

House Joint Resolution No. 15 in the 64th Legislative Session calling on the “federal government to restore federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians” and asking Congress to pass legislation to accomplish this. If the Senate passes H.R. 3764, Montanans’ calls to restore federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe will finally be answered.

The Little Shell Tribe of Montana enjoys immense support in the State of Montana because tribe’s history and culture are the fabric of Montana. The Little Shell deserves the passage of this legislation. It has been long overdue for this recognition and I call on the United States Senate to respect the State of Montana’s voice in this debate and move to pass H.R. 3764 in its current form. The Tribe has waited long enough for this action.

Sincerely,

STEVE BULLOCK,
Governor.

Mr. DAINES. The Little Shell is also unique, and all 12 of Montana’s Indian Tribes on our seven Indian reservations also support its recognition. The Little Shell also has the support of the entire Montana delegation. It has the support of our Governor, and it has the support of our Attorney General.

Here are their letters.

In fact, Federal recognition of the Little Shell has enjoyed support from the congressional delegation and our State’s Governors since the 1930s and 1940s when our country first began to federally recognize Indian Tribes. The American Indian Policy Review Commission, from later in 1977, also recognized its plight as a distinct entity.

There are more documents for the RECORD. Clearly, the record has existed in support of this Tribe’s Federal recognition. I remember, during my time in the House, looking at what it had been going through—literally, stacks and stacks of paperwork—in following a process. There is, indeed, longstanding evidence supporting its recognition, and I strongly disagree with my colleague’s objection.

The Little Shell Tribe has seen lifetimes—not a lifetime but lifetimes—of neglect from our Federal Government. I had hoped we could finally deliver its recognition here today. We are just one vote short in the Senate. I will not stop pushing for our government to rectify this injustice.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM R. EVANINA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday one of my colleagues came to the floor to talk about my objection to the unanimous consent request relating to the nomination of William R. Evanina.

When I noticed my intention to place a hold on this nominee back in June of this year, I made it very clear to the public and to the administration my reasons for doing so, and I put my statement of those reasons in the RECORD. I have done that consistently, not only since the rules of the Senate

require every Member to do that but even before that rule was ever put in place. When I put a hold on a bill or a hold on a nominee, I don’t ever want anybody to, say, put the adjective “secret” before the word “hold” because there is nothing secret about what I do when I place a hold on something.

The Judiciary Committee has experienced difficulty in obtaining relevant documents and briefings from the Justice Department and the Office of the Director of National Intelligence.

For example, Deputy Attorney General Rod Rosenstein personally assured me the Senate Judiciary Committee would receive equal access to information that had been provided to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence with regard to any concessions in its negotiations regarding pending subpoenas from that committee related to the 2016 election controversies. I have not received equal access, as promised, on that front.

On August 7 of this year, I wrote to the Justice Department and pointed out that the House Intelligence Committee had received documents related to Bruce Ohr that we had not received. The Department initially denied those records had been provided to the House Intelligence Committee. After my staff confronted the Department on that misinformation, we eventually received some Bruce Ohr documents.

In that 2018 letter I have referred to, I asked for documents based on my equal access agreement with Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein, and as you might expect, I have not received a response to date.

This morning, I had Acting Attorney General Whitaker in my office for issues he wanted to bring up, but I also had an opportunity to present him with three pages—fairly finely printed—that had a multitude of requests for information that in my constitutional role of oversight of the Justice Department, they should be providing to me. Some of them have nothing to do with this hold, but the Department does have a pretty good record of not responding to this chairman of the Judiciary Committee on things I have a constitutional responsibility to do.

I also have a promise from these Department heads that they will supply information when Congress asks for it. Since that 2018 letter, I have learned the Justice Department has taken the position that Director Coats has prohibited them from sharing the requested records with the committee.

In addition to the records that were requested in May of this year, the Director of National Intelligence and the Justice Department provided a briefing in connection with a pending House Intel subpoena to which no Senate Judiciary Committee member was invited. Thus far, the committee’s attempts to schedule any equivalent briefing have been ignored. The administration’s lack of cooperation has forced my hand. So then, I continue to press for this hold on this nominee.

My objection, if there were ever a request for a unanimous consent to move ahead, is not intended to question the credentials of Mr. Evanina in any way whatsoever. However, the executive branch must recognize it has an ongoing obligation to respond to congressional inquiries in a timely and reasonable manner.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, now I would like to speak to the issue and several issues that deal with international trade.

During the last 2 years, there has been more talk about international trade in this town than at just about any other point since this President has been President or, you might say, over a long period of time in Washington.

When I was elected to the Senate in 1980, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, known as GATT, was the main guiding document on international trade. GATT was signed by 23 nations in Geneva on October 30, 1947, a little more than 2 years after the destruction of World War II. It remained the institutional foundation for global trade until January 1, 1995. That day is when the World Trade Organization—we refer to it as WTO—was born with 81 charter members, including this great country of the United States. The WTO has been in place now for 24 years, serving as the clearinghouse for our rules-based international trading system.

Since the start of the WTO, international trade volumes have increased by 250 percent. Countries representing 98 percent of global merchandise trade are currently members of the WTO, with 22 more countries officially working toward joining. Over all, the WTO is moving global commerce forward just as planned. The rules-based trading system it promotes has been very successful, integrating people across the world into the global economy.

I also must acknowledge that international trade can, at times, be disruptive. There are regions of the country that have been disproportionately impacted by job losses, at least in part, to foreign competition over the last several decades. Those losses become especially problematic when they are the result of market forces being overwhelmed by foreign government intervention—any foreign government, as far as that is concerned. President Trump has rightly pointed that out and has delivered on his promise to make trade fairer for workers across our country, for agriculture and international trade is the bridge to the world’s customers.

In Iowa, we export every third row of soybeans. Some people like to say that God made Iowa for the growing of corn and soybeans, and I agree. Iowa also has significant pork and beef exports as well. American farmers produce more than we can possibly consume here in