

authorization lapses. I was a part of that group. We talked about the need to have this program reauthorized again before it expires. Now the deadline is just about 78 days away.

I must also mention that we have yet to fulfill our promise on funding for LWCF. We need to fully fund that program. It is something I hope we can do in the near future.

While I believe the structure of the Restore Our Parks bill is sufficient and that the same will not happen here, we need to ensure our full commitment to this new effort, so it doesn't suffer the same fate, by making sure we have the funding promised by Congress.

I urge my colleagues to find a bipartisan path forward to permanently authorize and to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund because access to the land we are trying to maintain is as important as the parks themselves.

I again thank my colleagues for coming together on the Restore Our Parks Act in recognition of the necessary, overdue fix to address our park unit's deferred maintenance backlog that has persisted for far too many years.

Thank you.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back the remainder of the time.

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

All time is expired.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 23, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 154 Ex.]

YEAS—70

Alexander	Flake	Murray
Barrasso	Gardner	Nelson
Bennet	Graham	Perdue
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Boozman	Hassan	Reed
Burr	Hatch	Risch
Cantwell	Heinrich	Roberts
Capito	Heitkamp	Rounds
Cardin	Heller	Rubio
Carper	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Coons	Johnson	Smith
Corker	Jones	Tester
Cornyn	Kaine	Thune
Cotton	Kennedy	Toomey
Crapo	King	Udall
Cruz	Klobuchar	Van Hollen
Daines	Lankford	Warner
Donnelly	Manchin	Whitehouse
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young
Ernst	Murkowski	
Fischer	Murphy	

NAYS—23

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Peters
Blumenthal	Harris	Sanders
Booker	Hirono	Schatz
Brown	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Lee	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Markey	Warren
Duckworth	Menendez	Wyden
Feinstein	Merkley	

NOT VOTING—7

Hyde-Smith	Paul	Tillis
McCain	Schumer	
Moran	Shaheen	

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 595.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2018.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Tom Cotton, Johnny Isakson, John Kennedy, John Thune, John Boozman, Roy Blunt, John Cornyn, Tim Scott, Richard Burr, Thom Tillis, Cory Gardner, Roger F. Wicker, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, Jerry Moran.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 892.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Andrew S. Oldham, of Texas, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Bob Corker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 903.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be

United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Ryan Wesley Bounds, of Oregon, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Roger F. Wicker, Steve Daines, Richard Burr, Mike Rounds, Bob Corker, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, Johnny Isakson, Orrin G. Hatch, John Cornyn, David Perdue, John Barrasso, John Hoeven, Roy Blunt.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions be waived.

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

The Senator from Arizona.

NATO SUMMIT

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a matter of great import, given the events of the past few days in Europe as they relate to friends, foes, and peace. Global peace is not a zero-sum game, and global alliances ought not be subject to whim, impulse, opaque machinations, or material threats of cancellation over internal disagreements. The world relies on the United States for stable and reliable leadership, and we have in turn benefited greatly from the peace and stability for which we have been the chief guarantors. This is not a subject that is even debatable.

Lately, the President of the United States has been characterizing our most vital relationships around the world in purely transactional terms, asserting that America has been taken advantage of, and he has gone so far as to suggest that when it comes to our relationship with our NATO partners, we get nothing for our troubles.

Nothing for a stable and peaceful Europe? This is the danger in viewing these relationships as mere transactions, absent our shared values. Absent values, the world is nothing but a cruel and cold place of warring camps and territorial ambitions and no durable alliances whatsoever. To view the world this way requires a frightening unawareness of the postwar security order that we ourselves created.

This posture of antagonism and suspicion toward our partners and peace can be held only when you blot out 70 of the most consequential years of the world. Apart from our shared sacrifice and our shared security, what we have been through together over those 70

years cannot adequately be reflected on any ledger or list of petty grievances, and a seeming ignorance of the scale of that history is blundering and strange.

The mindset that comprehends a trade deficit as a grievous offense or an unfair act of aggression is the same mindset that can upend vital security relationships that have been similarly misperceived. Sometimes, if I didn't know better, I might say that we are purposefully trying to destabilize the Western alliance and to turn the world upside down. I might come to this conclusion because, by a process of elimination, no other answer would make any sense.

If this is some kind of stratagem, what good could possibly be achieved by heedlessly making friends into enemies, and who, exactly, would benefit? What would this President replace the Western alliance with? There simply is no better order that could be achieved by this destabilization.

Today, I rise to pose a few questions, and I believe there is much riding on the answers to these questions.

A couple of days ago, the President of the United States said that his upcoming meeting with Russian President Vladimir Putin would likely be easier than his meeting with America's most important allies at the NATO summit. Why would a President—any President—say such a thing? The Russian President, at the very least, personally directed a propaganda campaign and an extraordinarily ambitious series of cyber attacks aimed at the integrity of our elections in 2016, and we have been told that these attacks are continuing. He has shown no signs whatsoever of changing his behavior.

The Russian President is a man schooled in treachery and espionage. He jails and murders his opponents, presides over a mafia state, and he is an enemy of democracy. Why would a meeting with Putin be easier than a meeting with the allies we rely on most to be a bulwark against him?

Vladimir Putin is not "fine," as the President recently asserted. And singing his praises for no good reason sends a terrifying message to our allies, especially those countries that share a border with Russia. Flattering such a man, who has demonstrated his hostility toward us and contempt for our values and has recently annexed parts of neighboring sovereign countries, is simply bizarre. That the admiration comes from an American President—well, that is unconscionable.

The President, of course, continues to entertain Mr. Putin's denial of election interference and otherwise hardly mentions the Russian attacks on us, other than to talk about the Russia hoax or to refer to Mueller's investigation into the attacks as a "witch hunt"—this, in spite of conclusive and overwhelming proof of Russian involvement generated from investigations conducted by his own government. Why?

Then, before the recent G7 meeting, the President called for Russia to be readmitted to the G7, in spite of the fact that Moscow continues to occupy Crimea and has shown no remorse whatsoever for its behavior toward the United States. Why?

Then, yesterday in Brussels, the President offered a twisted interpretation of how NATO works and how it is financed in order to frame a grievance against our NATO allies, supposedly on behalf of the American taxpayer. Why?

Why would an American President create such conflict? Why does the President's complaint about our closest friends on the global stage unnervingly echo the Russian position? Mr. Putin's singular foreign policy goal is to weaken democracies and destroy the Western alliance. Could we possibly be helping him any more in his quest than by baselessly attacking our own allies?

The antipathy and hostility toward our friends and allies are simply inexplicable, but it is not good enough for us just to say that. It is our job and obligation in this body to try to end it—to reassure our allies that they are still our allies.

Over the Independence Day holiday, I had the privilege to lead a bipartisan and bicameral delegation to the Nordic and Baltic states to talk to our friends whose view of the Russian threat is much more intimate than ours and to hear of the concerns of the leaders there—NATO allies and partners. We wanted to assess the threat for ourselves.

In Latvia, where 40 percent of the population is ethnic Russian, the propaganda from Moscow is strong and unrelenting: The NATO alliance is weak. It will not last. The United States is an unreliable ally.

These themes have lately become very familiar on this side of the Atlantic as well.

The people of Latvia, ethnic Russians, and otherwise, pay close attention when an American President is reported to have said things like Crimea is rightfully part of Russia because the people in Crimea speak Russian. Well, there is a lot of Russian spoken in Latvia too. Does that mean that the United States would concede to Russian aggression against Latvia on this basis?

Vladimir Putin presides dictatorially over the remains of a collapsed empire. All he has now are nationalism and territorial ambitions and nostalgic appeals to former glory. He is not a strong leader for his people, as our President has said, any more than Kim Jong Un's people love their dictator, as he has also said. If we fail to see these things clearly, then we fail the world, and we fail ourselves, and we dishonor those from our own country and from our allied countries who kept the Soviet menace at bay for half a century as the world hung in the balance.

We are now told that the President will be meeting one-on-one with Mr.