to allow State and local deductibility for property taxes but not income and sales taxes. That compromise raises $900 billion, meaning that Republicans, even with the compromise, are instituting nearly a trillion-dollar tax hike on working families to pay for breaks at the very top.

No matter how they construct this compromise, Republicans are still socking it to the middle class and the upper middle class but this time picking winners and losers. Sales taxes hit consumers the hardest. Ending the State and local deductibility for sales tax would fall on the backs of working-class and middle-class Americans, particularly in States like Tennessee, Florida, and Nevada, which don't have an income tax but have a large sales tax. States like Chairman BRADY's, Texas, on the other hand, which have very high property taxes, would be much better off.

Worse still, the tax hike from this so-called SALT compromise would heap pressure on State and local governments across the country to make the agonizing decision about whether to raise taxes or cut spending for services—education, law enforcement, hospitals, highway building—on which their middle-class constituents rely.

A warning to my Republican colleagues from high sales tax States like Tennessee, Florida, and Nevada and high-income States—a lot of Republican Congressmen in those States of New York, New Jersey, California, Minnesota, Virginia, Colorado—that this State and local compromise will not solve your problem. The compromise does not solve your problem. It will still hit your constituents right in their wallets.

Now, another debate on the other side of the aisle is how to cap Americans' pretax contributions to their 401(k) plans. Can you believe it? Here in America, where we want to help the middle class save, where we want to encourage savings, we are making it harder? In layman's terms, here is what our Republican colleagues want to do. They want to tax your 401(k)s. I can't believe my Republican friends are even considering such a bad idea. We have had bipartisan support on expanding the ability to retire, particularly now that so many companies are no longer giving pensions.

Giving Americans the ability to put away pretax dollars for their retirement is one of the few provisions in our Tax Code that encourage early savings. Capping the amount Americans can contribute pretax or, in other words, turning every 401(k) into something more like a Roth IRA, will discourage Americans from saving and handicap their ability to retire with dignity and security now that defined benefit plans are declining.

For years, we Democrats—often joined by Republican colleagues—have fought for policies that would make 401(k)s more attractive, provide greater benefits—in other words, the exact opposite of what the Republican leadership is considering. We have put forward proposals on autoenrollment, increasing incentives for businesses that enroll workers and match contributions and letting small businesses pool together to offer plans. Each of these ideas would encourage more Americans, particularly younger families who have great burdens on them, to start saving early for retirement, which everyone agrees is essential to building up enough of a nest egg to live out your golden years in some degree of dignity and comfort.

The Republican proposals say to every future retiree that they don't care about your ability to retire. They just want to get your tax revenue into Federal coffers as soon as possible so they can give a tax break to the very wealthy—that top 1 percent.

The contrast could not be clearer. Democrats want to expand and enhance 401(k) plans, not cut them and cap them. That is a better deal for American workers and for middle-class families.

So instead of this one-party, secretive approach, Democrats and Republicans should be meeting with each other, talking about tax reform in a bipartisan setting to forge a bipartisan proposal. That is what committees were designed to do. That is what regular order was designed to produce. Just like on healthcare, our Republican friends are straining the legislative traditions of this body and risking their ability to govern effectively—we saw what happened with healthcare—by going at it alone.

The American people expect more of their elected officials than that of an assembly line of partisan legislation, crafted in secret, considered with such haste. I know why our Republican colleagues want to rush this through. They know the more the American people learn about this bill, the more it favors the wealthy over the middle class, the less they will like it. Just like with healthcare, once this bill is unveiled—now only 30 percent of the American people support it and even fewer will. Maybe our Republican colleagues will see the light and work with us to get good tax reform that focuses on the middle class, not on the top 1 percent.

I yield the floor.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the

Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the McFadden nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Trevor N. McFadden, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I came to the floor to talk about judges, and I will in just a moment because the majority leader has now filed for cloture—that is a process that will end up in an up-or-down vote—on four distinguished nominees for the circuit court of appeals.

Coming on the tail end of the remarks of the Democratic leader, I must say that sometimes I feel like Washington, DC, is a parallel universe that bears very little relation to the rest of the country or the rest of the world because to hear the Democratic leader talk about some tax plan being written in secret defies the facts. The facts are, this is going to be done in a very public sort of way.

I expect that as soon as Wednesday, the House of Representatives will release their proposal and then, shortly thereafter, the Senate will likewise release its proposal that will then be amended and debated in the Senate Finance Committee just like the House bill will be debated and amended in the House Ways and Means Committee. These will be very public, and indeed they should be because they are going to touch on the ways that I believe we can unleash this sleeping giant of an economy, get the economy growing again, get businesses invested here in the United States, and higher wages and jobs for American families, from which all Americans will benefit, regardless of their tax bracket.

I have read that some of our Democratic colleagues—we heard a little bit of this when the President invited the bipartisan Senate Finance Committee members over to the White House just a week or so ago. Some of our Democratic colleagues said: Well, we haven't been included in the process.

Well, they made it clear that they don't want to be included, but I hope they will change their mind, and they will have that opportunity during the course of the Senate Finance Committee debate and amendment process. No one will be prohibited from offering an idea or debating an idea as we work through the process of a tax reform package that will, as I said, hopefully bring down the taxes for hard-working American families, let them keep more of what they earn, and, in the process, improve their standard of living.

As we reform our business Tax Code—which, as President Obama pointed out in 2011, is literally a self-inflicted wound because we have the highest business tax rate in the world, which makes it more likely that businesses will want to invest abroad in jobs and their infrastructure, rather than invest here in America—we want to bring all of that back here so that investors will invest in jobs in America and so that manufacturers can proudly stamp what they make here in America: ''Made in America.'' That is what we are striving for.

Again, I know our Democratic colleague, my friend, the Senator from New York, has a job to do on behalf of the Democrats. But it is, as I described at the outset, a parallel universe from what is actually happening. It does not bear any relationship to the reality that we have offered our Democratic colleagues to participate with us in growing the economy and giving hard-working American families the opportunity to keep more of what they earn and, thus, improve their standard of living.

Mr. President, at times this Chamber is marked by a spirit of hard work, cordiality, and bipartisanship. Unfortunately, this is not one of those times. Since President Trump's inauguration, our Democratic colleagues have been needlessly obstructing the confirmation of extremely qualified nominees, and lately their focus has been on obstructing nominees for our Nation's Federal courts. But, certainly, their obstruction has been across the spectrum of nominees—slowing down nominees, forcing us to burn time, and then finally confirming nominees which they, by and large, will vote in favor of. This is done for no other purpose than to make it harder for the President, now that he has been elected, to get his team on the field and to serve the interests of the American people and the President's administration.

Lately, as I pointed out, their focus has been on the Federal courts. The majority leader filed four nominations last Thursday, and we hope our Democratic colleagues will think better of dragging out the clock on what is already a certain outcome, which is confirmation of these four nominees. If they do, no one will be surprised.

This year, the Democrats have thrown up every obstacle they can, requiring procedural votes, needless debates, and a lot of time burned here on the Senate clock, with no one on the floor talking about anything one way or the other. It is what we call quorum calls here, when America tunes into what is happening on the Senate floor and there is nothing happening, other than the clerk calling the roll from time to time. That is time we could be using for bipartisan legislation. But the goal here for our friends across the aisle is to cause us to burn the time, keep us from doing the people's work, and obstruct the President's nominees to the Federal bench and beyond.

The irony here is that our Democratic colleagues have even obstructed judges originally nominated by President Obama, so they are not particularly picky in terms of the judges and the nominees they will obstruct. But all they have really accomplished so far is wasting the Senate's time and trying the patience of the American people, who know that there is more productive work to be done than simply having endless quorum calls and silence on the Senate floor while we burn the time on the clock in order to get these nominees confirmed.

Our colleagues know that these tactics will not actually stop a nomination, but they insist on engaging in them anyway, to the detriment of everyone, including the American people. This year, they forced needless cloture votes on seven of eight district and circuit court nominees—more than in any other early Presidency—and they demanded that we use the full 30 hours of floor time per nominee, which Senate rules currently allow for. These are partisan roadblocks that never change the outcome. They are just dilly-dallying. They intend to grind this body's normal procedures to a snail's pace so that nothing much else gets done, and, oh, by the way, then they complain that not enough is being done. That is the tactic. That is the game plan.

By way of comparison, during the first year of President Obama's Presidency, only once did Senate Republicans require a cloture vote on one of the President's nominees. In this Trump administration, Senate Democrats have forced cloture votes on all of the President's nominees except for one. This is all a game to waste time—and maybe a little bit for show.

These tactics don't change the outcome—which is confirmation—ironically, because of the even more cynical ploy adopted by Democrats under President Obama. The Senate used to require 60 votes for confirmation of judges. This permitted the minority to block judges who were truly out of the mainstream or who did not enjoy the support of their home State Senators. Senator Harry Reid, when he was majority leader—just a few years ago—changed all that. But it seems as though it backfired on him. He tore up the rule book when he invoked the so-called nuclear option in November of 2013 and changed the Senate rules to jam through three nominees to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals, eliminating the so-called filibuster because Democrats were upset that the DC Circuit was blocking regulatory overreach by the Obama administration.

Now the filibuster is gone, and I hope that going forward, our Democratic colleagues will recall their previous actions as our caucus proceeds with filling these vacancies. It is good that these outcomes are not in doubt because these positions are too crucial to be left open any longer, even if it means we stay in session over the weekend or at night.

On appellate nominations, we are going to move forward with four—whether the Democrats cooperate or not—because these are nominees who are highly qualified, well-respected jurists and academics. They are the

Notre Dame law professor, Amy Barrett, nominated for the Seventh Circuit; Michigan Supreme Court Justice Joan Larsen, nominated for the Sixth Circuit; Colorado Supreme Court Justice Allison Eid, nominated to the Tenth Circuit—that is the seat vacated by Judge Neil Gorsuch, elevated now to the Supreme Court of the United States—and the University of Pennsylvania law professor, Stephanos Bibas, nominated for the Third Circuit.

I look forward to talking in more detail about the high intellectual caliber and remarkable qualifications of these four nominees in the coming days. This is going to occupy the rest of this week. It is worth noting at the outset that the four include three of the most accomplished female lawyers in the United States.

For now, the important thing to note is our determination to get this done. Under Republican leadership, we are working to deliver for the American people, and confirming judicial nominations is just one example.

Today, the Senate is scheduled to confirm Trevor McFadden to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Mr. McFadden was voted out of the Senate Judiciary Committee—on which I serve—unanimously in July. He is Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice. He graduated from the University of Virginia School of Law and has extensive experience in law enforcement. This is someone who was voted unanimously out of the Senate Judiciary Committee, yet Senate Democrats are denying him a voice vote or other expedited process—again, forcing us to burn the clock just to get his nomination voted on.

Last week, though, we confirmed Scott Palk of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, despite the same sorts of games. Mr. Palk was originally nominated to the same seat by President Obama in 2015, so one would have thought that our Democratic colleagues would relent and ditch their procedural gimmicks. But no, they didn't, even for a judge originally nominated by President Obama. Fortunately, it didn't matter because Mr. Palk ultimately was confirmed by a substantial margin of 79 to 16. So why the delay? Why the obstruction? Why the foot-dragging if 79 Senators, on a bipartisan basis, are going to confirm the nomination?

I, for one, would like to commend the President on his sterling picks, not only of the recent district and circuit court nominees but also of a judge I mentioned a little bit earlier, now Supreme Court Justice Neil Gorsuch. To date, four of President Trump's appellate nominees have already been confirmed: two for the Sixth Circuit, one for the Eleventh, and one for the Eighth, respectively. This is an excellent addition to our Nation's Federal judiciary. All of them, I believe, will faithfully interpret the Constitution. They know their job is to say what the law is, not what they believe that it ought to be.

The majority leader has been unyielding in his goal of moving forward a productive schedule for the good of the country here in the Senate and moving as swiftly as our rules allow. Stall tactics will not work. They will not prevent us from moving forward with these nominees and confirming them before the week's end. You can count on it.

I yield the floor.

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

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

RUSSIA INVESTIGATION

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, everybody in Washington now knows that the special counsel has announced charges against two of President Trump's former campaign aides in connection with the ongoing investigation into whether Russia interfered with the 2016 election.

After painstaking investigations in the intelligence community, we now know that, in fact, Russia did interfere in the election. Since they have continued this pattern in other countries' elections, what many of us are concerned about is the fact that they will interfere in the next elections coming up. We have already seen attempts in the special election down in Alabama. They have been trying to increase the number of hits going to a Facebook or Twitter account. So they interfered.

We also learned this morning that a third former Trump campaign aide has pled guilty to lying to the FBI in January when he was asked about his interactions while he was with the Trump campaign.

These are very serious charges, and we should be united against any individual who helped further Russia's interference in our elections. Yet, sadly, the response to these indictments has been seemingly split along partisan lines. That doesn't make sense. Defending America isn't a partisan issue. In fact, everyone in the Senate—all of our Democrats, Republicans, our two Independents—has sworn an oath to do exactly that, to defend the Constitution against all enemies, both foreign and domestic. So charging these individuals shouldn't be seen as a victory for one party or another. It shouldn't be seen as a defeat for a party. These individuals are charged with crimes against the United States, crimes against all of us Americans.

The fact is that Russian President Vladimir Putin interfered in our election, and in so doing, he has attacked the very foundation of our constitutional democracy. We know that, and we also know that we are not the only country he has attacked. According to the U.S. intelligence community, he will continue this type of behavior unless he is stopped, and that is why we have such a heavy responsibility to defend America from these kinds of attacks and to defend our American constitutional foundations that are built on a process of free and fair and unfetterred elections.

It doesn't matter whether you are a Democrat or a Republican, it should be clear: If you help an enemy of the United States meddle in our democracy, you will be held accountable.

Here in this Senate and throughout the country as a whole, too often we find ourselves suddenly divided on issues because of party politics. That shouldn't be the case. There should be no disagreement when it comes to protecting America because we should be Americans first—not Democrats or Republicans first; we should be Americans first.

We must continue to be patient with the Mueller investigation and allow it to follow the facts wherever they may lead because finding out what happened is the only way we are going to be able to prevent this from happening again, and it is the only way we are going to be able to keep our country safe.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Under the previous order, all postcloture time is expired.

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

Mr. BARRASSO. 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. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 84, nays 10, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 253 Ex.]

YEAS—84

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

NAYS—10

Booker	Harris	Warren
Brown	Markey	Wyden
Cantwell	Murray	
Gillibrand	Peters	

NOT VOTING—6

Alexander	McCaskill	Merkley
McCain	Menendez	Sanders

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 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 Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, Johnny Isakson, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Marco Rubio, James Lankford, Richard Burr, Steve Daines, Todd Young, Ben Sasse, Mike Crapo.

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 Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 254 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Paul
Blunt	Gardner	Perdue
Boozman	Graham	Portman
Burr	Grassley	Risch
Capito	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heller	Rounds
Cochran	Hoeven	Rubio
Collins	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kaine	Strange
Crapo	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Enzi	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—4

McCain	Menendez
McCaskill	Sanders

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The assistant bill clerk read the nomination of Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

The Senator from Tennessee.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, when the 18 million Americans in the individual insurance market—those are Americans, shopkeepers, songwriters, farmers, men and women who don't get their health insurance from the government or on the job—begin enrolling on Wednesday, they will discover something very strange.

The Wall Street Journal, in a weekend story, explained exactly how strange this phenomenon will be. Some of these 18 million Americans will be able to get their insurance for free. They will pay absolutely nothing for their premium, but others will see their premiums skyrocket far beyond the increases they have seen in recent years.

Here is what the Wall Street Journal says:

In nearly all of the 2,722 counties included in the data, some consumers will be able to obtain free health insurance because they qualify for larger federal premium subsidies that cover the full cost of the plan, according to the new analysis.

The Wall Street Journal continues:

In the coming weeks, insurers are gearing up to promote the no-premium option. . . . On the flip side, those who don't get premium subsidies under the 2010 law may be responsible for the full brunt of steep rate increases, though they may be able to mitigate the impact by staying away from silver plans.

Insurers are gearing up to shepherd Americans into plans that will cost zero because taxpayers will be paying much higher subsidies. Meanwhile, the 9 million Americans in the individual health insurance market who do not have subsidies may be responsible for what the Wall Street Journal calls the ''full brunt of steep rate increases.''

What is causing this strange phenomenon? It is happening because Congress—us—has not funded cost-sharing reduction subsidies, or CSRs, for the 2018 plan year. Cost-sharing reduction subsidies are payments in the Affordable Care Act which the government makes to insurance companies to reimburse them for deductibles and copays for many low-income Americans. According to the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the President of the United States can no longer make these payments himself without the approval of Congress so President Trump ended those payments this month.

Insurance companies have raised premiums to make up the difference, loading most of the increase on the silver plan premiums. They did that because, under the Affordable Care Act, subsidies are based on silver plan premiums. So as premiums go up, subsidies go up. If silver plan premiums skyrocket, then the subsidies skyrocket, and then you can use your giant subsidy to go buy a bronze plan and pay nothing in premiums.

In California alone, according to the Wall Street Journal article, about half of the 1.1 million who buy health insurance with subsidies can get their insurance for free next year. To be clear, because Congress didn't provide temporary funding for the cost-sharing reductions for 2018, more than half of Californians on the ACA exchange can get free government-paid healthcare.

For the last few weeks, I have been saying that the chaos we are going to see, if we don't continue the cost-sharing payments, will be a four-lane highway to single-payer insurance. Now we see why. Premium-free private insurance for millions funded by the taxpayer—I am not sure what is conservative about that.

We don't need to worry about the insurance companies. They obviously know how to take care of themselves. As the article details, if the cost-sharing payments aren't made over 2 years, insurance companies shouldn't lose a penny. They have to pay, under law,

the copays and deductibles, but they have already secured permission to raise premiums for 2018 to cover that. Because courts have said the payments are illegal, they secured approval of rates that are 20 percent higher in 2018 just for this purpose. So the insurance companies are not hurt by stopping the cost-sharing reduction payments.

If subsidized Americans aren't hurt by stopping the payments and insurance companies aren't hurt by stopping the payments, then who is hurt by stopping the payments? Hard-working, low-income Americans making less than $11,000 a year who don't qualify for Medicaid and Americans who make more than $47,000 a year and who therefore have no government subsidy to help buy insurance. They must face these premium increases on their own.

A hard-working Tennessean in the individual market—let's take a look at her. She has already seen her premiums increase 176 percent over the last 4 years. For 2018, it is going to be up another 36 percent in Tennessee, on average. She will pay the whole bill, no government help.

Then take the American taxpayers. The Congressional Budget Office tells us that failure to continue the cost-sharing reduction payments increases premiums and therefore the subsidies to pay for those premiums by $194 billion over 10 years—$194 billion over 10 years added to the Federal debt because we don't continue the cost-sharing subsidies.

How do we avoid this? Believe it or not, we can avoid this situation by enacting a bill that will both prevent this strange phenomenon and reduce the Federal deficit by $3.8 billion. Senator MURRAY from Washington, the ranking Democrat on the Senate HELP Committee, and I introduced this bill. We were among 12 Republicans and 12 Democrats last week who proposed the bill and recommended it to the Senate, to the President, and to the House of Representatives after we conducted four hearings. In addition, we invited Senators not on the Senate HELP committee to join us in the development of this bill, and 37 showed up. We had about 60 of us who had some participation in the development of this proposal that Senator MURRAY and I recommended. We presented to the Senate our recommendation for continuing cost sharing and giving States more flexibility in approving premiums so people would have more choices and lower prices.

You may have noticed that a growing number of Republicans and conservatives are recommending that Congress act to continue for 2 years the so-called cost-sharing reduction payments as copays and deductibles for low-income Americans. The heads of the two tax-writing committees, Senator HATCH and Representative KEVIN BRADY, introduced legislation that would continue cost sharing in 2018 and 2019. In fact, earlier this year, almost all House Republicans voted to continue cost sharing for 2 years as part of their repeal-and-replace ObamaCare bill. Senators BILL CASSIDY and LINDSEY GRAHAM have said the provision to continue cost sharing temporarily would have been a part of their Senate repeal-and-replace bill, but Senate budget reconciliation rules didn't allow it.

President Trump has recognized this. He has asked for a short-term bill to prevent this kind of chaos. He encouraged me to talk to Senator MURRAY about this and to use cost-sharing reduction continuation as a way to negotiate some more flexibility for States so they could approve more choices at lower prices, which is exactly what Senator MURRAY and I did. That is what we recommended—the 24 of us, 12 Republicans and 12 Democrats—to the full Senate last week.

Some people still worry that continuing the cost-sharing payments is the same thing as propping up ObamaCare—those are the words we hear—or bailing out insurance companies. We hear those words too. In fact, just the reverse is true.

As the article explains in the Wall Street Journal, cutting off the cost-sharing payments, in the current circumstances, would increase insurance premiums on hard-working Americans who have no government subsidies, it would increase the Federal debt by nearly $200 billion over 10 years, and it would spend billions more in taxpayer dollars funding ObamaCare subsidies. Let me say that again. As the Wall Street Journal article explains, cutting off the cost-sharing payments in the current circumstances will increase insurance premiums on hard-working Americans who receive no government subsidies—up 36 percent in Tennessee—increase the Federal debt by $200 billion over 10 years, and spend billions more in taxpayer dollars funding ObamaCare subsidies.

There are two groups of people who would be basically held harmless if Congress does not approve the cost-sharing payments; one, Americans with ObamaCare subsidies; and, two, insurance companies. On the other hand, according to the CBO report last week, continuing the cost-sharing subsidies as part of the Alexander-Murray agreement would actually save taxpayers $4 billion by reducing premiums and therefore ObamaCare premium subsidies.

During 2018, it would provide rebates to consumers State by State to those hard-working Americans with no government subsidy, and it would begin to lower premiums in 2019. It would also give all Americans the opportunity to buy a new category of policy—catastrophic—so that a medical catastrophe doesn't turn into a financial catastrophe, and it would give States more flexibility to write policies with more choices at lower prices.

Many States want to do that. They need these additional flexibilities to stabilize their markets because problems with the individual market did not start with the uncertainty over the cost-sharing payments. We need to return power over the insurance markets to States if we want to begin creating long-term solutions.

The President and many others have said they don't want to bail out insurance companies. I don't want to bail out insurance companies. Senator MURRAY doesn't want to bail out insurance companies. I don't think I have run into anybody in the U.S. Senate who wants to bail out insurance companies. Our agreement doesn't bail out insurance companies. In fact, it does just the reverse.

If President Trump is looking for his majority, he might find it in Americans who don't like higher taxes and who don't like more government funding for ObamaCare subsidies. Somewhere the idea got started that continuing cost-sharing payments bails out insurance companies, but insurance companies are big boys and girls. They know how to take care of themselves, and they have proved it once again.

Failure to continue the cost-sharing subsidies is going to hurt taxpayers, and it is going to hurt unsubsidized Americans who have no subsidy to help buy their insurance. There is nothing conservative about that.

Before I yield the floor, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Wall Street Journal Weekend Edition entitled ''More ACA Plans to Come With No Premiums in 2018.''

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 27, 2017]

MORE ACA PLANS TO COME WITH NO PREMIUMS IN 2018

(By Anna Wilde Mathews and Christopher Weaver)

Trump indirectly bolstered the federal subsidies that help consumers with their insurance premiums.

More people will be eligible in 2018 for no-premium health plans under the Affordable Care Act.

Insurers selling Affordable Care Act plans have a compelling new pitch: free health insurance.

When sales of plans on the law's exchanges begin Nov. 1, a growing number of consumers around the country will be able to get coverage for 2018 without paying any monthly premium, according to health insurers and an analysis of newly available federal data.

In nearly all of the 2,722 counties included in the data, some consumers will be able to obtain free health insurance because they qualify for larger federal premium subsidies that cover the full cost of a plan, according to the new analysis.

The growing availability of no-premium plans is a side effect of a decision by President Donald Trump's administration to end federal payments that are used to reduce out-of-pocket costs, such as deductibles, for low-income enrollees. The administration didn't halt—and indirectly bolstered—the federal subsidies that help consumers with their insurance premiums.

The new analysis doesn't project exactly how many consumers could be eligible for the no-premium plans, a figure that depends

on variables including people's income, household size, age, location and access to other types of health coverage.

In the coming weeks, insurers are gearing up to promote the no-premium option. Amid uncertainty about the future of the 2010 health law, known as Obamacare, many insurers have pulled back from the law's marketplaces. Many of the remaining ones are worried about losing enrollment next year—largely among consumers who aren't eligible for subsidies and won't be able to get premium-free plans.

Insurers hope the no-premium insurance draws in more enrollees, particularly those they need most: people with few health needs. Healthy consumers help bolster the stability of the market by balancing out the health costs of sicker enrollees.

''We absolutely will be promoting this opportunity to get coverage at a zero price,'' said Wendy Curran, a spokeswoman for Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wyoming, which is mentioning the no-premium plans in print, radio and social-media advertising. ''We hope those younger people will say, 'Well yeah, if it's not going to cost me anything, sure.'''

Ms. Curran said it was ''astounding even to us'' how many people will be able to get no-premium insurance in Wyoming.

The no-premium plans will also receive a hefty promotional push from insurance agents. EHealth Inc. and HealthMarkets Inc., both big national agencies, said they're preparing to highlight the option in advertising and other outreach. ''It's just the idea of something free being really appealing,'' said Nate Purpura, a vice president at eHealth. The company's surveys have consistently shown that price is the most important factor in consumers' choice of plan, he said.

Availability will vary by age and income, but some enrollees who don't have a very low income may be able to land zero-premium coverage, according to the analysis of federal data conducted by consulting firm Oliver Wyman, a unit of Marsh & McLennan. The firm found that zero-premium ACA exchange plans would be available next year to at least some consumers in a total of 2,692 counties, out of 2,722 in the study.

A 60-year-old making about $36,000 a year could find free 2018 plans in 1,590 counties, while one with income of about $48,000 could do so in 654 counties, according to the analysis, which used data released Wednesday for plans available on HealthCare.gov, the federal marketplace used by 39 states.

For 2017, no-premium plans were available in many places for the very lowest-income enrollees, but for those at slightly higher levels, they were much more scarce. For instance, in 2017, a 60-year-old making about $36,000 could find free plans in about 300 of the counties.

That is what is different in 2018, said Kurt Giesa, a partner at Oliver Wyman. The zero-premium plans are ''much more prevalent now than they were,'' he said.

In California, which isn't included in the federal data, there is a ''huge increase from last year'' in the number of people who are eligible for zero-premium plans, said Peter V. Lee, executive director of Covered California, the state's ACA exchange. Covered California currently has about 1.1 million enrollees who receive federal-premium subsidies, and more than half of them will be able to buy a no-premium plan for 2018, he said.

The growing availability of no-premium plans is tied to the complicated dynamics of the 2010 heath law, as well as a recent move by the GOP president.

Under the law's rules, subsidies that help pay for premiums are available to people making up to about $48,000 a year. Those subsidy amounts are linked to the cost of the second-cheapest silver plan in an enrollee's location. So, when silver premiums go up, subsidies go up.

Earlier this month, Mr. Trump's administration cut off federal payments to insurers for covering certain out-of-pocket costs for low-income enrollees in silver plans. In response, insurers raised premiums on their 2018 policies sharply to cover the extra expense, now coming out of their pockets—and in many cases, they loaded the extra boost only onto the silver plans. Because the separate premium subsidies, which Mr. Trump didn't cut, are linked to silver-plan prices, those subsidies are rising, too. In many states, the costs for cheaper bronze plans are going up much less rapidly than silver plans, so many more people will wind up being eligible for no-premium plans.

On the flip side, those who don't get premium subsidies under the 2010 law may be responsible for the full brunt of steep rate increases, though they may be able to mitigate the impact by staying away from silver plans.

For those who can get free plans, the lure may be irresistible.

Medica, an insurer that is offering exchange plans in states including Iowa, Nebraska and Wisconsin, is running ads in some places that say ''$0 premium plans for individuals who qualify.'' It is also sending letters to some current exchange enrollees with bronze plans, who are likely to be enrolled with Medica in 2018, informing them that they can stop paying premiums next year. ''That's a nice letter to get,'' said Geoff Bartsh, a vice president at Medica.

Jerry Dworak, chief executive of Montana Health Co-op, said, ''of course we're hoping that'' young and healthy enrollees flock to the no-premium plans.

''If they see that it's free, why not take it?,'' he said.

Mr. Dworak said that a person making as much as $33,000 a year could get one of his company's Idaho plans and pay no premium.

The plans may attract more older consumers than younger because premiums and subsidies rise with age, making free plans more available to older people.

And for some, the zero-premium plans won't actually be the best deal, insurers and insurance agents say. The silver plans could be cheaper overall for people who use much health care, despite their higher premium costs, if these people are eligible for the health law's cost sharing help.

According to HealthCare.gov, for instance, a 40-year-old man in Cheyenne, Wyo., who makes about $24,000 a year could get a zero-premium bronze plan, but he could pay as much as $6,650 over the course of 2018 in deductibles and other out-of-pocket charges. Or he could get a silver plan that would cost him around $125 a month, but cap his out-of-pocket costs at $2,450.

''There's this trade-off,'' said Michael Z. Stahl, a senior vice president at HealthMarkets, who said the company's agents will walk through the pros and cons with clients.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session 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.

REMEMBERING SUE MINTON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the life of Sue Minton, of London, KY, who passed away on September 27, 2017, at the age of 67. Her passing is a deep loss to the community and to the local newspaper, The Sentinel-Echo, where she worked for 41 years.

For those who knew her as a colleague and a friend, Sue will be remembered for her dedication and her friendship. She was also a beloved member of the Laurel County community, where she lived with her husband, Dennis, and their daughter Denise.

Sue was always willing to help others, and she especially enjoyed spending time with her grandchildren. Sue will be deeply missed by friends, family, and the community. Elaine and I send our condolences to them in their time of grief

The Sentinel-Echo recently published an article on Sue's life and career. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Sentinel-Echo, Sept. 29, 2017]

LONGTIME SENTINEL-ECHO LIFESTYLES EDITOR SUE MINTON PASSES AWAY

(By Nita Johnson)

As the news of long-time Sentinel Echo employee Sue Minton's passing on Wednesday night spread throughout the community, many people who knew and had worked with her were shocked and saddened.

Minton began working at The Sentinel Echo in 1976 when the newspapers were printed in the basement area of the current building. She had many stories about the days when the operation was run by Luke Keith, and then by Al Smith, who sold the company to corporate ownership. She said she had withstood the many sales of the company since that time, but remained loyal to her job and co-workers throughout the 41 years of her employment.

Minton was the longest employee in the history of the Sentinel Echo, coming in next to former business manager Judy McCowan who retired after 39 years of employment. Minton and McCowan became acquainted during their early years at the newspaper and remained friends over the years, even after McCowan retired.

McGowan said hearing of her long-time friend's death was devastating.

''I'm so heartbroken,'' McGowan said. ''We've been friends for over 40 years. She seemed more like a sister.''

Minton and McCowan had a bowl of Cheerios every morning around 9 a.m. in the employee breakroom while McCowan worked for the newspaper. But McCowan's retirement ended that morning routine.

''She told me she hadn't eaten Cheerios since I left,'' McCowan said. ''But we still had lunch sometimes and I always looked forward to seeing her. She was a true friend to me. She was a good person and she was always there when you needed her.''

''Sue was not only a dedicated employee, she was also a trusted friend,'' Managing Editor Denis House said. ''I've known Sue since I first started working at The Sentinel in 1983. She used to call me her ''work Denis'' since her husband was also named Dennis, although we spelled our names differently. She knew this community and was a wealth of information and knowledge. She loved watching her grandchildren play sports. I will miss her.''

''I was very blessed to have worked with Sue for a little over a year,'' Regional Publisher Dave Eldridge said. ''She was one of the classiest ladies I believe I have ever met, a conscientious worker that strived to make The Sentinel the very best it could be with every edition. Sue had a quick wit and smile and I really think she knew everyone in Laurel County, or so it seemed. Her years here made Sue a treasure that we will never be able to replace, nor would we expect to. MasterCard would refer to her as 'priceless,' and she was to us. She will be sorely missed and we pray for her family's peace and comfort.''

Minton was known for her willingness to help others and her dedication to her job. She was responsible for publishing the obituaries, school news, business and church pages as well as several monthly and special publications such as the Chamber of Commerce newsletter and special sections for the World Chicken Festival, Laurel County Fair, and Laurel County Homecoming. She also participated in writing special stories for the Silver magazine (now Southeast Kentucky NOW magazine) and the annual veterans' tribute magazine. She won a first place award in the only Kentucky Press Association contest she ever entered for her in-depth story on the Bush fire department.

Minton was well known in the community as well as with her newspaper job. Raised in Breathitt County, she met her husband, Dennis Minton, while attending Cumberland College in Williamsburg. The two married and settled on the Minton farm in eastern Laurel County in the Bush community, where they raised their daughter, Denise Griebel.

A devoted mother, she was just as devoted to her two grandchildren, Weston and Hailey. After working hours, she was on the sidelines of ball games, cheering them on and always providing that special love set aside between grandmothers and grandchildren.

Tammy Mays worked at The Sentinel Echo for five years with Minton, although she said she was also related to Minton's husband.

''Sue was just a good soul,'' Mays said. ''She wasn't just a co-worker, she was family.''

That close tie continued between the two even after Mays secured another job. But the two still communicated frequently.

Minton was known among her coworkers for her smile and dedication to producing the newspaper with timely and community related news. She had called Laurel County home since settling here and ensured that local news and people were highlighted.

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 253, on the nomination of Trevor McFadden to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Columbia. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 254, on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Amy Barrett to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.●

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I was unavoidably absent due to a family issue for rollcall votes Nos. 250, 251, and 252. Had I been present, I would have voted yea on No. 250, cloture on Palk; yea on No. 251, confirmation on Palk; and yea on No. 252, cloture on McFadden.

FISCAL YEAR 2018 ENFORCEMENT FILING

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 congressional budget resolution, included an instruction to the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget to file enforceable levels in the Senate in the event the budget was agreed to without the need to appoint a committee of conference on the measure. On Thursday, October 19, 2017, the Senate passed the budget by a vote of 51–48. On Thursday, October 26, 2017, the House of Representatives passed the budget without any changes on a vote of 216–212. As such, today I wish to submit the required filing found in the resolution.

Specifically, section 4113 of the fiscal year 2018 congressional budget resolution requires the chairman to file: No. 1, an allocation for fiscal year 2018 for the Committee on Appropriations; No. 2, an allocation for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations for the fiscal year 2018, fiscal year 2018 to 2022, and fiscal year 2018 to 2027 periods; and No. 3, a list of accounts eligible to receive advance appropriations.

The figures included in this filing are consistent with the spending limits set forth in the Budget Control Act of 2011 and the levels included in H. Con. Res. 71, as adjusted to include the budgetary effects of legislation that were enacted after the baseline for the resolution was constructed but before passage of the resolution by the House of Representatives, pursuant to section 4205 of the resolution.

Adjustments for the budgetary effects of the following enacted legislation were included: Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanction Act, H.R. 3364; VA Choice and Quality Employment Act of 2017, S. 114; Harry W. Colmery Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2017, H.R. 3218; FDA Reauthorization Act of 2017, H.R. 2430; Granting the consent and approval of Congress for the Commonwealth of Virginia, the State of Maryland, and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to the establishment of the Washington Metrorail Safety Commission, H.J. Res. 76; Emergency Aid to American Survivors of Hurricanes Irma and Jose Overseas Act, H.R. 3732; Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2017, H.R. 3819; Disaster Tax Relief and Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2017, H.R. 3823; Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria Education Relief Act of 2017, S. 1866; Continuing Appropriations Act, 2018 and Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirements Act, 2017, H.R. 601; and Additional Supplemental Appropriations for Disaster Relief Requirement Act of 2017, H.R. 2266.

For purposes of enforcing the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule, which is now found in section 4106 of this resolution, I am resetting the Senate's scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.

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:

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

[$ Billions]

Appropriations	Budget Authority	Outlays
Revised Security Category Discretionary Budget Authority[1]	549.057	n/a
Revised Nonsecurity Category Discretionary Budget Authority[1]	552.266	n/a
General Purpose Outlays[1]	n/a	1,187.547
Memo:		
Subtotal	1,101.323	1,187.547
on-budget	1,095.489	1,181.682
off-budget	5.834	5.865
Mandatory	1,013.202	1,000.871

[1]The allocation will be adjusted following the reporting of bills, offering of amendments, or submission of conference reports that qualify for adjustments to the discretionary spending limits as outlined in section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA). The budget authority for the revised nonsecurity category and outlays have been adjusted in this table to reflect passage of both H.R. 601 and H.R. 2266 (a combined budget authority and outlays of $36.517 billion and $19.662 billion, respectively), both of which included appropriations for disaster relief that were designated as emergencies pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of BBEDCA. These adjustments are allowed under section 4205 of H. Con. Res. 71, the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEES OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS *

[$ Billions]

	2018	2018–2022	2018–2027
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:			
Budget Authority	126.308	625.801	1,286.568
Outlays	114.589	575.641	1,189.902
Armed Services:			
Budget Authority	169.680	906.589	1,856.298
Outlays	165.105	907.714	1,852.288
Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs:			
Budget Authority	22.948	110.304	218.965
Outlays	−2.113	0.549	−7.446
Commerce, Science, and Transportation:			
Budget Authority	17.855	96.091	198.319
Outlays	14.082	77.971	152.636
Energy and Natural Resources:			
Budget Authority	4.703	25.212	49.342
Outlays	4.391	24.909	49.112
Environment and Public Works:			
Budget Authority	46.833	219.114	426.774
Outlays	2.313	12.343	27.935
Finance:			
Budget Authority	2,281.616	13,510.107	32,116.900
Outlays	2,280.970	13,482.300	32,069.238
Foreign Relations:			
Budget Authority	39.543	178.314	338.121
Outlays	30.383	156.269	314.824
Homeland Security and Government Affairs:			
Budget Authority	143.970	764.213	1,648.718
Outlays	142.049	751.753	1,616.129
Judiciary:			
Budget Authority	29.616	99.853	186.772
Outlays	18.597	108.196	197.498
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:			
Budget Authority	13.009	90.244	188.101
Outlays	16.925	89.464	193.052
Rules and Administration:			
Budget Authority	0.051	0.258	0.515
Outlays	0.023	0.132	0.291
Intelligence:			
Budget Authority	0.514	2.570	5.140
Outlays	0.514	2.570	5.140
Veterans' Affairs:			
Budget Authority	98.347	580.175	1,265.095
Outlays	102.847	583.589	1,267.581
Indian Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0.325	2.048	4.504
Outlays	0.722	2.690	4.860
Small Business:			
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.000
Unassigned to Committee:			
Budget Authority	−1,001.746	−6,244.350	−15,987.270
Outlays	−963.858	−6,095.224	−15,700.813
Total			
Budget Authority	1,993.572	10,966.543	23,802.862
Outlays	1,927.539	10,680.866	23,232.227

*Includes entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts.

ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE

FINANCIAL SERVICES AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Payment to Postal Service

LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION

Employment and Training Administration
Education for the Disadvantaged
School Improvement
Special Education
Career, Technical, and Adult Education

TRANSPORTATION, HOUSING, AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Tenant-based Rental Assistance
Project-based Rental Assistance

Memorandum: Section 4101 of H. Con. Res. 71, the congressional budget resolution for FY 2018, provides for a point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate Section 4101(b) provides for several account-level exceptions to this rule, including advance appropriations for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, several accounts of the Veterans Health Administration, and the accounts listed above (pursuant to Section 4205 of this year's budget resolution).

BUDGET AGGREGATES

[$ Billions]

		2018	2018–2022	2018–2027
Figures Found in H. Con. Res. 71 Spending:				
	Budget Authority	3,136.721	N.A.	N.A.
	Outlays	3,131.688	N.A.	N.A.
Revenues		2,490.936	13,759.23	31,171.52
Social Security Levels:				
	Outlays	849.609	4,883.048	11,654.643
	Revenue	873.312	4,667.573	10,209.480
Adjustments Pursuant to Section 4205 of H. Con. Res. 71 Spending:				
	Budget Authority	36.780	N.A.	N.A.
	Outlays	21.753	N.A.	N.A.
Revenues		0.003	0.024	0.046
Social Security Levels:				
	Outlays	0.000	0.000	0.000
	Revenue	0.000	0.001	0.003
Adjusted H. Con. Res. 71 Figures Spending:				
	Budget Authority	3,173.501	N.A.	N.A.
	Outlays	3,153.441	N.A.	N.A.
Revenues		2,490.939	13,759.252	31,171.567
Social Security Levels:				
	Outlays	849.609	4,883.048	11,654.643
	Revenue	873.312	4,667.574	10,209.483

Memorandum: Aggregate figures are displayed at levels assumed in H. Con. Res. 71, as passed, with adjustments for legislation that has cleared Congress between the publication of the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 baseline and the passage of the budget resolution. Spending and revenue aggregates have been updated to reflect the on-budget, non-section 403 emergency-designated (FY 2010 budget resolution) budgetary changes. Social Security levels reflect off-budget budgetary changes. Total figures represented here reflect levels different from those that will be enforced immediately. This is due to several factors including, but not limited to: assumed spending for cap-adjustments (section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985) that have not yet occured, the inclusion of CURES funding (which under scorekeeping practice and guidance from the 21st Century Cures Act does not count for enforcement purposes), and budgetary changes that will be held in reserve for reconciliation legislation (pursuant to section 3003 of fiscal year 2018 budget resolution).

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE SENATE

[$ Billions]

	Balances
Fiscal Year 2017	0
Fiscal Year 2018	0
Fiscal Years 2017–2022	0
Fiscal Years 2017–2027	0

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 17–57, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Canada for defense articles and services estimated to cost $140 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. HOOPER,
Lieutenant General, USA,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17–57

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF LETTER OF OFFER PURSUANT TO SECTION 36(B)(1) OF THE ARMS EXPORT CONTROL ACT, AS AMENDED

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Canada.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* $130 million.

Other $ 10 million.

Total $140 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Up to thirty-two (32) AIM–120D Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM).

Up to eighteen (18) AMRAAM Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs).

Up to four (4) AMRAAM Non-Development Item Airborne Instrumentation Unit (NDI–AIU).

Up to two (2) AMRAAM Instrumented Test Vehicles (ITV).

Up to seven (7) spare AMRAAM guidance units.

Up to four (4) spare AMRAAM control sections.

Non-MDE: Included in the sale are containers; storage and preservation; transportation; aircrew and maintenance training; training aids and equipment, spares and repair parts; warranties; weapon system support and test equipment; publications and technical documentation; software development integration, and support; system integration and testing; U.S. Government and contractor engineering technical and logistics support; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (XX–D–YDG).

(v) Prior Related Cases. if any: CN–D–YAE for AIM–120 AMRAAMs; CN–D–QBU for in-service support for those AMRAAMs.

(vi) Sales Commission. Fee, etc., Paid. Offered. or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: Oct 30, 2017.

*As defined in Section 47 (6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Canada—AIM–120D Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM)

The Government of Canada has requested a Letter of Offer and Acceptance for the procurement of up to thirty-two (32) AIM–120D Advanced Medium-Range Air-to Air Missiles (AMRAAMs), up to eighteen (18) AMRAAM Captive Air Training Missiles (CATMs); up to four (4) AMRAAM Non-Development Item Airborne Instrumentation Unit (NDI-AIU); up to two (2) AMRAAM Instrumented Test Vehicles (ITV); up to seven (7) spare AMRAAM guidance units; up to four (4) spare AMRAAM control sections for use on their F/A–18 aircraft. Included in the sale are containers; storage and preservation; transportation; aircrew and maintenance training; training aids and equipment, spares and repair parts; warranties; weapon system support and test equipment; publications and technical documentation; software development, integration, and support; system integration and testing; U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical, and logistics support; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is $140 million.

This proposed sale will contribute to the foreign policy and national security objectives of the United States by helping to improve the security of a NATO ally which has been, and continues to be, a key democratic partner of the United States in ensuring peace and stability. The missiles will be used on Royal Canadian Air Force (RCAF) fighter aircraft.

This proposed sale of defense articles and services is required to enable RCAF fighters to optimally fulfill both North American Aerospace Defense (NORAD) and NATO missions and also meets the U.S. Northern Command's goals of combined air operations interoperability and standardization between Canadian and U.S. forces. The RCAF will have no difficulty absorbing these missiles into its inventory.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The prime contractor will be Raytheon Missile Systems, Tucson, AZ. The Government of Canada has advised that it will negotiate offset agreements in conjunction with this sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Canada.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 17–57

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM–120D Advanced Medium Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) hardware, including the missile guidance section, is classified CONFIDENTIAL. State-of-the-art technology is used in the missile to provide it with unique beyond-visual-range capability. The increase in capability from the AIM–120C–7 to AIM–120D consists of a two-way data link, a more accurate navigation unit, improved High-Angle Off-Boresight (HOBS) capability, and enhanced aircraft-to-missile position handoff.

2. AIM–120D features a target detection device with embedded electronic countermeasures, and electronics unit within the guidance section that performs all radar signal processing, midcourse and terminal guidance, flight control, target detection, and warhead burst point determination.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that Canada can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary to further the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed on this transmittal are authorized for release and export to Canada.

NOMINATION OF RANDY REEVES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the nomination of Randy Reeves of Mississippi to serve as Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Reeves, a retired, U.S. Navy commander, has distinguished himself in Mississippi and around the Nation through his nearly 30-year military career and steadfast dedication to veterans. Randy, a decorated combat veteran, led the Mississippi Veterans Affairs Board for the past 8 years. He recently served as president of the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs and as a member of the Department of Veterans Affairs Rural Health Advisory Committee.

Veterans' cemeteries are hallowed ground on which grateful Americans can honor those who have served our Nation in uniform. As Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs, Randy will lead the National Cemetery Administration, a role for which he is well prepared. Randy successfully coordinated design, funding, and construction of Mississippi's two State veterans cemeteries.

I am confident that he will serve the Department of Veterans Affairs with distinction. It is with pride and pleasure that I am able to recommend to the Senate the nomination of Randy Reeves.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DETROIT RIOT

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, today I wish to observe the 50th anniversary of Detroit's tumultuous summer of 1967, widely known as the 1967 Detroit Riot or the 12th Street Riots. The events of 1967 made a tremendous impact on the city and coincided with multiple incidents that took place across the country during that historic summer.

On Sunday July 23, 1967, patrons of an after-hours club were celebrating servicemembers coming home from Vietnam, above the Economy Printing Company on Clairmont Avenue and 12th Street. At 3:30 a.m., police officers raided the club, which was within a mostly African-American business district with an active nightlife, arresting 85 people.

While the police arrested each person inside of the establishment, a crowd formed on the outside. Those who were gathered began reacting to the escalating discord between those who lived in the neighborhood and the police department. As time elapsed, a rise of arson and looting began to erupt. By 8 a.m., the number grew to an estimated 3,000 people who assembled in protest. As the Detroit police force struggled to contain the crowd, Mayor Jerome Cavanagh and Governor George Romney agreed to deploy the Michigan National Guard that afternoon; paratroopers joined 2 days later.

Just over 7,200 arrests were made between July 23 and July 27, 1967. As tensions began to subside, community members and government officials surveyed the aftermath. More than 1,600 buildings were destroyed, and the cost of damage to commercial and residential property totaled an estimated $132 million. Beyond property damage, the community suffered the loss of 43 citizens and hundreds were injured.

Detroit's 1967 unrest was not an isolated event; urban centers across the country were experiencing similar instances of civil disturbance. A day after the conclusion of the unrest in Detroit, President Lyndon B. Johnson sought out to investigate the cause of the phenomenon, establishing the Kerner Commission. The Commission concluded that the riots that took place between 1965 and 1968 were due to racism and frustration at lack of economic opportunity. From these findings, the Commission suggested economic, social, and housing reform to quell tensions.

The events of that summer were seen through countless eyes. Many Detroiters saw the unrest as a rebellion against the systemic oppression that plagued the African-American community, who had no voice or adequate representation in government or in the police force but accounted for one-third of Detroit's population. Various government agencies painted the events as an insurrection, war, or riot. Regardless of how the events were characterized, there is no denial of the real emotional and physical toll the summer had on citizens. The countless stories of people in their homes watching tanks roll down the very streets children once played in or the visual of soldiers with rifles on their backs juxtaposed to mothers walking along the same sidewalk with their babies in strollers, illustrated the surreal nature of the unrest and the response.

I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating an event that affected not only the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan but was a pivotal moment in our Nation's history. Detroit stands as the birthplace of Motown, center of the automotive industry, and the ''Arsenal of Democracy.'' It has been and continues to be a city of innovation and promise. I am proud of its resilience and the grassroots efforts contributing to its resurgence. The 50th anniversary of the civil unrest is a great opportunity to reflect and learn from the events of the past, celebrate progress, and to continue to support community partnerships that influence future success that is inclusive of all neighborhoods.

TRIBUTE TO KEITH BOWAR

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Keith Bowar of Gillette, WY, on finishing his fourth term as president of the Wyoming Conference of Building Officials Chapter of the International Code Council. This is a great milestone, an instant replay memory Mr. Bowar will cherish and remember for a long time to come.

I commend Mr. Bowar for all that he has been able to accomplish over the years both in the Wyoming Conference of Building Officials and as a building code professional. For 23 years, he has dedicated himself to furthering public safety, beginning in 1994 as a building inspector for the city of Gillette and advancing to the position of chief building official for Campbell County in 2011.

Mr. Bowar's elevation to president of the Wyoming Conference of Building Officials was a recognition by his peers of his dedication and effectiveness, and he used the position to improve building and fire safety throughout Wyoming. The challenges Mr. Bowar faced and the changes that he helped to bring to the world around him reflect the way he uses his skills and knowledge to make a difference in so many ways.

I send my best wishes to Mr. Bower on completing his tenure as president of the Wyoming Conference of Building Officials and for his service to Wyoming.

Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING SOUTHWEST CONFERENCE HALL OF FAME INDUCTEES

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the long and proud history of University of Arkansas collegiate athletes who have made us proud to cheer on the Razorbacks. Arkansas has achieved tremendous levels of success throughout the history of its athletic program. You cannot discuss Razorback sports history without discussing its time in the Southwest Conference. The Southwest Conference was highly competitive, and its teams produced many of our Nation's greatest athletes, including many from Arkansas. As we reflect on the rich history of the conference, I am proud to recognize the Razorbacks selected as class of 2017 inductees for the Southwest Conference Hall of Fame.

I congratulate Razorback football greats Jim Benton, Ronnie Caveness, Joe Ferguson, Steve Little, Fred Marshall, Wear Schoonover, Billy Ray Smith, Sr., and Dennis ''Dirt'' Winston; former Razorback basketball players, Ron Brewer, Amber Shirey, and Darrell Walker; and track stars Edrick Floreal and Cynthia Moore on their induction today.

I would like to congratulate the late Orville Henry on his induction to the Southwest Conference Hall of Fame. Mr. Henry is an iconic Arkansas sports writer who covered the Razorbacks for six decades. His work, professionalism, and legacy live on to this day.

Earlier this month, former Razorback All-American football player Dick Bumpas was also inducted into the Hall of Fame along with eight other former Southwest Conference legends.

The Razorback nominees to the Southwest Conference Hall of Fame Class of 2017 have certainly earned this honor. I applaud these former Razorbacks for their contribution to not just the legacy of the Southwest Conference but also for their contribution to the legacy of Arkansas athletics.●

TRIBUTE TO DAWNA DIANGELIS

● Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today I wish to honor Ohioan Dawna DiAngelis for 30 years of service to the Canton Repository.

Unlike many others in the news industry whom I have honored on the Senate floor before, you will not see Dawna's name in a byline or anywhere else in the paper, but make no mistake, the folks in Stark County can count on their news each day because of Dawna and her team in the production room.

The ''Canton Repository'' has kept Stark County residents informed since 1815, but it wasn't until 172 years later, in 1987, that the paper hired its first woman for the Rep's composing room. Dawna became the first woman in the male-dominated pre-press department,

the department responsible for the layout and look of every single page of the paper.

Dawna didn't stop there. She went on to earn the position of department head—again, the first woman to do so in the history of the paper. For the last 30 years, she has served behind the scenes to produce thousands of editions of the Repository. Dawna and her husband, J.D., have both served the Canton community—Dawna at the Rep and J.D. at WHBC radio.

Dawna's work in the composing room has guaranteed that Canton residents get to read their news each day, and while doing her day job, she paved the way for other women in the news industry to follow.

I join the entire Canton community and Dawna's colleagues at the Rep in congratulating her for her 30-year anniversary at the Repository.●

REMEMBERING MARTHA LEE ''MARTY'' ORWIG

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, my colleague Senator JIM RISCH joins me today in honoring Martha Lee ''Marty,'' Orwig who shined so brightly in our world and will be greatly missed.

Marty had endearing monikers, including ''The Rocket'' and ''Aunt Marty,'' that reflect how deeply she touched many lives and left a lasting impression of sincerity, enthusiasm, joyfulness, spirited know-how, and a profound commitment to the Lord and assisting others. In learning of her passing, others have shared their impressions of Marty that include ''special lady,'' ''great lady,'' ''a delight to work with and simply to know as a person,'' ''passionate about everything she involved herself with,'' ''feisty, spirited, and never backed down from a challenge,'' and ''gone too soon.'' Marty modeled dedication and excellence. Her service as founder and leader of the North American Moose Foundation, through which she mentored Mackay High School students, is no doubt leaving an imprint of her committed example in the lives of generations of young leaders.

While Marty was deeply rooted in Sun Valley, her home base for the past more than 40 years, and Mackay, ID, she was born on August 19, 1951, in St. Louis, MO, to Elizabeth and David Orwig. After graduating from the University of Denver and earning a master's degree in biblical studies from Multnomah University in Portland, OR, to our great benefit, she chose Idaho to be her home. Her work as a real estate broker and ski instructor shifted to a career as a political consultant working on Republican campaigns, including campaigns for former Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush. Her career also included leading the Blaine County Republican Party and serving as a field director for former U.S. Senator Larry Craig. She served in President George H.W. Bush's administration as a Presidential appointee, and she was appointed by Governor Butch Otter to the Idaho Fifth District Magistrates Commission. She also founded and led the Quincy Group and was a member of the Idaho National Federation of Republican Women, Rotary Club, and Kiwanis Club.

Marty Orwig was a driven leader, thought-provoker, and encourager. She was guided by a great love of God and used her experience to help guide and support local youth and others. We extend our condolences to her sister and brother-in-law, Sarah Orwig and Clark Costen, and countless friends. Marty will be greatly missed, but her loving legacy will remain a major part of the heart of our great State and Nation.●

REMEMBERING RICHARD ZIEBARTH

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to memorialize an American veteran and true Nevadan Richard Ziebarth, who recently passed away at the age of 58.

Widely known as ''Zman,'' Mr Ziebarth spent close to 26 years in the U.S. Air Force as a fighter pilot and squadron commander, where he achieved the rank of lieutenant colonel. He was stationed at Nellis Air Force Base in Las Vegas in 2003 and retired from the military in 2007. He served his country all over the world in South Korea, England, and at the Pentagon.

Mr. Ziebarth's leadership did not stop after his military service. He was an active member of his community, the Canyon Ridge Christian Church, and chairman of the church's board of elders.

He graduated from Point Loma Nazarene University in 1981 with a bachelor's in computer science and business. He also graduated from Averett College with an MBA and received a doctorate of strategic leadership from Regent University. Mr. Ziebarth started a business called Integrity Leadership that helped employers determine the best fit for employees within their companies.

Mr. Ziebarth also worked as director of operations for Remote Imagery Technology, Inc., RITI, which provides operational support to Department of Defense contracts.

As Nevada's senior Senator, I know that Mr. Ziebarth's service in uniform and to the community, will not be forgotten. My thoughts and prayers go out to his family, especially his best friend and wife of 36 years, Beth, his children, and the rest of his family and friends who loved and cared for him deeply.●

RECOGNIZING OUR LADY OF PEACE POST 1947

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the Catholic War Veterans of America's Our Lady of Peace Post 1947 in Las Vegas, NV, and Dennis DeGree, Post 1947 first vice commander and Vegas native.

Post 1947 exemplifies their motto of ''For God, country, and home.'' The group works tirelessly to help veterans, their families, homeless veterans, and active duty personnel. I am deeply appreciative of these veteran members' sacrifices and service, as well as the group's efforts to support Nevadans who have answered our Nation's call.

Founded in 2006, Post 1947 is Nevada's first Catholic War Veterans of America post and one of 215 posts across the country. The organization offers a number of critical initiatives to the veteran and Las Vegas communities.

The group's youth programs include poster and essay contests, letter writing and get-well cards for hospitalized veterans, and the Eugene T. Roark Memorial Junior ROTC Scholarship Program. Additionally, Post 1947 maintains and operates a food pantry, participates in homeless stand-downs, and educates and assists veterans, their families, widows, and orphans in obtaining VA medical care and benefits.

At the 82nd Annual Convention of the Catholic War Veterans held in St. Louis, MO, Post 1947 of Las Vegas was awarded Most Outstanding Post of 2017 out of 215 posts. This award was given to the post by the national department for best overall programs provided to all veterans regardless of religious ethnicity. Our Lady of Peace Post 1947 has won this award 8 of the past 10 years.

Post 1947 was recognized because of a successful veteran service organization program they implemented called the National Veterans Service Office. Since opening in 2013, the National Veterans Service Office has been successful in obtaining over $10 million in awards to veterans. Remarkably, Our Lady of Peace Post 1947 has been named the Most Outstanding Welfare Program 9 of the past 10 years by the national department.

Post 1947's major achievements do not end there. Dennis DeGree, first vice commander of the group, was deservedly named Most Outstanding Catholic War Veteran of 2017 by the National Catholic War Veterans. Mr. DeGree received the award ''for being the individual who, in the opinion of the National Department, has contributed most to the betterment of the CWV.''

It is clear that Post 1947's contributions have made Las Vegas a better place for Nevada's warriors and their families. As a lifelong Nevadan and the senior U.S. Senator for the Silver State, I am honored to recognize both Post 1947 and Dennis DeGree for lending a hand to those who have made sacrifices in the name of this great country.●

RECOGNIZING TELSTAR ASSOCIATES, INC.

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, every month I celebrate the power of the American entrepreneurial spirit by

highlighting the successes of a small business in my home State of Idaho. This month's recipient of the Small Business of the Month is a veteran-owned business, which is fitting since this week is National Veterans Small Business Week. It is always great to see veterans succeed after they close out their years of service and continue their path as a civilian. The founders of October's Small Business of the Month demonstrate that, with determination and hard work, there is no limit to what can be accomplished. I am honored to recognize an enterprise that makes it their business to help other businesses experience growth and prosperity of their own. As chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am pleased to recognize TelStar Associates, Inc., as the Senate Small Business of the Month for October 2017.

TelStar was founded in 1979 by Jose Telleria and Douglas Stark, who decided to join together and use their individual strengths and experience in the field of information technology to create their own business. The company name, TelStar, is a combination of the names of its founders and represents the partnership between Telleria—Tel—and Stark, Star. For their first contract, TelStar developed a software program that tracked the storage and shipping of onions for Murakami Produce. Within a short period of time, TelStar was providing their services to a diverse range of clients in both the private and public sectors, including the Idaho Governor's Office, Idaho Department of Health and Welfare, the Idaho National Laboratory, and Boise State University. TelStar also developed a chemical management and waste disposal management application that is currently used by the U.S. Navy. In addition to being an invaluable asset to their community, TelStar exemplifies the entrepreneurial spirit by continually adapting to the needs of their clients.

As leaders in the IT field, Jose and Douglas created a business known for flexibility and for consistently providing meaningful services. Responding to the changing needs of businesses, TelStar expanded their services from custom contract programming to network support, field services, cyber security, and IT staffing services. TelStar provides their clients with access to affordable services that allow them to improve their IT capabilities. In an increasingly technological world, small businesses have the opportunity to benefit from businesses like Jose and Douglas's. I know the technological challenges businesses can face, which is why I am proud to recognize TelStar, a successful business that is committed to helping other businesses achieve success of their own, by empowering them to be the best at what they do. Since their first contract for Murakami Produce, TelStar has exemplified the innovative nature of many American small businesses.

A belief central to TelStar's culture is that ''People make the difference.'' There is nothing more commendable than helping someone else achieve their goals, and I would like to congratulate Jose Telleria, Douglas Stark, and all of the employees of TelStar for the impact they have had on their community. TelStar's entrepreneurial spirit is an example for every American to follow, and I look forward to watching your continued growth and success.●

REMEMBERING CHESTER RENFRO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, Chester Renfro of Pinellas County, FL, passed away this October 22. Chet, as he was known to family and friends, was a friend of mine, and I want to say a few words about him in his passing. Married to his wife, Betty, Chet was a graduate of the University of Southern California and an engineer by trade. He designed and installed industrial water pumps for commercial industries and water treatment facilities. He started his career in California, later moving to St. Louis and then Louisville, KY, where he started his own business. He moved to Pinellas County nearly 20 years ago.

Betty was the love of Chet's life, and he adored her. When they married, they each brought their sons with them into the family—Betty and her three sons, Gene, Brad, and Paul Garcia; Chet and his two sons, Rick and Greg Renfro. Their daughter, now Melanie Nethery, came later to bless that family full of boys. Chet loved all of his children but was exceptionally proud of his grandchildren. He would be glad to tell you all about them and their accomplishments.

Chet lived a full, meaningful life, and in everything—professionally, personally, and politically—he worked hard. He loved his Wednesday golf game, his travels with Betty, and his pecan pies. He gave his time and energy to many State and local organizations, including the Southwest Florida Water Management District and the Pinellas County Canvasing Board. I looked to his guidance as a member of my academy board in the Tampa Bay region, interviewing many of the young men and women from that area who want to attend a service academy and serve our country.

Chet Renfro leaves behind a legacy of service to others and of love for his family, friends, and country. He was someone I was proud to call my friend, and he and his family are in my prayers.●

MONTANA'S WOMEN VETERANS OF WWI

● Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, today I wish to honor the hundreds of Montana women who honorably served our country during World War I.

They braved the German u-boats to serve on the frontlines. Women cared for the wounded and connected calls to the battlefield offices of GEN John Pershing. Without them, the American forces serving in Europe could have faced catastrophe. Without them, the course of the war could have been much different.

We shouldn't be surprised. Montana women have been breaking down barriers for generations.

Merle Egan Anderson pressured the U.S. Government for 60 years to get the women who worked the Army's telephone switchboards the status of ''veteran.'' Montanans like Merle Egan Anderson and Lena Roy volunteered to be a part of the Army Signal Corps without promise of pay, benefits, or recognition of their service. The Signal Corps women, nicknamed the ''Hello Girls,'' proved their worth immediately. Merle, Lena, and their peers' speed and precision allowed officers to communicate across battlefields, enemy lines, and war-torn terrain. They served at the frontlines and quickly garnered the respect of the men with whom they served. They braved enemy fire and suffered casualties among their ranks. Despite their outstanding service, they returned to an indifferent government who denied them veteran status, including healthcare and burial rights.

Merle Egan Anderson took on the government, and 60 years later, she won. When the government granted the ''Hello Girls'' veteran status, only 18 of the 223 women were still alive.

Nearly 200 Montana nurses entered military service, 86 of whom braved enemy submarine-patrolled waters to care for troops on the frontline. They came from 56 cities, towns, and forgotten railroad stops across the Big Sky State.

Nurses Elizabeth Sandelius from Cokedale and Harriett O'Day from Billings were cited for heroism under fire for their service in France. Cora Craig from Glasgow, MT, received a Silver Medal from the King of Siam for her care of soldiers from present-day Thailand. Eula Butzerin braved the carnage of post-war France to find the battlefield grave of her brother Roy, marked only with a stick and his dog tags.

Thirteen Montana women enlisted in the Navy and served stateside. Gertrude Zerr from Chinook achieved the rank of chief yeoman, directing fellow yeoman in the naval headquarters.

During the war, these women proved to their fellow Americans and the world that women were an asset in battle. Their service defied gender stereotypes and helped changed the tide of public opinion that culminated in the 19th Amendment of our Constitution, granting women the right to vote at long last. They helped pave the way for women to take on combat roles in World War II and beyond.

After the war, Montana's World War I women veterans faded into history. Their service remains largely unknown. These women gave voice and power to a nation of women. Their service and actions helped change the

course of history. These strong Montana women were followed by more strong Montana women who have carried the fighting torch of equality for generations.

It is my honor to present this legacy today and my privilege to represent the past and present women of Montana.

On behalf of a grateful nation, I commend Montana's women veterans of WWI.●

TRIBUTE TO TOM TROXEL

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Tom Troxel for the many years of his career that he has dedicated to improving the ecological health of our national forests and for his service to the timber industry, which has strengthened the economic health of local communities.

Tom has spent more than 40 years in the forestry industry, and he has mastered the art of promoting environmentally sound forest management practices while strongly supporting the timber industry. Tom has been a trusted source of reliable and accurate information throughout his career.

He received his bachelor of science in forestry from the University of Montana in 1973. He worked for the U.S. Forest Service in Idaho, Montana, and California, starting as a summer job in 1970 during college and continuing until 1989.

Since 1989, Tom has been the executive director for the Intermountain Forest Association based in Rapid City, SD. During that time, he has worked with forest products companies in Colorado, South Dakota, and Wyoming and has played a critically important role in addressing issues related to national forest timber programs, including forest planning, project analyses, timber sale contracts, and legislative affairs.

Tom has served as the executive director of the Black Hills Forest Resource Association, the executive director of the Colorado Timber Industry Association, and a member of the Forest Service's Forest Planning Advisory Committee. He has also served as the executive secretary of the Black Hills Regional Multiple Use Coalition for 25 years and as a member of the board of directors for the Rapid City Chamber of Commerce.

Those of us who have had the privilege of working with Tom over the years will miss the knowledge and expertise he has shared with us. Our forest landscapes and communities are better because of his work.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Tom for his work on behalf of our forests, the timber industry, and local communities. As he retires from his very successful career, I wish him continued success and happiness in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 3:04 p.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 bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1698. An act to expand sanctions against Iran with respect to the ballistic missile program of Iran, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1698. An act to expand sanctions against Iran with respect to the ballistic missile program of Iran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 1199. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reauthorize the Border Enforcement Security Task Force program within the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 115–179).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Emily Webster Murphy, of Missouri, to be Administrator of General Services.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2030. A bill to deem the compliance date for amended energy conservation standards for ceiling light kits to be January 21, 2020, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 2031. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain National Forest System land within Kisatchie National Forest in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. ROBERTS):

S. 2032. A bill to make certain footwear eligible for duty-free treatment under the Generalized System of Preferences, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 312. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2017 and 2018 each as ''National Month for Renters''; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 313. A resolution designating the week of October 30 through November 3, 2017, as ''National Veterans Small Business Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. Res. 314. A resolution designating October 30, 2017, as a national day of remembrance for nuclear weapons program workers; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 253

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 253, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the Medicare outpatient rehabilitation therapy caps.

S. 266

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 266, a bill to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Anwar Sadat in recognition of his heroic achievements and courageous contributions to peace in the Middle East.

S. 322

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 322, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 324

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 324, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of adult day health care services for veterans.

S. 339

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 339, 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. 353

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 353, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to extend the rural add-on payment in the Medicare home health benefit, and for other purposes.

S. 445

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 445, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 503

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 503, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make publicly available certain regulatory records relating to the administration of the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the use of an alternative depreciation system for taxpayers violating rules under the Animal Welfare Act and the Horse Protection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 629

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 629, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drugs, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safety and effectiveness of medically important antimicrobials approved for use in the prevention, control, and treatment of animal diseases, in order to minimize the development of antibiotic-resistant bacteria.

S. 654

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 654, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 674

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 674, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the retirement income account rules relating to church controlled organizations.

S. 700

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 700, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 793, a bill to prohibit sale of shark fins, and for other purposes.

S. 872

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 872, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the extension of the Medicare-dependent hospital (MDH) program and the increased payments under the Medicare low-volume hospital program.

S. 910

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

S. 978

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 978, a bill to direct the Secretary of Education to establish an award program recognizing excellence exhibited by public school system employees providing services to students in prekindergarten through higher education.

S. 1022

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1022, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to facilitate assignment of military trauma care providers to civilian trauma centers in order to maintain military trauma readiness and to support such centers, and for other purposes.

S. 1064

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, 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.

S. 1130

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1130, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to create a sustainable future for rural healthcare.

S. 1343

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1343, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend and modify certain charitable tax provisions.

S. 1580

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1580, a bill to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

S. 1674

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1674, a bill to provide grants for the repair, renovation, and construction of public elementary schools and secondary schools, to establish a school infrastructure bond program, and for other purposes.

S. 1690

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1690, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide greater support to students with dependents, and for other purposes.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) and the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1738, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a home infusion therapy services temporary transitional payment under the Medicare program.

S. 1746

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1746, a bill to require the Congressional Budget Office to make publicly available the fiscal and mathematical models, data, and other details of computations used in cost analysis and scoring.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1842, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1953

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1953, a bill to amend the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 and the Indian Law Enforcement Reform Act to provide for advancements in public safety services to Indian communities, and for other purposes.

S. 1981

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1981, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to expedite approval of exports of small volumes of natural gas, and for other purposes.

S. 2019

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2019, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal antidiscrimination claims.

S. RES. 250

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 250, a resolution condemning horrific acts of violence against Burma's Rohingya population and calling on Aung San Suu Kyi to play an active role in ending this humanitarian tragedy.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 312—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 2017 AND 2018 EACH AS ''NATIONAL MONTH FOR RENTERS''

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 312

Whereas rental housing is a vital component of the housing market of the United States, providing a place to live for nearly 44,000,000 households and more than 111,000,000 individuals in the United States;

Whereas the number of households renting homes increased by 9,000,000 over the past decade, the largest 10-year gain on record;

Whereas more than 11,000,000 households in communities across the United States spend more than 50 percent of their income on rent and utilities, making those households severely cost-burdened under Federal standards; and

Whereas those 11,000,000 severely cost-burdened households include 14,000,000 women, 8,000,000 children, 9,000,000 members of the Millennial Generation, 2,000,000 senior citizens, and nearly 800,000 veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of September 2017 and 2018 each as ''National Month for Renters'' to draw attention to the rental housing shortage in the United States;

(2) urges a truly national effort involving all levels of government, the private sector, and the philanthropic community to expand the supply of rental homes affordable to low- and moderate-income households;

(3) recognizes that subsidized rental housing programs implemented by the Federal Government only serve ¼ of eligible renters and so are the equivalent of a lottery; and

(4) recognizes that expanding the supply of rental homes affordable to low- and moderate-income families, particularly when close to employment opportunities, will—

(A) help reduce commuting costs;

(B) restore the first rungs of the housing ladder;

(C) stabilize families and communities;

(D) promote equality of opportunity; and

(E) support greater economic growth and prosperity.

SENATE RESOLUTION 313—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 30 THROUGH NOVEMBER 3, 2017, AS ''NATIONAL VETERANS SMALL BUSINESS WEEK''

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. RISCH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 313

Whereas the Armed Forces of the United States train individuals with the skills, discipline, and leadership necessary to establish and operate a successful business;

Whereas there are approximately 2,500,000 veteran-owned small businesses in the United States, employing more than 5,000,000 individuals;

Whereas veteran-owned businesses make up nearly 10 percent of all businesses in the United States;

Whereas veterans account for more than $1,100,000,000,000 in business receipts every year;

Whereas veterans are 45 percent more likely to be self-employed than nonveterans;

Whereas business ownership by women veterans has increased significantly, from 97,114 in 2007 to 383,302 in 2012;

Whereas the Office of Veterans Business Development of the Small Business Administration is dedicated to maximizing the availability and usability of small business programs for veterans, members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces of the United States, members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving on active duty, transitioning service members, and the spouses, dependents, or survivors of those members and veterans;

Whereas the Small Business Administration serves more than 200,000 veterans, service-disabled veterans, women veterans, and military spouses annually;

Whereas the entrepreneurship training program of the Small Business Administration, Boots to Business, has trained more than 30,000 service members, veterans, and spouses of service members and veterans since launching in 2013;

Whereas the Small Business Administration hosts events honoring National Veterans Small Business Week from October 30 through November 3, 2017;

Whereas the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives celebrate National Veterans Small Business Week during the week of October 30 through November 3, 2017; and

Whereas the week of October 30 through November 3, 2017, would be an appropriate time to celebrate National Veterans Small Business Week: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 30 through November 3, 2017, as ''National Veterans Small Business Week'';

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Veterans Small Business Week;

(3) celebrates the millions of people in the United States, especially veterans of the United States and the spouses of those veterans, who benefit from the programs of the Small Business Administration; and

(4) expresses appreciation for the continued service to the United States by the veterans of the United States through small business ownership and entrepreneurship.

SENATE RESOLUTION 314—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 30, 2017, AS A NATIONAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR NUCLEAR WEAPONS PROGRAM WORKERS

Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. CORKER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. GARDNER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 314

Whereas, since World War II, hundreds of thousands of men and women, including uranium miners, millers, and haulers, have served the United States by building nuclear weapons for the defense of the United States;

Whereas dedicated workers paid a high price for developing a nuclear weapons program at the service, and for the benefit of, the United States, including by developing disabling or fatal illnesses;

Whereas the Senate recognized the contributions, services, and sacrifices that those patriotic men and women made for the defense of the United States in—

(1) Senate Resolution 151, 111th Congress, agreed to May 20, 2009;

(2) Senate Resolution 653, 111th Congress, agreed to September 28, 2010;

(3) Senate Resolution 275, 112th Congress, agreed to September 26, 2011;

(4) Senate Resolution 519, 112th Congress, agreed to August 1, 2012;

(5) Senate Resolution 164, 113th Congress, agreed to September 18, 2013;

(6) Senate Resolution 417, 113th Congress, agreed to July 9, 2014;

(7) Senate Resolution 213, 114th Congress, agreed to September 25, 2015; and

(8) Senate Resolution 560, 114th Congress, agreed to November 16, 2016;

Whereas a national day of remembrance time capsule has been crossing the United States, collecting stories and artifacts of nuclear weapons program workers relating to the nuclear defense era of the United States, and a remembrance quilt has been constructed to memorialize the contribution of those workers;

Whereas the stories and artifacts reflected in the time capsule and the remembrance quilt reinforce the importance of recognizing nuclear weapons program workers; and

Whereas those patriotic men and women deserve to be recognized for the contributions, services, and sacrifices they made for the defense of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 30, 2017, as a national day of remembrance for the nuclear weapons program and uranium enrichment workers of the United States, including the uranium miners, millers, and haulers; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to support and participate in appropriate ceremonies, programs, and other activities to commemorate October 30, 2017, as a national day of remembrance for past and present workers in the nuclear weapons program of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have 2 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 FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, October 30, 2017, at 5 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the Authorization for the Use of Military Force.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, October 30, 2017, at 5:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing on the nomination of: Emily Webster Murphy, of Missouri, to be Administrator of the General Services Administration.

CONDEMNING THE VIOLENCE AND PERSECUTION IN CHECHNYA

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 243, S. Res. 211.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 211) condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert the part printed in italic, and with an amendment to strike the preamble and insert the part printed in italic, as follows:

Whereas, on April 1, 2017, the Russian newspaper Novaya Gazeta reported that authorities in Chechnya, a republic of the Russian Federation, had abducted, detained, and tortured over 100 men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas multiple independent and first-hand accounts have subsequently corroborated the Novaya Gazeta report, and describe a campaign of persecution by Chechen officials against men due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas, as a result of this persecution, at least three deaths have been reported and many individuals have been forced to flee Chechnya;

Whereas Chechen officials have denied the existence of such persecution, including through a statement by the spokesman for Chechen leader Ramzan Kadyrov that ''You cannot arrest or repress people who just don't exist in the republic.'';

Whereas the same spokesman for Ramzan Kadyrov has also stated that ''If such people existed in Chechnya, law enforcement would not have to worry about them, as their own relatives would have sent them to where they could never return,'' and credible reports indicate that Chechen authorities have encouraged families to carry out so-called ''honor killings'' of relatives due to their actual or suspected sexual orientation;

Whereas Chechnya is a republic of the Russian Federation and subject to its laws, and Ramzan Kadyrov was installed as the leader of Chechnya by Russian President Vladimir Putin;

Whereas Chechen authorities have a long history of violating the fundamental human rights of their citizens, including through extrajudicial executions, forced disappearances, and torture of government critics;

Whereas Kremlin spokesman Dmitry Peskov dismissed reports of persecution in Chechnya and termed them ''phantom complaints'';

Whereas the Russian Federation is a participating State of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and thus has agreed to guarantee the fundamental human rights of all of its citizens;

Whereas, on April 7, 2017, the United States Department of State issued a statement saying ''We categorically condemn the persecution of individuals based on their sexual orientation'' and urging the Government of the Russian Federation to take steps to ensure the release of all those wrongfully detained in Chechnya, and to conduct a credible investigation of the reports; and

Whereas, on April 17, 2017, United States Ambassador to the United Nations Nikki Haley issued a statement saying ''Chechen authorities must immediately investigate these allegations, hold anyone involved accountable, and take steps to prevent future abuses. We are against all forms of discrimination, including against people based on sexual orientation. When left unchecked, discrimination and human rights abuses can lead to destabilization and conflict.'': Now, therefore, be it

That the Senate—

(1) condemns the violence and persecution in Chechnya and calls on Chechen officials to immediately cease the abduction, detention, and torture of individuals on the basis of their actual or suspected sexual orientation, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(2) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to protect the human rights of all its citizens, condemn the violence and persecution, investigate the allegations in Chechnya, and hold accountable all those involved in perpetrating such abuses;

(3) calls on the United States Government to continue to condemn the violence and persecution in Chechnya, demand the release of individuals wrongfully detained, and identify those individuals whose involvement in this violence qualifies for the imposition of sanctions under the Sergei Magnitsky Rule of Law Accountability Act of 2012 (Public Law 112–208; 22 U.S.C. 5811 note) or the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (Public Law 114–328); and

(4) affirms the fundamental human rights to peaceful assembly, freedom of association and expression, and freedom from arbitrary detention and torture or cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment, and that governments that fail to respect these rights jeopardize the security and prosperity of all their citizens.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment to the resolution be agreed to.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the resolution?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 211), as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I 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 in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ACADEMY OF NUTRITION AND DIETETICS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Agriculture Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 75.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 75) recognizing the 100th anniversary of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics, the largest organization of food and nutrition professionals in the world.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 75) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 1, 2017, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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. 312, S. Res. 313, and S. Res. 314.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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 were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2017

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, October 31; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Barrett nomination postcloture; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that all time during morning business, recess, adjournment, and leader remarks count postcloture on the Barrett nomination.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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

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

The Senator from Rhode Island.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. REED. Mr. President, a few weeks ago, I traveled to South Korea to better understand the threat posed by North Korea. I would like to share my impressions from the trip and how I believe we should be positioning ourselves to better deal with this current crisis.

I want to recommend to my colleagues and the administration that the time for debate on this issue is now, before the crisis comes to a head. We need to have a clear strategy and increased cooperation with South Korea, Japan, China, and Russia to contain and to deter the nuclear threat posed by North Korea. I have significant concerns that we are not doing everything we can right now to improve our bargaining position with North Korea. I am convinced we must try to find a diplomatic solution to this problem because the alternatives are extraordinarily costly. While we should always remain prepared to go to war and never take that option off the table, I believe as long as there is a possible diplomatic solution to this crisis, we must make every effort to make it a reality.

I would like to spend some time talking about the threat posed by North Korea and then review the history of our diplomatic negotiations since the early nineties.

North Korea voluntarily joined the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, NPT, in 1985. It was clear only a few years later that it was in violation of the NPT.

Our first crisis occurred when Kim Il Sung, the grandfather of the current leader, refused inspections required under the treaty in 1993. Since then, North Korea has engaged in the illegal production of fissile material and nuclear devices, and has conducted six nuclear weapons tests. The latest test occurred just last month on September 3.

The threat we face from North Korea is not just a nuclear weapon aimed at New York City or Washington, DC. This regime has proven over and over again that it will not hesitate to proliferate weapons of mass destruction for financial gain. The proliferation threat is a global one. We can all imagine the consequences of a nuclear weapon in the hands of al-Qaida or ISIS that can be deployed anywhere in the world.

North Korea poses not only a nuclear threat to the globe but also a conventional one. In 2010, the regime torpedoed and sank a South Korean warship, and 46 South Korean sailors lost their lives. Later that year, the regime killed four South Korean citizens when it shelled Yeonpyeong Island. Once this regime achieves its goal of developing a nuclear weapon that can hit the continental United States, we may see increased kinetic attacks against South Korea and Japan and possibly other countries in the region.

North Korea has repeatedly engaged in cyber attacks over the last decade and uses them as an asymmetric weapon against companies and governments alike. It has been attributed with sweeping attacks against the financial industry's Society for Worldwide Interbank Financial Telecommunication or SWIFT protocol to enrich itself to the tune of millions of dollars. This SWIFT protocol is the backbone of the world financial system.

It orchestrated the DarkSeoul cyber attacks in 2013, attacking South Korean news stations and financial institutions, and it was responsible for the destructive and coercive attacks against Sony Pictures, a successful American entertainment company, because it didn't like a movie's depiction of the current leader.

Let us not forget that North Korea engages in horrific human rights violations against its own people. It maintains a system of brutal prison camps that incarcerate thousands of men, women, and children who live in atrocious living conditions under the constant fear of rape, torture, and arbitrary execution. It keeps its civilian population isolated from the rest of the world without access to current news and information that would undermine its propaganda to brainwash its population into believing in and revering their leader and demonizing the Western ideals of freedom and democracy.

I think it is important for us to remember the long and torturous diplomatic path we have walked with North Korea for the last 25 years and recognize the wasted opportunities by past administrations that could have prevented or reduced the threat we face today.

After we realized that North Korea had failed to meet its obligations under the NPT in the mid-nineties, we almost reached a crisis point in the late spring of 1994, as the Clinton administration considered striking the Yongbyon nuclear facility. The crisis was resolved when former President Carter traveled to Pyongyang that summer and brokered the outlines of a deal. North Korea would freeze its plutonium production program in exchange for a light-water nuclear reactor. A final deal was brokered later that year called the Agreed Framework, under which North Korea agreed to freeze its plutonium production programs and to eventually dismantle them in exchange for two nuclear reactors and the prospect of normalization of economic and diplomatic relations.

How did we get from that agreement to today? For starters, in 1998, North Korea tested its first long-range ballistic missile, and that began to unravel the deal. The Clinton administration attempted to salvage the Agreed Framework by negotiating additional terms to stop its missile program but was unable to conclude arrangements before President Clinton left office. After President Bush took office in 2001, the new administration wanted to distance itself from Clinton's policies and stopped negotiating the Agreed Framework in earnest. North Korea, reacting to the Bush administration's new hostile tone, also stepped away from the talks.

For example, in January 2002, President Bush delivered his ''axis of evil'' State of the Union speech that identified North Korea as a regime ''arming [itself] with missiles and weapons of mass destruction, while starving its citizens.'' In April of that year, President Bush issued a memorandum stating he would not certify North Korea's

compliance with the Agreed Framework. Rumors also abounded at this time about North Korea's pursuit of a uranium-based nuclear weapon, which were confirmed in October of 2002. By the end of 2002, diplomatic efforts having stalled, North Korea expelled inspectors from the country, withdrew from the NPT in early 2003, and turned fuel rods that the United States had helped to store safely under the Agreed Framework into weapons-grade plutonium. It was a lost opportunity to go back to the drawing board, reengage with the North Korean regime, and attempt to find a comprehensive deal that would include both its plutonium and uranium programs, as well as the missile program.

After North Korea admitted in April 2003 that it possessed nuclear weapons but was willing to get rid of its program in exchange for something ''considerable'' from the United States, the so-called Six-Party Talks started in August of that year and eventually reached an agreement in September of 2005, in which North Korea committed to the other five parties that it would abandon all nuclear weapons and existing nuclear programs.

At this point, North Korea's nuclear program had made significant progress, and forcing the North Korean regime to implement the agreement and stop its program would have required a significant diplomatic investment by the United States, but at that time we were fighting two wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and did not see North Korea as the highest priority.

After North Korea tested a nuclear device in 2006, we had a moment when the other parties to the Six-Party Talks were even more resolved to work together. The Six-Party Talks did produce two additional agreements in which North Korea froze the plutonium program, turned over operating records, and dismantled the cooling tower, but they again faltered and then failed over verification measures. It is possible that with consistent pressure and cooperation with the other parties, we could have convinced North Korea to follow through on its verification commitments. Then the North Korean leader suffered a stroke in 2008, and President Bush left office in January 2009, complicating matters even more. North Korea greeted the newly elected Obama administration with a ballistic missile test in April 2009 and a nuclear test in May.

After Kim Jong Un took control of North Korea in 2011, the situation became even more challenging when it became clear that there was a new and concerted effort to advance their nuclear program. The Obama administration struck the so-called Leap Day Deal—both countries separately announced an agreement to suspend operations at its Yongbyon uranium enrichment plant and invited the International Atomic Energy Agency or IAEA inspectors to monitor the suspension and implement moratoriums on nuclear long-range missile tests. In exchange, we offered a generous food aid package. It was an attempt to begin the process of denuclearization but was short-lived since North Korea announced its plans to launch a satellite in violation of U.N. resolutions only 2 weeks after the agreement was announced. Yet, again, it was a lost opportunity to really challenge the current leader before he had consolidated power within North Korea over a provocation that did not need to derail negotiations.

My purpose in reviewing this history is to note that there were opportunities, especially under the Agreed Framework and later during the Six-Party Talks, to reengage the North Korean Government and find a comprehensive diplomatic solution.

We missed those opportunities and deferred this problem and now we are in a much worse negotiating position than in any time in history. Of course, we cannot ignore that the biggest problem has always been North Korea's failure to stand by its commitments and its covert development of programs despite repeated assurances during negotiations. That is why I believe we need to make sure any deal includes stringent verification measures, with snapback sanctions and economic measures that will cripple the North Korean economy and starve it of any resources it can use for a nuclear program. While I understand the risks inherent in any deal with North Korea, I believe the alternatives are much riskier.

I would like to be very clear. While we will prevail in a war against North Korea, it will not look like winning. I want to paint for you the very stark and grim reality we will be facing in a conflict against North Korea. First, it would and should not be lost on anyone that the United States has never fought against a nuclear-armed state. Even if we were to engage in a preemptive war with North Korea now, it currently has the capability to hit both South Korea and Japan, our main staging areas and where the majority of our troops would be located, with a nuclear weapon. The irony is that by striking first to prevent a nuclear strike against the United States, we would be significantly increasing the likelihood of a nuclear strike against ourselves or our allies.

Even if North Korea does not hit South Korea or Japan with a nuclear weapon, a conventional war would be devastating. Within the first weeks, we would see tens, if not hundreds, of thousands of civilian casualties from the long-range artillery strategically aimed at the 25 million citizens of Seoul. There are some 250,000 American citizens living in South Korea who would need to be evacuated, mostly from Seoul, while the city is under siege. The United States has never conducted a noncombatant evacuation operation of this scale. It is likely that most U.S. citizens would not be able to be evacuated within the first week of hostilities, resulting in massive U.S. civilian casualties in addition to the thousands of our Korean friends who would also lose their lives.

Moreover, either in anticipation of hostilities or in response to a preemptive attack, North Korea will engage in significant cyber operations that will strike at infrastructure throughout the world, including the United States. Further complicating the scenario is the fact that North Korean cyber operations are conducted outside of its territory, principally in China. Without any prior agreement with these countries, we would be faced with the difficult decision of how to stop these remote North Korean operations.

Let us also not discount the cascading economic effects of war. The South Korean economy would be in ruins, and shortly thereafter, the Asian markets and the global market would begin to see the effects. As noted by Emerging Asia Economics Focus by Capital Economics with regard to the potential economic impacts of such a war, South Korea accounts for around 2 percent of global economic output. If South Korea's GDP fell only by half, that would result in a 1-percent decrease in global GDP, not to mention a huge disruption to global supply chains. The U.S. Federal debt would go up considerably. Collectively, this war could cost us billions, in addition to the actual financial and military resources that we would need to expend.

To those who think we will have a quick and certain military victory, I would say that our assumptions of a quick victory have been proven wrong many times in our history. We will not be viewed as liberators by the majority of the North Korean population, who have been taught from birth that the United States initiated the hostilities that led to the Korean war and is determined to destroy their country. The Korean war, during which the North Koreans suffered massive casualties and a constant bombing campaign that reportedly killed almost 20 percent of its population, is within the living memory of older North Koreans.

Add to that the incredibly risky missions of locating, isolating, and neutralizing nuclear, chemical, and biological weapon sites and the thousands of underground facilities in North Korea and we are looking at a month-long kinetic campaign with a years-long stabilization effort, not to mention the decades it will take not only to reconstruct North Korea but to bring its infrastructure and population forward to the 21st century.

We also cannot underestimate the reactions of the global community, especially China, if we act prematurely. China has a defense treaty with North Korea, and although it has publicly stated that it will not aid North Korea if North Korea attacks first, we cannot gauge what China's reaction will be if it determines that we were the initial aggressors.

Again, we will prevail after a long, bloody, and costly fight, but it will not look like winning. We must do everything we can now to set the theater to win the war, and then do everything in our power to avoid it. To that end, we should exhaust every single diplomatic avenue for peace before considering other options. We have an obligation to our men and women in uniform to vigorously seek a diplomatic solution before using military force. We also need to convince our allies, especially South Korea and Japan, that we are serious about their security and have made every effort to avoid conflict. We will undermine our own credibility and our standing in the world if we rush to war without demonstrating our commitment to peace.

Finally, even if diplomacy fails—and I fear that our likelihood of success is low, given the history I have laid out above—there are certain advantages to being secured solely through the process of negotiating that will be significant achievements in their own right.

First, we will have a much better sense of what the current regime's strategic interests are. It was clear Kim Il Sung, the present leader's grandfather, had three strategic priorities: to use the nuclear program to blackmail the rest of the world for economic concessions; to appeal to the North Korean populace, who had been told that nuclear weapons were a mantle of legitimacy; and to scapegoat the United States with North Korea's economic problems, arguing that the sacrifices made by the North Korean people were necessary to fend off U.S. imperial aggression.

It is less clear where the current regime's interests lie. It is possible that Kim Jong Un is interested only in regime survival and will be willing to agree to a deal that will freeze its programs and instead focus its attention on developing its infrastructure and improving its economic growth in exchange for guarantees that we will not seek regime change.

Despite our strongest sanctions programme to date, the North Korean economy is growing, albeit from a remarkably low starting point. Kim Jong Un has taken a page from the Chinese economic plan of the 1980s and 1990s and significantly increased the economic prosperity of his people. While maintaining strict social and political control, he has opened the economy through decollectivization, the reduction of market restrictions, and allowing small private enterprises to flourish. The North Korean economy grew more than 3 percent last year. It is clear that Kim Jong Un is interested in allowing his economy to develop and in providing greater economic opportunity to his people.

But it is also possible that Kim Jong Un has more aggressive ambitions and seeks to finish his grandfather's goal of reuniting the peninsula under North Korean rule. I believe we should spend the time to try to understand Kim Jong Un's ultimate goals and whether peace is really on the table.

Second, we will have the moral authority to go to war having demonstrated to the world that we negotiated in good faith and that the North Korean regime is not interested in peace. It will also give us an opportunity to better understand and coordinate on China's strategic interests. While China is also quite concerned and alarmed by the nuclear programs, it has a considerable interest in maintaining stability on the peninsula to avoid regime collapse, to avoid a humanitarian crisis triggered by millions of refugees flowing across its southern border, and to avoid the possibility of a biological or chemical weapon attack or a nuclear attack so close to its territory.

Diplomacy may offer the opportunity to find common ground with China on these issues—issues that concern us as well—and to coordinate our responses in the event of a contingency. We should discuss end states with China that take into account their vital national interests.

Finally, we should be able to receive some commitments from other countries, especially China, with regard to the enforcement of sanctions as an aid to the diplomatic process. To date China has been unwilling to exert the type of pressure necessary to cause real economic pressure on the North Korean regime. I believe we should push for an agreement with China and Russia on even stronger sanctions that will be immediately enforced during the negotiation process and will continue to be enforced if the negotiations fail.

We should be expending every possible resource now to set the right conditions for diplomacy and to improve our negotiation position. This administration has not created the right conditions to date, and there are four areas that I believe we need to focus on today: consistent and clear messaging to North Korea and the world; increasing our diplomatic and military capacity; improving international cooperation and coordination; and increasing pressure on the North Korean regime through better sanctions enforcement, military pressure, and information operations.

There has been a marked failure to consistently message to the North Koreans, our allies in the region, other global players like Russia and China, and the rest of the world. Secretary Tillerson has repeatedly made public statements regarding our intentions to pursue a diplomatic solution with North Korea and has been consistently undercut by the President's commentary that we are not really interested in diplomacy. While I understand the President's intent might be to demonstrate that we can and will use military force if necessary, there are certainly more artful ways of making that message clear than tweeting that the Secretary of State is ''wasting his time trying to negotiate with Rocket Man.''

This is not a time for incoherence or confusion. We need to be as precise and clear as possible with regard to the administration's avowed strong preference for diplomacy.

Likewise, President Trump's speech at the United Nations General Assembly sent exactly the wrong message to North Korea and to our ally South Korea. Threatening to destroy North Korea, a country of 25 million people, may send a deterrence message, but it also plays into the regime's narrative that we are out to destroy them. We should not be feeding into Kim Jong Un's propaganda machine by reaffirming their mistaken belief that we are interested in annihilating their country, and we should not be signaling to South Korea that this administration does not take its security seriously.

I sincerely hope that the President does not repeat his tone-deaf messaging during his upcoming speech to the Korean National Assembly. The Government of Korea needs to hear a clear commitment to diplomacy and a clear commitment to protect the Republic of Korea as is required by our alliance.

In this regard, it is disturbing to hear of reports that officials responsible for executing our diplomacy with regard to North Korea are, as reported in an October 25 Foreign Policy situation report, ''frustrated by an inability to communicate the urgency of the situation to the White House.'' Unless there is consistency in our message and constant and acute attention from the White House, we are on a path to disaster.

In addition to consistent messaging, we need to drastically improve our capacity, both diplomatic and military, to position ourselves for any negotiation with North Korea. It is diplomatic malpractice that there is no U.S. Ambassador to South Korea. The President is heading there in a few days. There is insufficient time, even if an Ambassador were to be named tomorrow, to confirm that individual before the President's trip. We have a key diplomatic post that has been empty for 8 months. There is also no Assistant Secretary of State for Asia in the State Department or in the Department of Defense. While we have Acting Assistant Secretaries, that is no substitute for the political appointees who will be able to operate with far greater freedom and support from the administration. I urge this administration to fill these positions immediately.

Since sanctions are our most important diplomatic tool, it is also astounding that Secretary Tillerson is eliminating the State Department's Coordinator for Sanction Policy office, ''which has been led by a veteran ambassador-rank diplomat with at least five staff'' as reported in an October 26 Foreign Policy article. He will reportedly entrust this critical task to one individual in his Policy Planning Office.

One of the most important elements to strengthening our bargaining position is demonstrating that we are prepared to fight if necessary. When I was in South Korea, I spoke at great length with our military commanders, including General Brooks, about our readiness. I was very impressed by not only how prepared we are to go to war but also how integrated our operations are with the Republic of Korea's.

Even so, I believe there are some additional measures that should be taken now. Specifically, I believe we need to increase our intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance operations, our strike capabilities, and strengthen our missile defense capabilities in the region with more Patriot, THAAD, and SM–3 interceptors, as well as increase our critical munitions stocks to ensure that we are providing credible military options on the Korean Peninsula. We should be providing U.S. Forces Korea with every tool they may need to prosecute a possible war. However, even this increased readiness would not overcome the massive casualties and possible use of nuclear weapons that I outlined before.

As we have learned time and time again, the multilateral approach is the best path to a successful outcome, whether in diplomacy or war. There are a number of countries whose national security interests are touched by the North Korean threat, although I would submit that North Korea poses a global challenge because of the risk created by its nuclear weapons and human rights violations.

First and foremost, we need to better coordinate our messaging and strategy with our allies, South Korea and Japan. It will be nearly impossible to initiate any unilateral action against North Korea without the commitment and cooperation of South Korea and Japan. The majority of our forces are either stationed or flowing through those two countries. They are indispensable and equal partners in the crisis and should be treated as such.

We cannot assume that South Korea and Japan have identical interests to us or that they are in complete agreement on all aspects of our strategy. Through constant diplomacy, we can ensure that we enter into negotiations with the same objectives and understand our partners' interests and their tolerance for risk. We also need to push our partners to work better together. For example, at the end of last year, South Korea and Japan entered into a General Security of Military Information Agreement to share sensitive information on North Korea's missile and nuclear activities. However, this agreement has yet to be implemented, to the detriment of the security of South Korea, Japan, and the United States. Our allies must learn to work in concert to ensure we are in the best position to deal with the threat we all face.

Second, we should be seriously considering some combination of multiparty talks with the relevant stakeholders, including China and Russia, to first establish some basic redlines that can be conveyed to the North Korean Government: No atmospheric tests of nuclear weapons, no electromagnetic pulse attacks, and no missile attacks on the United States, its allies, or any country. These talks should be also geared toward getting additional commitments on sanctions, especially from China and Russia, that have to date failed to fully implement sanctions against North Korea.

If we can come to some agreement among ourselves about the path forward and show a unified, diplomatic front to North Korea, I believe we will be much more successful in any negotiations.

It is also critical that we increase the pressure on North Korea and create less operating space for the regime to pursue its ballistic missile and nuclear ambitions.

We are not at the maximum level of sanctions that can be imposed on North Korea. There are financial institutions that are conducting transactions with North Korea that have not yet been subjected to sanctions. We should be pursuing sanctions against every institution, no matter how large or small, that conducts even a single transaction with this regime. There are significant authorities that have been created, both through the United Nations and by other authorities, to go after companies and individuals who are doing business with North Korea. The issue, as I see it, is enforcement. Our Treasury Department, in cooperation with the State Department, must act faster to target these bad actors. Time is not on our side. Every day that passes is a day that Kim Jong Un is closer to the goal of achieving an intercontinental ballistic missile that can hit the eastern seaboard of the United States with a nuclear weapon.

In addition to financial institutions, we must starve the regime of the resources it needs to support its elites and the military—whether through coal or overseas labor, every avenue of revenue must be cut off.

We need to make a concerted effort through our diplomatic channels to cut off North Korea's access to hard currency. Every country that continues to employ North Korean labor and allow North Korean business to operate within its borders needs to know that there will be economic and diplomatic consequences for its behavior. To those who argue that we would be punishing everyday North Koreans with these measures, I would note that the vast majority of funds are remitted to the regime to use for its nefarious purposes.

We should be engaging every single country with a North Korean Embassy that has not yet been closed to follow Spain and Mexico's example and order them closed. It has been reported for years that these Embassies operate as fronts for North Korea's illicit activities, including trading in counterfeit currency, arms smuggling, and circumventing sanctions by selling prohibited goods.

China needs to be convinced not only to cut off the fuel supply to North Korea but also to clamp down on the regime's use of its financial institutions. Russia employs thousands of workers and stands ready to sell fuel to North Korea, acting opportunistically instead of as the global leader it makes itself out to be.

The United States withheld nearly $300 million in military assistance to Egypt after we discovered that the military had purchased 30,000 North Korean rocket-propelled grenades.

I believe it is our failure to exact severe consequences on the countries that do business with North Korea that has allowed the regime to spread its workers and exports across the globe and reap billions of dollars from the global economy.

North Korea needs to realize that its reckless pursuit of nuclear weapons has left it with no allies, no friends, and no financial resources. This is one reason why the devastating cuts to the State Department and the failure to adequately staff our diplomatic corps is such a wasted opportunity to increase our diplomatic capacity to spread this message to all the countries that work with North Korea.

We need to increase the military pressure on North Korea. This requires flying close surveillance missions and continuing our exercises and posture on the peninsula. We need to make it clear to Pyongyang that while we prefer diplomacy, we will not hesitate to use military force if necessary. To that end, we should be doing everything to set the military theater on the peninsula in our favor.

Finally, we have not sufficiently countered the propaganda that has brainwashed the North Korean people into believing that we are their enemies and that we seek to destroy their country. We should be increasing the budgeting for Radio Free Asia and other organizations that everyday North Koreans can access. We should also be exposing the North Korean people, through every avenue available, to real information about the world and the deplorable conditions that their leadership has created within their country.

I believe it was a mistake to do away with the position of Special Envoy for North Korean Human Rights. We need more diplomats fully engaged and working on improving the human rights conditions for millions of North Korean citizens, helping North Korean refugees, and increasing efforts to educate them.

We should be just as concerned with internal pressure on the regime as we are with external pressure. The Soviet Union collapsed because everyday Soviet citizens saw how far behind their Western counterparts the USSR's policies had left them. Everyday North Koreans want the same things: security,

stability, and the ability to educate and raise their children in peace and prosperity. That is the message we should be promoting in North Korea.

I wish I could stand here and say that I am confident we can negotiate a deal with the North Koreans to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula. This may have been possible in the late 1990s under the Agreed Framework, but it will be very challenging now. The price of peace has risen dramatically since that time. Administration after administration kicked the can down the road, and now we are left with a North Korean regime that is very close to developing a nuclear-armed ICBM that can hit the United States and a North Korean leader who observed the fates of Saddam Hussein and Muammar Qadhafi and has decided that his regime will only survive if he has a nuclear weapon capable of hitting the United States.

We may need to be willing to accept a deal short of denuclearization that includes a verifiable freeze on the development and testing of nuclear weapons and missile programs. We will likely need to have some interim confidence-building agreements over a period of months or years short of this goal to build momentum. Obtaining the necessary agreements regarding verification and inspections will be the most challenging aspects of the deal and I worry may derail our best efforts at negotiation.

There will likely be discussion of reducing our military presence on the peninsula and curtailing our joint military exercises with the Republic of Korea. I believe we should not agree to any reduction of joint exercises in exchange for a freeze, but I do think we should carefully consider whether there should be a step down in military exercises on both sides to reduce tensions and build confidence.

Any agreement will need to contain strict prohibitions on proliferation and an international observation organization to ensure that North Korea is not selling its nuclear or missile technology to other countries or nonstate actors.

It is important that we all recognize that we are not faced with the binary options that many people are fond of promoting—denuclearization or war. There are diplomatic options short of denuclearization that we may be forced to consider. If diplomacy fails, our only alternative is not a kinetic one. There is the same option we chose when Russia and China became nuclear states—accept the risks and mitigate it through isolation, containment, and deterrence.

I would like to note that the costs associated with this path are very high but still likely less than the cost of war. There is a significantly lower risk of the loss of life.

For example, we will need to invest even more heavily in our missile defense, and even after investing millions of dollars, we are left in a position where we won't have confidence that we can shoot down every single missile pointed at Washington, DC, or New York. That is where we were with the Soviet Union and still are with the Russians today.

We will also need to increase our funding for overhead intelligence to make sure we have the most accurate information, minute by minute, about developments within North Korea.

Additionally, we will need to maintain a strictly enforced sanctions regime for years to come, and we will need to work diligently to overcome the inevitable sanctions fatigue.

We will also need to invest even more heavily in our agencies that prosecute sanctions. We will need a nimble Treasury, State Department, and intelligence community that can identify and quickly target bad actors. The North Korean regime has proven itself quite able to engage in illegal and illicit activities as varied as cyber crime, arms sales, currency, counterfeiting, narcotics, and wildlife trafficking. Empowering our State, Treasury, and intelligence Departments to identify and target these illicit activities and schemes will be expensive, both in manpower and diplomatic negotiations with countries that stand to profit from these arrangements.

We will also need to work hard to prevent a nuclear arms race in the Asia-Pacific region. There are already elements in South Korea that are agitating for the return of tactical nuclear weapons. As North Korea's nuclear program grows more robust, these elements will only get stronger. Even nuclear-adverse Japan may reconsider its position as it feels more pressure from its neighbor to the west. The risks of proliferation in Asia and the rest of the world are high. Let us remember that proliferation is not the solution, it is the problem.

We need to be clear-eyed about the threat we face from North Korea. Years of indecision have left us with a number of imperfect and expensive options. North Korea's aggressive behavior has led us to the brink of war. We are in a time of uncertain peace.

I would urge this administration and my colleagues to consider the costs of war that I have outlined and for all of us, Republicans and Democrats, to work toward a peaceful and diplomatic solution to this crisis now.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:39 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 31, 2017, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

IRVING DENNIS, OF OHIO, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, VICE BRADFORD RAYMOND HUTHER.

OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

STEVEN GARDNER, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT, VICE JOSEPH G. PIZARCHIK.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

M. LEE MCCLENNY, OF WASHINGTON, 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 PARAGUAY.

CARLOS TRUJILLO, OF FLORIDA, TO BE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

PETER HENDRICK VROOMAN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF RWANDA.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

KENNETH L. MARCUS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, VICE CATHERINE ELIZABETH LHAMON.

THE JUDICIARY

CARMEN GUERRICAGOITIA MCLEAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE GREGORY E. JACKSON, RETIRED.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

ROBERT M. DUNCAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2018, VICE THURGOOD MARSHALL, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

ROBERT M. DUNCAN, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2025. (REAPPOINTMENT)

CALVIN R. TUCKER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2023, VICE CAROLYN L. GALLAGHER, TERM EXPIRED.

DAVID WILLIAMS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2019, VICE DENNIS J. TONER, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. LISA M. FRANCHETTI

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 30, 2017:

THE JUDICIARY

TREVOR N. MCFADDEN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.