

Act, and argued to strike down the Affordable Care Act's contraception coverage mandate.

So from reproductive rights to civil rights to gun safety, name a partisan legal case from the past 5 years, and there is a good chance that Britt Grant has been involved, taking up a fringe legal argument—way out of the American mainstream—to weaken well-established rights and overturn precedent in pursuit of an ideological objective.

I would also like to bring to my colleagues' attention that in speeches and in handwritten notes—even with this extreme record—Judge Brett Kavanaugh has repeatedly praised Britt Grant's record. In fact, Kavanaugh called Britt Grant “a superb solicitor general of Georgia.” That is someone with these extreme views.

Judge Kavanaugh's ringing endorsement of Britt Grant's record may serve as a window into his own judicial philosophy. It makes you wonder: What, exactly, does Judge Kavanaugh agree with her on so that he would call her so many laudatory things?

Does he agree with Britt Grant that a woman's constitutional, guaranteed freedom to make her own reproductive choices should be curtailed, even though an overwhelming majority of Americans support Roe? Does he believe, like Britt Grant, that States should be able to define marriage as only between a man and a woman, even though the Supreme Court has declared things the other way? Does he believe, like Britt Grant, that insurers shouldn't have to provide contraceptive coverage?

Britt Grant is the kind of lawyer Judge Kavanaugh, in his own words, considers “superb.” Maybe that is why they both ended up on the same short list of 25 potential out-of-the-mainstream court nominees—out of the mainstream because they were vetted by the Heritage Foundation, which believes that the government should not be involved in healthcare, and by the Federalist Society, whose leader's goal is to repeal Roe v. Wade, even though 71 percent of Americans are against that repeal.

Whether you are a Democrat or a Republican or Independent, you should want a better process for choosing judges. The American people deserve judges from the legal mainstream who will interpret the law rather than make it, who will respect and defer to precedent unless there is a darn good reason not to—not just folks picked off some list prevetted by extreme conservative groups that don't represent what a majority of Americans think, and they probably don't even represent what a majority of Republicans think. But the Republican majority has been advancing an assembly line of nakedly partisan, ideological judges like Britt Grant. That Judge Kavanaugh has praised her record so roundly is concerning.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I intend to speak for a few moments as in morning business concerning the National Flood Insurance Program, which is set to expire tomorrow night at midnight, July 31, and which certainly this body will not allow to expire. We will undoubtedly reauthorize the program and not leave millions of Americans without flood protection at the height of the Atlantic hurricane season.

The House has sent us legislation that provides for a clean reauthorization, temporary as it may be. It will keep the program going without injecting reforms or changes, and it reassures homeowners and property owners across the country who rely on this program that it will still be there and that they can count on it.

We are not bathing ourselves in glory by doing this. I think we would all acknowledge that passing this reauthorization right before the deadline does not entitle us to pat ourselves on the back. Instead, it should motivate Members to work across the aisle to provide meaningful reforms. I have a suggestion or two for some meaningful reforms when we take this up on a permanent basis.

We may have assured Americans today and tomorrow that when we act on this, they can rely on the National Flood Insurance Program through No-

vember, but we need to assure them that they can rely on the program for the next year, for the next 5 years, or for 10 years. That will be a challenge over the next several months.

We need to make this program financially sustainable for the long term, but we also need to assure property owners that they are not going to be hit with a huge insurance bill they can't afford. History does not provide the public with very much encouragement with regard to actually getting some reforms done. We have to keep it going with a patchwork.

Out of the 41 times that the National Flood Insurance Program has been reauthorized over the past 20 years, reforms have been included only 3 times out of 41. That is not a great record. I hope that before the end of this calendar year, we can add a fourth substantive change to make some progress.

One thing I hope we can do is to enact the changes to the COASTAL Act in a bill that I have introduced called the COASTAL Implementation Act. If you recall, after Hurricane Katrina, we saw how discrepancies between wind damage and water damage on the total-loss properties often prevented property owners from being made whole. There was a dispute between the flood insurance folks and the wind insurance folks, and the property owner was caught in the middle.

The COASTAL Act and the followup COASTAL Implementation Act seeks to address these discrepancies with better data collection and more accurate poststorm assessments. More specifically, we want NOAA, or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to be able to assess the strength of wind and water at affected sites. With sound data, the property owners can receive fair compensation for their losses—some, perhaps, from the flood insurance coverage, and some from the wind insurance coverage. Reducing cases of “indeterminate losses” would ultimately reduce costs to the National Flood Insurance Program and better serve the public.

My other reform proposal also seeks to arm us with better data. I call this legislation the MEMA Act, which stands for Municipality Empowerment Mapping Achievement. Under this act, FEMA would publish the NFIP's rate maps. These maps would cover the entire United States, and they would be created using the latest technology. Information on an area's flood hazard risks should be accessible and comprehensive.

Accurate maps can also help to draw businesses to our smaller communities. Without this information, these businesses might go to a nearby urban area to invest. The playing field should be leveled in this regard. Other ideas, such as competition from the private sector, can help to bring down high flood insurance rates.

What we don't want to do is to drive folks away from coastal areas. Forty

percent of our population lives in a coastal county. There are 56 million jobs there, and more than \$8 trillion is produced in goods and services, according to NOAA.

Let's also not forget about our rivers and inland waterways. The Mississippi River, for example, accounts for a \$400 billion annual economic impact. When communities near a river, lake, or ocean suffer, the effects can ripple across the whole Nation. Try as we might, we can't prevent floods. We can mitigate and try to guard against them and try to strengthen our protection, but we can't eliminate flooding from happening. They are the most frequent natural disaster. We should do what we can to mitigate the damage and costs.

It is also worth reminding my colleagues that the National Flood Insurance Program is a program that serves ordinary people—workers and families who are just trying to make an honest living and who do not want to see everything they have washed away in a flood. These 5 million Americans pay their flood insurance premiums, and they should be able to live without worry that should a disaster strike, they will be left high and dry.

I call on my colleagues in the next day and a half to pass this short-term authorization, and, certainly, we will do that on a bipartisan basis. Then, let's give the Banking Committee and people who are concentrating on this issue some bipartisan support to pass much needed reforms.

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

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

NOMINATION OF BRETT KAVANAUGH

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, there are few responsibilities—I would say none—more important than our duties in connection with the appointment of a Supreme Court Justice. Much is at stake in the nomination that is before the Senate now to appoint Judge Brett Kavanaugh as the Justice who will replace Justice Kennedy. So much is at stake—the future of *Roe v. Wade*, affordable healthcare, particularly, preexisting conditions and the protections of them for millions of Americans.

But I am not here to talk about Judge Kavanaugh as a nominee. I am here to talk about how we reach a conclusion as to how my colleagues and I vote and how we seek and pursue the truth about Judge Kavanaugh, his qualifications, his temperament, his integrity and intellect, who he is, and what kind of Justice he will be.

The best way to do it is to know what he has written and said—all of his writings and opinions and the articles he has written. These points are pretty basic.

I am struck by our colleagues' objection to our seeking documents they have sought in connection with past nominees when they were made by Presidents of our party. When President Obama nominated Justice Kagan, Republicans asked for documents from her years in the Clinton administration, her tenure as dean of the Harvard Law School, and even her clerkship for Justice Thurgood Marshall. Senator GRASSLEY, now the chairman of the Judiciary Committee said at the time: "For the Senate to fulfill its constitutional responsibility of advice and consent, we must get all of her documents . . . and have enough time to analyze them so we can determine whether she should be a Justice."

I agree. Now, unfortunately, Republicans want to apply a completely different standard to Judge Kavanaugh. They want his documents kept sealed and stored so that he can waltz onto the Court without having to answer tough questions about what he has written, said, and done. They maintain that there is nothing in the documents that would be relevant or revelatory. Well, we can't know this supposed irrelevance, and neither can they until we all see those documents.

For some reason, the Republicans seem worried. They seem concerned. They seem apprehensive. The American people and we have a right to ask: What are they concealing and why are they scared of it? What is Judge Kavanaugh hiding and why is he afraid of it? That is a question he should answer and which they have a responsibility to address before we begin the hearings. Our questions require those documents.

There is, in fact, a lot of good reason to think that those documents will be relevant and revelatory, particularly the documents from his time in the White House. My Republican colleagues are now downplaying the role Judge Kavanaugh had while working for President Bush. Republican whip and Judiciary Committee member JOHN CORNYN, our friend and colleague from Texas, said that Judge Kavanaugh was "more or less a traffic cop," but that contention contradicts what our colleagues said at the time when Judge Kavanaugh was a nominee to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals. Senator CORNYN himself said then of Kavanaugh: "He . . . is currently Staff Secretary to President Bush, a job whose title belies the very serious and important responsibilities that individual performs."

Senator HATCH, also a colleague and a very distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee, said of Judge Kavanaugh: "His background as Staff Secretary may prove to be particularly good judicial training."

But for me the best indication of how important his role as Staff Secretary to President Bush was—not just as counsel, but as Staff Secretary—comes from Judge Kavanaugh himself. He said:

When people ask me which of my prior experiences has been most useful to me as a judge, I tell them that all of them have been useful, and I certainly draw on all of them. But I also do not hesitate to say that my five and a half years in the White House—and especially my three years as Staff Secretary for President Bush—were the most interesting and in many ways the most instructive.

I would read that sentence again, but I am not sure I need to. It will be in the RECORD, and it is well-known to many of my colleagues.

Judge Kavanaugh went on:

As Staff Secretary, I sat in meetings where he talked with President Hu and then-President Musharraf and President Karzai and Prime Minister Blair and Pope John Paul. I was at the G-8 in Scotland when the London subway bombing occurred. I saw and participated in the process of putting legislation together, whether it was terrorism insurance or Medicare prescription drug coverage or attempts at immigration reform. I worked on drafting and revising executive orders. I remember times on the Hill in negotiating last-minute changes in legislation. I saw regulatory agencies screw up. I saw how they might try to avoid congressional mandates. I saw the relationship between independent agencies and executive agencies and the President and White House and OMB. I saw FOIA requests.

That is from Judge Kavanaugh.

If there is any indication as to why we need those documents from the time he was Staff Secretary to President Bush, it is from Judge Kavanaugh's own words. If we want to know what kind of Justice he will be, we need to understand the decisions he has made and the lessons he has learned in that most informative job. If we refuse to even try, we have abdicated our constitutional responsibility. We have a duty.

I submit, with great respect, that the request made by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee involves all of us abdicating that responsibility unless we protest and raise a hue and cry and force the production of additional documents. This goes beyond any sort of partisan divide, and it goes beyond the question of whether any of my colleagues are voting for or against Judge Kavanaugh. It is about our constitutional responsibility.

These documents, as Judge Kavanaugh himself has said, would, in effect, reveal much about Judge Kavanaugh, for he worked on just about every major issue as counselor to President Bush and as Staff Secretary to him.

In a recent interview, Karl Rove noted: "Literally every document that goes to the president on a policy issue has to pass through the hands of the staff secretary."

As he himself has said, Judge Kavanaugh was at the President's side at many pivotal moments of the Bush Presidency—from the passage of the partial-birth abortion ban to debates over same-sex marriage and well beyond. We should know just what Judge Kavanaugh said as Staff Secretary to President Bush during those and other critical moments of the Bush Presidency. His advice to President Bush

and his role in those decisions are relevant. I think that word understates its importance. It is critical to our judgments about his qualifications.

Perhaps—maybe just by chance—there is nothing in those documents. When Judge Kavanaugh was in the White House, maybe he was just a traffic cop, as Senator CORNYN has claimed, or was an honest broker, as the judge described himself at his confirmation hearing. Yet, if that were true, what are they hiding? Why do they need to conceal it? We should have the opportunity to determine whether Judge Kavanaugh had truly been an honest broker, just a traffic cop, or had just passed documents through his hands without his having had any input. The best way to determine this is by reviewing those documents.

Judge Kavanaugh made this very point when he was an appellate court nominee. At his confirmation hearing, he was asked how Senators should assess his record. He answered: "I think that's done through an assessment of going back, in my case, 16 years of my career and looking at the kinds of things I've done in the staff secretary's office."

We should heed those words. They are the words of Judge Kavanaugh. We should examine all of the documents. It may take some additional time to review all of those documents but maybe not if there is nothing in there that relates to his view and his opinion and his role. If he were just a traffic cop or an honest broker, we can get through them very, very quickly. Regardless of the time involved, there is no more important task that we will undertake as U.S. Senators than to decide on his qualifications for being a Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. Anything less would be a dereliction of our duty.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The Senator from Louisiana.

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, last week, the House voted overwhelmingly, by a vote of 366 to 52, to extend the National Flood Insurance Program for 4 months, until November 30, 2018. The purpose is to allow for the continued reform efforts of this program so as to make it more accountable, more affordable, and more sustainable. Two weeks ago, the Senate demonstrated almost unanimous support for a 6-month extension of the National Flood Insurance Program, by a vote of 94 to 5.

The NFIP, as the Flood Insurance Program is called, insures properties in every State—approximately 6 million homes and businesses and over \$1.2 trillion in assets. The current law has it set to expire at 11:59 p.m. tomorrow, on July 31. If the NFIP is not extended, people will not be able to renew their flood insurance policies or purchase new ones. That means more will be uninsured during the peak of hurricane season. That is not acceptable. According to the National Association of Re-

altors, letting the NFIP expire would cost up to 40,000 property sales per month, or about 1,330 home sales per day.

Last week, the Senate tried to pass the short-term extension that the House had passed by unanimous consent, but we were unable to. So, on Friday, cloture was filed in the Senate on the 4-month extension that the House passed. The problem is that the cloture vote will not occur until Wednesday, setting up the final passage of the extension on Thursday. That means that the NFIP would lapse for 2 days.

This is totally avoidable. Its delay does nothing to advance reforms within the NFIP, many of which I proposed a year ago in a long-term reauthorization bill that I had introduced with colleagues from New York and West Virginia. A lapse does disrupt real estate transactions for the 2,600 Americans who are trying to close on their homes—perhaps on their first homes—over the next couple of days. By the way, these are not million-dollar properties, for 98.5 percent of NFIP properties are in parishes or counties with median household incomes of below \$100,000, and 62 percent are in parishes or counties with median household incomes below the national average of \$54,000.

Congress has always honored the flood insurance policies that NFIP policyholders have had. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to expedite the consideration of the National Flood Insurance Program's 4-month extension and pass it by unanimous consent.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

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

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

MEDICAID

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to talk about an important anniversary. Today marks 53 years since the Medicare and Medicaid Programs have been created. I will speak specifically today about Medicaid. Many Americans are familiar with all of the benefits that Medicaid provides to so many Americans, but I don't know if people have a sense of the scope of it.

First of all, Medicaid helps 70 million individuals and families in every stage of life. Medicaid covers nearly half of every birth in the United States of America. Medicaid covers 40 percent of all children across the country. In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, it is also true that roughly 40 percent of all of the children have their healthcare covered through Medicaid. Roughly 50 percent of the people with disabilities in our State are covered by Medicaid, and about 60 percent of those who need skilled care, so-called nursing home care—about 2 million Pennsylvanians—are covered by Medicaid.

Medicaid is currently considered the "gold standard" for children's

healthcare, which includes the early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment benefits, known as EPSDT. It doesn't get a lot of attention, but a lot of the professionals who understand pediatrics and children's healthcare will stress the importance of early and periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment.

Medicaid helps to prevent moms and dads from being forced into deciding whether to put food on their tables or take a child to see a doctor. Through Medicaid, 15 million people with disabilities receive assistance with their healthcare or with durable medical equipment, such as wheelchairs or assistive speaking devices, long-term supports for daily living, such as personal care attendants, and so many other benefits.

If you just focus on the category of Americans with disabilities who are children, 60 percent of children in America with disabilities are covered by Medicaid. Medicaid helps Americans afford their Medicare premiums. That is the interplay between both the Medicaid Program and the Medicare Program. Medicaid pays for nursing home care for older relatives who otherwise would incur \$75,000 per year of expenses, which would force countless middle-class families out of their homes and deprive them of their hard-earned savings.

How about our schools? Forty-eight percent of school districts use Medicaid funds to provide medical and therapy services in schools for children who receive special education.

Medicaid also funds transportation for eligible individuals to receive medical services.

Finally, on this long list, Medicaid is the primary payer for the treatment and services of opioid addiction, as well as for substance use disorder services.

All of those issues are critically important to the American people and especially, of course, to the American family. That is why last year—and continuing into 2018—the efforts that have been made to repeal the Affordable Care Act have had an adverse impact on Medicaid by, in one sense, decimating the program and badly injuring our ability to deliver all of those healthcare benefits to children, to people with disabilities, to seniors. In virtually every bill that has been considered in the Senate or the House, the effect on the opioid crisis has been devastating because of what has happened to the expansion of Medicaid as opposed to the original Medicaid Program itself.

I hope our Republican friends will consider all of those benefits and the impact on Medicaid when they are proposing repeal legislation and similar legislative proposals.

I will make a point about one family, which I think, in so many ways, is emblematic of a lot of other families when it comes to Medicaid. In Pennsylvania, I received a letter from a mom in Southeastern Pennsylvania. Her name

is Pam Simpson. She was writing to me about her son, Rowan. The impact on Rowan Simpson's life, like a lot of children's lives, is incomparable. It is hard to comprehend how beneficial it has been.

As I said, his mom Pam sent me a note. Here is what she said, in pertinent part. I will not read all of it, just an excerpt. She said:

In late January 2016, I applied for Medicaid assistance.

Medical Assistance, I should say. That is the Medicaid Program in Pennsylvania, Medical Assistance.

After Rowan was awarded this assistance, we were able to obtain wrap-around services, which included a Behavioral Health Consultant (BSC) and a Therapeutic Staff Support worker (TSS). . . . The wrap-around services have been a Godsend.

Toward the end of the letter, Pam Simpson said:

Without Medicaid, I am confident that I could not work full time to support our family. We would be bankrupt, or my son—

Meaning Rowan—

would go without the therapies he sincerely needs.

Pam Simpson concludes the letter this way:

Please think of my dear Rowan and his happy face, his big blue eyes, and his lovely strawberry blonde hair. Please think of me and my husband working every day to support our family. Please think of my 9-month-old daughter, Luna, who smiles and laughs at her brother daily; she will have to care for Rowan later in her life after we are gone. Overall, we are desperately in need of Rowan's Medicaid Assistance and would be devastated if we lost these benefits.

That is one mom talking about her son in Pennsylvania, but of course they are representative of so many families across the country.

All of us here know—it is pretty evident from the data on where we are positioned in the world—that we are the strongest country in the world—meaning the strongest economy—and that we are also the strongest military power in the world. There is no question about that. But that same country, that same strong country, over time has figured out a way to take care of the American family, especially through a program like Medicaid.

Hubert Humphrey said it well years ago. He may have even said this on the Senate floor when he was representing Minnesota. Hubert Humphrey said: "The moral test of government is how it treats those who are in the dawn of life . . . those who are in the twilight of life . . . and those who are in the shadows of life." In a sense, he is talking about children in the dawn of life, those with disabilities and others who might be in the shadows of life, and those who are senior citizens in the twilight of life.

No program touches more Americans than the Medicaid Program, and we must continue to work to fight to keep Medicaid strong not just for the next 50 years or 53 years—today is the anniversary—but for many years after that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, one of the great honors and privileges of being a Senator is that we get to confirm Presidential nominations to our country's highest courts.

President Trump has nominated an outstanding judge to fill an opening on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit. That judge is Georgia Supreme Court Justice Britt Grant. Tonight, the Senate will vote to invoke cloture on her nomination so we can confirm her later this week. This is a crucial vote.

Justice Grant has served with distinction on the Supreme Court of Georgia since January 2017. In that role, she has written over 40 opinions on both criminal and civil matters and participated in hundreds of other opinions. Her positions are not a mystery. She has a long record of defending and upholding our Constitution.

She served as Solicitor General for the State of Georgia from 2015 until her appointment to the State Supreme Court. This year, she was elected to her seat on the State Supreme Court without opposition. When that happens in my State, that means people on both sides of the aisle understand how she is applying the rule of law. It is a testament to the quality of her work and the dedication she has to the Constitution and to the people for whom she works.

Prior to her public service, Justice Grant argued a commercial litigation case before the highest Court in the land, the U.S. Supreme Court. And by the way, she won.

Justice Grant attended Stanford Law School. After graduating, she actually clerked for Judge Brett Kavanaugh—another outstanding nominee who will hopefully be confirmed to the U.S. Supreme Court later this year. I might add that Judge Kavanaugh sat through Justice Grant's confirmation hearing in front of the Judiciary Committee just a few months ago. He was there for the entire hearing because she did such a good job clerking for him earlier in her career.

Clearly, Justice Grant is immensely qualified to fill this Court of Appeals vacancy, and there is no doubt in my mind that she will do a fantastic job. In fact, our country needs more judges like Justice Grant.

I couldn't be prouder of her, her husband Justin, and their three kids, Charles, Mary Elise, and Jack.

Earlier this year, I was honored to introduce Justice Grant in her confirmation hearing and to commend her nomination with my highest recommendation. Tonight, I strongly urge my colleagues to support her final confirmation to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be granted enough time to complete my remarks before the vote.

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

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I come briefly but quickly and proudly to recommend Britt Grant to this body and to the United States of America to be the next judge from the State of Georgia to be on the circuit court of appeals.

Britt Grant is an outstanding jurist. She became a judge on the Georgia Supreme Court at the age of 40. She went to Stanford University Law School, and she went to Wake Forest University as an undergraduate. After she left Stanford University, she came to clerk for Brett Kavanaugh, who is now nominated for the U.S. Supreme Court.

Throughout her legal career, whether it was practicing as an attorney, whether it was serving as a judge, or whatever she did, she was always at the top of her class, at the top of her case, or at the top of her ability. I don't remember ever having a judge come before this body, since I have been in Congress, from my home State of Georgia who had more people pulling for her, more people wanting her to win, more people who think she is the right person at the right time for the United States of America.

So I come to the floor as the senior Senator from Georgia to tell my colleagues this: You have the chance to invoke cloture tonight with your vote and to vote tomorrow for the confirmation of the Honorable Britt Grant of the Georgia Supreme Court to be on the U.S. Circuit Court for the Eleventh Circuit of the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes for cloture and yes for Judge Grant tomorrow.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

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 Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit.

Mitch McConnell, Cindy Hyde-Smith, David Perdue, Mike Crapo, Mike Rounds, John Boozman, Ron Johnson, John Barrasso, Steve Daines, John Cornyn, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, James E. Risch, Richard Burr, Lindsey Graham, Thom Tillis, Roy Blunt.

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 Britt Cagle Grant, of Georgia, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Eleventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

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

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

NAYS—44

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

NOT VOTING—4

Flake	Nelson
McCain	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 52, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

CENTENNIAL OF FORT KNOX

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, today I am proud to recognize Fort Knox, an important asset of our national defense infrastructure in my home State, as it celebrates its centennial anniversary. Located in Bullitt, Hardin, and Meade Counties, the installation was established by Congress in 1918 and has taken an active role in the defense of our Nation ever since. Today Fort Knox is a source of pride for the community and our Commonwealth, and I would like to take a look back at its century of accomplishment.

Named in honor of the Revolutionary War major general and the first U.S. Secretary of War, Henry Knox, the site began as a field artillery training range for Camp Zachary Taylor in Louisville. Congress purchased 40,000 acres of land in Kentucky to accommodate approximately 60,000 soldiers. Construction began in July 1918 under the supervision of quartermaster W. H. Radcliffe, and Camp Knox served as a facility to support troops returning home at the conclusion of the Great War.

In subsequent years, Camp Knox became a training facility for thousands of troops from the National Guard, Reserve Officers Training Corps, and Citizens Military Training Camps. One of the citizens who trained there was author Robert Penn Warren of Guthrie, KY. Before he gained enduring fame for writing "All the King's Men," Warren's first published poem "Prophecy" appeared in the "Camp Knox Mess Kit" in 1922.

In 1931, the Army revolutionized our Nation's Armed Forces and formed a mechanized cavalry regiment at the facility. The next year, Congress gave the installation the name we call it today. Fort Knox was at the center of the mechanization of the cavalry, and it can proudly take credit for developing many of the tactics that helped win World War II.

As a vital contributor to our national security, Fort Knox has served wide-ranging roles throughout its 100 years. For instance, in 1937, it became the home of the U.S. bullion depository and the guardian of our Nation's most valuable assets and, at times, some of the world's most precious possessions. During the darkest days of the Second World War, the depository guarded the U.S. Declaration of Independence and the Constitution.

Fort Knox is also the proud home of the General George Patton Museum and Center of Leadership, a tourist destination honoring one of the giants of American military history.

While we celebrate the installation's remarkable history, we also recognize that Fort Knox continues to play a dynamic and integral role in our conventional force structure and our State's economy. In 2009, the Army Human Resources Command relocated to Fort Knox and led to the construction of the Army Human Resources Center, the largest project in the base's history. It's also the home to the Army's Recruiting Command and Cadet Command, which hosts thousands of Army

cadets each year for Cadet Summer Training. Most recently, the First Theater Sustainment Command moved to Fort Knox in 2017. These units add an indispensable benefit to our national security, and I am proud to have each one of them in Kentucky. Further, the installation has been recognized on numerous occasions in the Army's Communities of Excellence program and has developed a highly recognized energy savings program. At the same time, the surrounding community has established a number of supportive initiatives to help military families and transitioning Army personnel pursue regional employment opportunities.

From its origin as a camp with 40,000 acres, this multifunctional military installation has grown to cover approximately 109,000 acres and is the sixth largest urban area in Kentucky. The centennial celebration is bigger than the Army, involving a passionate community that supports the installation and the men and women serving there. It is my utmost privilege to join each of them in sending my congratulations to Fort Knox and to all of the Army personnel there for reaching this milestone. During the many events planned to mark the occasion, I wish them all the very best and would like to once again thank them for all they do to keep our nation safe. I urge all of my Senate colleagues to join me.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, family obligations unfortunately have kept me from being present for the cloture vote today on the nomination of Britt Grant, of Georgia, to be a U.S. circuit judge for the Eleventh Circuit. I have grave concerns about Justice Grant's qualifications and her record, and, had I been present, I would have voted against cloture on her nomination.

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: