the record on a truly astonishing policy proposal—a truly astonishing policy proposal.

After months of enthusiastic declarations of support, after tripping over one another to prove their devotion to the far-left core of the new Democratic Party, the vast majority of our colleagues across the aisle were unable to vote against even an obviously ludicrous proposal to tank the U.S. economy and to leave American workers out in the cold.

You might think that after their radical proposal met with such an inglorious end, my colleagues might choose to pause and take stock. Well, think again. Just yesterday, our Democratic colleagues introduced a Senate version of Speaker Pelosi's sweeping legislation to rewrite the rules of American politics to benefit one side—new Washington rules for how citizens can exercise political speech, new Washington systems to funnel taxpayer dollars into the pockets of political campaigns, and an unprecedented Washington intrusion into State and local election law all across our country.

As I have argued before, it conveniently turns out that the vast majority of their proposed changes seem tailored to help more Democrats get elected and stay elected; hence my name for this legislation: the Democratic politician protection act.

Apparently, our friends are under the impression that if Democrats aren't winning as many elections as they would like, then the entire process by which we elect our representatives must certainly be broken. If Democrats don't like an outcome, then the rules themselves need to be tossed aside. This seems to be emerging as a kind of pattern on the other side of the aisle.

When our Constitution, our institutions, or the American people disappoint our Democratic colleagues, instead of taking the hint and perhaps making their own positions more mainstream, they instead look to change the rules.

After they failed to defeat the nomination of Justice Kavanaugh last year, liberal leaders decided the underlying structure of the American judiciary needed to be radically overhauled to suit their whims.

They set out to rehabilitate the absurd notion of "court-packing"—a term that since the 1930s has been synonymous in American history with the idea of an unprincipled power grab.

The idea that Democrats sometimes lose Presidential elections and that Republican Presidents sometimes subsequently appoint Supreme Court Justices is apparently no longer tolerated. Instead of filling the existing vacancies, why shouldn't the next Democratic President just make up a bunch of new ones—create a bunch of new ones—create a bunch of new cones—so the far left can stack the Court? Forget about nine Justices. Forget about judges who don't wear red robes or blue robes but black robes. Forget about interpreting and applying

our laws and Constitution the way they are written instead of how partisans might wish they were written. The far left wants to forget about all of that because Democrats would rather rewrite the rules.

So out of the ash heap of history came this talk of "court-packing"—a notion that would threaten the rule of law and our American judicial system as we have long understood it. It is a truly radical proposal that has been dead and buried by bipartisan consensus for almost a century. But now President Obama's Attorney General, Eric Holder, says: "We should be talking even about expanding the number of people who serve on the Supreme Court, if there is a Democratic president." One of our Senate colleagues, who is currently running for President. called this an "interesting idea that I would have to think more about." The New York Times reported that at a recent campaign event, another Democratic candidate said that he is open to the idea after being asked about it by a member of a new far-left group that is literally named—this is their name: listen to this—"Pack the Courts."

I hope the lion's share of our Democratic colleagues will speak out forcefully against exhuming this thoroughly discredited idea. I hope my colleagues will have the courage to look these farleft agitators in the eye and tell them that some traditions and some institutions are more important than partisan point-scoring. But given that we have already seen Democrats rush headlong to embrace schemes like the Democratic politician protection act, Medicare for None, and the so-called Green New Deal, I have to say, at this point, that kind of courageous statement would come as a pleasant surprise.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 297

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the title of the bill for the second time.

The senior assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 297) to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019—MOTION TO PROCEED— Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 268, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 15, H.R. 268, a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

The question is on the motion to proceed.

The motion was agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 268) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes.

Pending:

McConnell (for Shelby) Amendment No. 5, of a perfecting nature.

Schumer Amendment No. 6, of a perfecting nature.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw Amendment Nos. 5 and 6.

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

The amendments were withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

AMENDMENT NO. 201

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 201.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. Shelby] proposes an amendment numbered 201.

Mr. SHELBY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute.)

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

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 senior assistant 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 Senate amendment No. 201 to H.R. 268, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal